

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE MEETING MAY 14, 2019

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

President Kimberly Brandon called the meeting to order at 2:45 p.m. The following Commissioners were present: Kimberly Brandon, Victor Makras and Doreen Woo Ho. Commissioners Adams and Gilman were not present.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – April 23, 2019

Commissioner Woo Ho made minor edits on pages 74-76 of the minutes.

ACTION: Commissioner Woo Ho moved approval as amended; Commissioner Makras seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners in favor. The minutes of the April 23, 2019 were adopted, as amended.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Vote on whether to hold a closed session and invoke the attorney-client privilege.

ACTION: Commissioner Woo Ho moved approval; Commissioner Makras seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners in favor.

At 2:45 p.m., the Commission withdrew to closed session to discuss the following:

(1) CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL AND REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR – This is specifically authorized under California Government Code Section 54956.8. *This session is closed to any non-City/Port representative: (Discussion Item)

- a. Property: Pier 43½, located at Taylor St. and the Little Embarcadero
Persons Negotiating: Port: Michael Martin, Deputy Director Real Estate and Development
**Negotiating Parties: Golden Gate Scenic – Red & White Fleet: Joe Burgard, Executive Vice President

Under Negotiations: ___Price ___Terms of Payment Both

5. RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

At 3:15 p.m., the Commission withdrew from closed session and reconvened in open session.

ACTION: Commissioner Woo Ho moved approval to adjourn closed session and reconvene in open session; Commissioner Makras seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners in favor.

ACTION: Commissioner Woo Ho moved approval to not disclose any information discussed in closed session; Commissioner Makras seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners in favor.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Port Commission Affairs Manager announced the following:

- A. Announcement of Prohibition of Sound Producing Electronic Devices during the Meeting: 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. Announcement of Time Allotment for Public Comments: 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.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA

8. EXECUTIVE

A. Executive Director's Report

- Salmon Season Opening – May 1, 2019

Elaine Forbes, Executive Director - The first item is to announce the opening of salmon season. It opened on May 1st. There will be a temporary closure beginning June 1st through the 3rd and again on July 1st through the 10th. The season will be open through October 15th. Captains from Fisherman's Wharf sports boats anticipate a good year as the recreational season opened very strong in the spring between April 13th and 30th. A good fishing season for us brings in the transient fleet boats, which drives up revenues at Hyde Street Harbor. We wish our fishing community a safe and successful salmon season.

- Japanese Coast Guard Training Ship Vessel, Kojima, Visit to the Port – May 11, 2019

Currently at Piers 30-32 is the Japanese Coast Guard training vessel, Kojima. She arrived on the May 11th and will depart tomorrow. San Francisco was her first port of call from Japan. She is traveling through the Panama Canal to New York when she leaves tomorrow for 101 days of over 2,600 miles of journey with 43 cadets from the Japanese Coast Guard. It's a training mission. We're happy to have her here at Piers 30-32. She was commissioned in 1993.

- Teatro ZinZanni Project Status & ENA Update

Finally, I would like to provide an update to the Port Commission on the status of Teatro ZinZanni and the status of the ENA. In November 2018, this commission granted two six-months' extension to the ENA between the Port and the development team. Since that meeting, the Historic Preservation Commission has found the project design consistent with the planning code article 10 requirements for the Northeast Waterfront Landmark District. The planning commission provided a conditional use authorization unanimously and the final required land use approval on May 2nd. Congratulations to the development team. Under my delegated authority, I agreed to the final six-month extension request made by the developer earlier this month. Port staff and the developer are working diligently on the LDDA and lease. We'll be able to bring that to you and then to the Board of Supervisors in the next few months.

Timothy Reyff - I'm a field representative with Carpenters Local 22. I'm here to speak in favor of this development. The development team has reached out to the carpenters. As you know, it has agreed to use the signatory union GC, which will provide quite a few jobs for our members, also opportunities for apprentices, women and minorities. It's a great project. Like Commissioner Richards at the Planning Commission said we're losing Beach Blanket Babylon, and we're losing Lucca Deli. We're getting something back with this project and it's a good project. I hope you people will move forward with this.

Diana Taylor - I'm president of the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association. Our members live and work across the street from this development. We've been working with the developer for some time and the architects to make it a good project and we're in support. We hope this can be moved ahead as fast as possible.

Jay Wallace, project manager and partner at TZK Broadway – I'm simply here to say we're looking forward to coming back in two weeks. In two weeks, we'll have an informational presentation. When we were last here, we thought that we might need a couple extra months. We came this close to finishing everything in the first six-month extension. We recently asked for another extension but we can see the light at the end of the tunnel. I want to thank the Port director and the staff that she's presented to the project. We're working twice a week finalizing all of the details. It's been a

great project. You've got great staff. We're pleased to be here and ready to get going. Thank you very much. We'll see you in a couple weeks. I want to introduce one of my partners. ZinZanni didn't come down today but Rakesh Patel of Presidio Hotel Group of San Francisco is here as well. We're all excited to be in front of the Port over the next couple of months.

Cynthia Gomez - I am the research analyst at Unite Here Local 2. We represent about 13,000 hotel workers and have been working closely with the developers of the ZinZanni project for going on five-plus years. They have had a very strong collaborative relationship with us. The project has our support partly because it comes with guarantees that the workers will have a fair and neutral process with which to organize a union once the hotel is in place. We look very much forward to seeing the hotel open. Hopefully, it gets all of its approvals.

9. CONSENT

- A. Request approval to amend the Port's Harbor Traffic Code allowing certain parking and curb restrictions on Port streets within Mission Bay east of Third Street to accommodate events at the Chase Center. (Resolution No. 19-17)
- B. Request approval of Consent to Sublease between Blue and Gold Fleet, L.P. and Open Top Sightseeing San Francisco, LLC., for a month to month term to operate a ticket booth and office space located at Pier 41 on the Embarcadero near the foot of Powell Street. (Resolution No. 19-18)

ACTION: Commissioner Makras moved approval; Commissioner Woo Ho seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners in favor. Resolution Nos. 19-17 and 19-18 were adopted.

10. REAL ESTATE & DEVELOPMENT

- A. Informational update on the San Francisco Fire Boat Station No. 35 Project and a new 50-year Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Port of San Francisco and the San Francisco Fire Department.

Elaine Forbes - I'd just like to announce that our new fire chief is in the house. Welcome, Chief Nicholson.

Dan Hodapp, Port's Planning and Environment Division - Who you'll get to hear from in just a moment. I'm working collaboratively with the Port's real estate division and the project team in bringing this project forward. At this presentation, I'd like to introduce the project team and the city's new fire chief, provide a description of the project. Our team will then provide detail on the proposed memorandum of understanding between the Port and the fire department. First and most importantly, our new fire chief, Nicholson, would like to say a few words.

Jeanine Nicholson - Thank you very much, young lad. I appreciate that. Good afternoon, President Brandon, commissioners, Director Forbes. Hello, my sister. This is the maiden voyage for me here at this commission. Thank you for having us. Much appreciated. This project has been a team effort going on long before I took over last week, as you can imagine. I have been involved in this project for a while. We have done our due diligence with all the parties involved, Public Works, BCDC, the Port, the architects on not just the design but also the Port MOU, which we are thrilled that we're moving towards that. It's been a long time coming. I want to thank everyone for their work on that.

In terms of the fire department, our operational responsibilities on the water has grown significantly over the past many years. This is a much-needed facility for us. We are looking forward to moving this project forward. This is also going to be on our agenda at our commission meeting next week. I want to let you know that we believe this is a great project. We're excited about it moving forward.

Commissioner Brandon - Thank you, and congratulations.

Dan Hodapp - In addition to our new fire chief, I just want to point out a couple of other team members in the room: Charles Higuera from Public Works, the bond program manager; Alan Kawasaki of Shah Kawasaki Architects; and Bill Krill of Swinerton Builders are all here, very important and very involved people as well as our fire chief who was involved in a lot of the details and development of what we have to present to you today for your consideration in an upcoming meeting. We know the fire department fights fires but the fire boat crews do much more. Their duties include search and rescue, spill containment, assisting with Homeland Security and much more around the Bay.

Location is important. Fire Station 35 at Pier 22½ near the Bay Bridge at the foot of Harrison Street is located centrally within Port property. It's also centrally along the city's waterfront. It's centrally within the central Bay Area region, a lot of centrals there, which relates to its role. It's much more than Port property. It also serves the larger city. It also is the one fire station on the Bay that responds to many different types of emergencies with this expanded role, which has in part to do with why they're building a new fire station for us here.

Fire Station 35 is currently inadequate for its function due to its age, its condition and size. The new station is larger to meet current code for living conditions, to consolidate gear such as oil containment booms and jet skis, things that have to be delivered to the site in case of an emergency at this point and to berth multiple vessels at this location.

The project would demolish Pier 22½ behind the historic fire station, as you can see in this image. It's the one with the fire boat in front of it. It would also demolish what's left of Pier 24, known as the south finger pier. You can see there's not a lot to take down there anymore and also parts of the marginal

wharf. This image shows in orange the areas that would be demolished. In the shaded gray would be the location of a new floating fire station. On it would be a two-level, 14,500-square-foot, two-story fire boat station constructed on a 16,500-square-foot steel float. The apron around the floating fire station would provide mooring for at least three fire boats.

A plan view where you can see the building and the size of the float, mooring for three fire boats, one small rescue watercraft, a gangway and access ramp that would connect the float to the existing wharf and provide pedestrian vehicle access on that.

The fire boat station would be constructed off site largely. It would be towed to the site by a tugboat and delivered. There is a relatively small amount of construction that occurs on site. There is some shoreline work for the size of the project.

The existing fire station 35 would remain in place. No renovation work is proposed for that structure and it would remain that. A floating pier or barge concept was chosen to address the expected flooding and sea-level rise in the project area during its 50-year design life.

The floating pier has the advantages of not needing access ramps to the fire boats from the float, which helps with response time and also eliminates the maintenance problems with the flexible floating ramps that would be necessary and both the construction and maintenance costs associated with that.

It's a new type of design, as we respond to sea-level rise. We're excited for this project to address this and move forward with this type of a concept. For the fire station, the first floor will be for emergency operations, equipment storage, supply and repair, decontamination rooms, equipment lockers and small craft storage.

The second floor is the living space for 35. It includes a dormitory, locker rooms, also sleeping rooms, laundry and a kitchen/dining area that opens onto an outdoor patio at the east end of the building. The total height of the floating fire station will be 36 feet.

The perceived height of the fire boat station from the shoreline will vary as the float rises and falls with the tides. So we can expect it to be eight feet higher and lower. The historic fire boat house will continue to be used for fire engine and some equipment storage.

There would also be an 950-square-foot public-access deck built for viewing the fire station and for public art that is currently being developed in conjunction with the arts commission. The project is required to provide fill mitigation for the amount of new cover.

Pier 70 Wharf 8 would have 15,000 square feet of derelict fill removed. To give you an idea of what the condition of this is, it's a very apt project to have removed. A couple of views of the new fire station -- this one from the promenade just to the north of it.

The materials were selected. It uses the same type of siding that we have on our cruise terminal. It picks up a form similar to the pier sheds, emphasizing its horizontal nature. It's intended to sit quietly behind the existing fire station.

This is a view from a little further out. You can see it in relationship to Pier 26 beyond. It's designed to sit quietly along the waterfront but still have a presence with its fire boats. The fire boats will probably be the biggest visual as they are now.

The project was recently approved by the Bay Conservation and Development Commission. Funding is from the 2014 earthquake safety and emergency response bond. It's about \$35 million in total project cost. If approved by this commission at the next meeting, construction would start in July and be complete by the end of 2020. Our deputy director of real estate, Michael Martin, will now talk to you about the memorandum of understanding that's being put together.

Michael Martin, real estate and development - I want to briefly run you through the basic terms of the memorandum of understanding starting off with the plan view of the leased premises under the MOU, starting with the historic firehouse, which is the blue rectangle towards the bottom of the slide. The rent payable on that location is \$1.60 per square foot, which is our parameter rate for shed space in this area. Moving outward from that to the red dotted polygon around it, that's the marginal wharf area, which includes the area that will be reconstructed after demolishing some of the dilapidated piers.

The rent payable for that area will be \$0.40 per square foot, which is the apron and pier parameter rate. The large green polygon going up to the top of the slide from that is the water area within which would be the gangway, the steel float and the new firehouse construction as well as the berthing areas to the left and right of the new steel float. That area would be payable \$0.09 a square foot, which is half of the submerged land parameter rates. We've negotiated that term in reference to the maritime benefits of this operation in terms of life and safety and other benefits to the maritime operations and the mission of the Port.

It would have a 50-year term with rent escalation during that term. The project construction will take approximately two years. During that time, the premises would still operate. The operations would continue after construction is complete. As described earlier, some of the rents payable would be approximately \$14,000 a month, which would be payable commencing after project completion. The MOU also calls for rent credits so \$1.6 million of improvements that were formed at Pier 26 that would be remaining

unamortized after the completion of that lease would be allocated here to defray rent costs.

In addition, \$800,000 of improvements to Port property -- the new public access area to the south of the historic firehouse to be constructed as part of this project would be assigned rent credits. The MOU calls for additional rent credits should additional capital improvements benefitting Port property happen in the future subject to Port approval.

The MOU calls for maintenance and repairs to be the sole responsibility of the SF Fire Department. The fire department would also perform a capital needs assessment every five years. If that needs assessment identifies projects that need to be performed, the Port and SFFD would work cooperatively on trying to find funding for those to make sure the site continue to be operated in a safe manner.

The MOU provides provisions and conditions under which the fire department may relinquish portions of the premises. So long as the premises can still be operated for the fire department purposes with that relinquishment, that's one of the conditions. In addition, if the Port is to take anything back, it needs to be able to repurpose and used for the benefit of the Port, either through rentals or other Port benefits. Obviously, to be able to take it back, we need to have access rights and everything pertinent to actually taking that property back.

It's a process that's laid out. Obviously, the parties will negotiate the right way to do that at the proper time. Lastly, the fire department must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act and the mitigation, monitoring and reporting program that has been issued in respect of this project. There's an operations plan that the Port and the fire department have agreed to as part of the MOU that will govern the operations at the site. All regulatory permits and the conditions of those permits must be adhered to as well as applicable city laws and ordinances.

Commissioner Makras - I support it completely. I accept staff's analysis with the economics of this. But I look at this as a one-off. It's a city agency and crunching the numbers in this way to arrive at a deal with a sister agency is just fine with me. If the fire department left for some reason, I'm sure the recommendation from staff on repurposing this for something else would yield much different numbers than this. I'm prepared to support the item next time it comes before us.

Commissioner Woo Ho - I'm very supportive. We've all seen that fire boat. Actually, we've been on it once. I was on it once with Mayor Lee and we went out on the boat. It was during America's Cup. It was kind of fun. I think the tugboat shot the water up in the air, said it was a salute. I am familiar with the space and the facility. I could see where some of the renovations are needed. Staff has done a thorough job. I don't have any further questions at this time.

Commissioner Brandon - Chief, congratulations and welcome to the Port of San Francisco. I, too, support this item. It's good that for the first time we're actually going to get rent. My only question is the existing structure and what's going to happen with it. What is the life expectancy of it? How long can it remain without any investment?

Michael Martin - As we described, it is currently able to be used for its purpose. The fire department continues to want to continue to use it during construction. We all see that there may be expenditures to be needed. That's why we negotiated the capital needs assessment every five years. We can really keep a good eye on what is required to avoid any sudden outages of that facility. The benefits of the new construction would allow it to be operated should there be an outage where we need to do construction on the historic firehouse. There was an intention to keep what's there in place as long as possible until we have the new structure in place. I wouldn't say that's an indefinite future for the historic firehouse. But there's a definite interest from the historic preservation community in trying to keep that historic fabric as part of the Embarcadero.

Commissioner Brandon - Thank you. We look forward to the item coming back.

11. FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION

- A. Request authorization to award contracts to (1) BAE Urban Economics, (2) Economic & Planning Systems, (3) Keyser Marston Associates, and (4) Seifel Consulting, for as-needed real estate economics and related professional services, each contract in an amount not to exceed \$750,000. (Resolution No. 19-19)

Boris Delepine, finance and administration division - The item before you is an action item to recommend award of the Port's as-needed real estate economics request for qualifications to the four highest-ranked scoring firms. They are BAE Urban Economics, Economic and Planning Systems, Keyser Marston Associates, and Seifel Consulting. Each contract will have a not-to-exceed amount of \$750,000 with a four-year term and an option to extend that term for one additional year.

The project complies with a number of our Port-wide strategic goals including planning and executing a holistic and balanced strategy to the real estate portfolio and asset management to maximize value and income stream to the Port and by prioritizing projects to renew waterfront facilities for the ongoing enjoyment of residents and to support local commercial and industrial businesses and employees.

The scope of work for this contract, like all as-needed or on-call projects, is not defined in advance. As-needed contracts serve as master agreements under which Port staff issue contract service orders, or CSOs, on a project-by-project basis.

Historically, these contracts were managed by the Port's planning and development division. After the Port's structural reorganization in 2017, these contracts now come under the new real estate and development division.

The current project scope includes a greater focus on lease negotiations and financial feasibility analysis with a decrease in architectural and planning services, which has also resulted in a decrease in the LBE subcontracting goal. The scope is based on the availability of firms. There are more planning and architectural firms than there are real estate economic firms. The services under this contract may include but are not limited to real estate lease negotiations, financial feasibility analysis, development cost forecasting, market and leasing, strategic planning, lease management analysis.

Some of the upcoming projects include support and assistance with the evaluation of solicitations for pier rehabilitations, strategic leasing support and economic consultant assistance at Pier 70, Mission Rock and Crane Cove Park.

The current four master agreements for as-needed real estate economic services were awarded in 2016. Those contracts valued at \$500,000 each were slated to last through June 2020. However, those funds have nearly all been expended in advance of the contract's expiration date.

With your approval on January 16th of this year, we issued a request for qualifications to solicit proposals for a new pool of consultants. On February 5th, we held a pre-proposal meeting at Pier 1. There were 26 individuals that attended that meeting. Given the specialized scope of these services, we were satisfied with the turnout. We then convened a three-member evaluation panel. Panel members included: Faith Kirkpatrick, a senior project manager from the Mayor's Office of Housing; Susan Ma, a business development manager from the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development; and Meghan Wallace, the Port's finance director made up our panel.

A list of the selection panel members was provided to and approved by the contract monitoring division. On the submittal deadline, March 1st, we received seven proposals. The first step in any evaluation process is to review each proposal for compliance with the minimum qualifications.

All firms met the MQs. One firm, The Concourse Group, was deemed nonresponsive by CMD for failure to meet the pre-award LBE requirements. The RFQ was divided into two phases. The written proposal phase was worth a total of 100 points. Five of the remaining six 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 results. We're recommending contract award again to Seifel Consulting, BAE Urban Economics, Keyser Marsten Associations and

Economic and Planning Systems. They are the four highest-ranked firms. Three of those teams are incumbent firms. Keyser Marsten is the sole exception. Staff from the real estate division and I met with the losing firms to review score sheets, to provide feedback on their strengths and weaknesses. On April 17th, we issued the notice of intent to award contracts. We did not receive any protests regarding the evaluation process or the selected teams.

Representatives from BAE Urban Economics are here today. BAE is a minority-owned firm comprised of 18 individuals and five offices nationwide including Berkeley. BAE currently serves as a prime consultant on the Port's existing contract. On their current contract, they're meeting 14 percent LBE participation goal currently but they're projected to close at 20 percent due to contract service orders that we have forthcoming with our maritime division. BAE has provided a financial feasibility analysis for Piers 80 to 96. They supported the Port's economic impact and nexus study. They have provided development support on the NASA Research Park development in Mountain View.

Economic Planning Systems, or EPS, are also here today. They're a Sacramento-based company with an office in Oakland. They are an incumbent firm with real estate economic experience that includes the Pier 70 master plan, waterfront plan update and the redevelopment of Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard and Treasure Island. Their current LBE participation is also 14 percent but they'll close at 22 percent on the existing contract.

Keyser Marsten is a Berkeley-based company with experience providing financial analysis and lease negotiations on Pier 70 historic core, Marina del Rey harbor project and Alameda Point Development in Alameda, California. They have committed to subcontract 18 percent of the contract work to LBE firms.

Finally, Seifel Consultant is a woman-owned San Francisco-based LBE. Seifel is also an incumbent firm. They are currently at 18 percent and projected to close at 20 percent LBE participation. They've supported us with Alcatraz lease negotiations, the Teatro ZinZanni financial feasibility analysis, Mission Rock and Pier 70 cost estimating and real estate economic support on the Candlestick revitalization project.

If you award these contracts today, we'll work to issue the notices to proceed by mid-June. The contracts are scheduled for completion in 2023. We respectfully request that you award the Port's as-needed real estate economics RFQ to BAE Urban Economics, Economic and Planning Systems, Keyser Marsten Associates and Seifel Consulting. Each contract is valued at \$750,000 with a four-year term and an option to extend that term for one year. I'm joined today by Rebecca Benassini from our real estate division. Finbarr Jewell from the contract monitoring division is also here as are representatives from the winning teams. We're all available to answer your questions.

Commissioner Woo Ho - Thank you for the presentation. It's good that we are obviously dealing with some known firms. They seem to have had experience with us already. My question relates on a higher landscape level to understand. As we have been awarding these contracts out over the years, it certainly has not been the first time that we've been presented with this kind of proposal. How much of the work do we think is volume related, meaning we don't have enough staff to do the work. How much of the work is specific expertise that we lack? The third part of my question is as we work with all these consultants, I assume we get smarter, that we learn more and that we learn models, or we learn and so that our reliance factor also changes over time as we absorb. Or hopefully, that's the way we work with them so that we do learn and that we also can absorb more and, in the future, can be more self-reliant. My questions are more at that strategic level than to question whether we need the contracts but to understand where we're headed with these over the longer term.

Elaine Forbes - I'm going to start to answer that question. Then, Boris, we'll give it to Rebecca Benassini. One of the things I do want to note is that part of it is a staff-capacity issue but part of it is a third-party-validation requirement as well. Even if we have staff that can beautifully run the models and we do and understand the financial analysis and understand real estate extremely well, when we have such high-value economic proposals in front of us, we do want that third-party validation. Though staff can perform much of this work and performs a lot of this work, we do rely on that third party just to double, triple check because there is such value in these deals. We want to make sure that our public agency is not leaving money on the table.

Rebecca Benassini - I completely agree with that. The only other thing I would add -- volume definitely. As we contemplate the various items coming before us with Mission Rock and Pier 70 going very, very quickly, we also have the RFPs coming up and historic piers and other RFPs that we're working on. We see a tremendous volume of work. I know we're going to have the assistance that we're really going to rely on that. We can just accomplish a lot more with the firms. The other valuable thing that we get from our firms, not only validation, is a negotiating tool. It's helpful to have information they can bring to bear relative to other deals that we can then use the negotiation table that we could have found ourselves. It would just take us quite a long time to come up with the other examples that we then use in our negotiations.

Commissioner Woo Ho - I do think that you all are very competent. What you show us, whether in open or closed session, you do your homework. Your analysis is strong. I do have confidence in that. I want to say that also for the record. I understand the argument of third-party validation but I hope that each time we learn something from an outside source or we learn it ourselves, we're just getting smarter and smarter. I think that has been the case since I've been on this commission. We have learned a lot of lessons. We are smarter about how we go about doing business and that should always be the ongoing goal of continuous learning here and continuous improvement.

Commissioner Makras - No questions. I'm supportive of the item.

Commissioner Brandon - Boris, thank you so much for this presentation. Has CMD given us LBE goals for this?

Boris Delepine - Yes. The LBE subcontracting goal for this RFQ is 13 percent.

Commissioner Brandon - It's 13. So what is the goal of 21 percent?

Boris Delepine - The previous contract. The current contract that we currently have is 20 percent goal. I was giving you a look at how well these incumbent firms did in terms of meeting the existing goal but the goal for this contract is 13 percent.

Commissioner Brandon - So the existing firms, none of them have reached that goal, but yet we've run out of money?

Boris Delepine - They will meet the goal at the end of the contract life. When we take a snapshot today, two of the firms are at 14 percent. Those are payments and not work that's been invoiced to date and work that will be done to complete the existing contract service order. We can project that each of the existing firms will meet their LBE obligations on the existing contract.

Commissioner Brandon - On here, you have it at 20 percent but it's actually 21 percent?

Boris Delepine - The existing LBE subcontracting goal is 20.

Commissioner Brandon - So they will all meet 20 percent by the end of the contract?

Boris Delepine – Yes and representatives from the contract monitoring division are also here. When LBE goals are not met, the contract monitoring division has the ability to fine or submit penalties to firms that don't meet the goals to balance that differential.

Commissioner Brandon - When they fine them, where does the money go?

Boris Delepine - To the general fund.

Commissioner Brandon - So you will report back to us if they do or don't meet that goal?

Boris Delepine - Yes.

Commissioner Brandon - Why was the former goal 20 percent, and now it's 13 percent?

Boris Delepine -Because of the new scope of work. When this contract moved from the planning and development division to the real estate and development division, we lost a lot of the planning services and architectural services that were performed with the Waterfront Land Use Plan update. It had a high LBE availability. The real estate economics work, the lease negotiation, site planning has fewer firms that provide that work and, therefore, a lower LBE goal.

Commissioner Brandon - I understand that but the amount of the contract is the same.

Boris Delepine - The previous contract amount was \$500,000. These contracts are \$750,000.

Commissioner Brandon - It's increasing with a lower goal.

Boris Delepine - Yes.

Commissioner Brandon - What can we do as a commission as the Port to increase the availability of firms?

Elaine Forbes - I think that a lot of the outreach work we've been doing is helpful to get firms certified who do this work but don't do it for the city is one. Obviously breaking up the work that they've done as good as they can to reach a smaller pool of qualified LBE firms.

Finbarr Jewell - CMD is always trying to encourage new firms to be certified. Even at pre-proposal conferences, we are encouraging the LBEs that do attend, if they are taking on new tasks or providing new services, to become LBE certified. When CMD sets the LBE goal or requirement for the project, we work very diligently with Port staff to ensure that we understand the changing niche of the demands of the upcoming as-needed projects. With consultation with Port staff, the LBE participation requirement was lowered.

Commissioner Brandon - So this is for planning, or this is for real estate?

Elaine Forbes - It's for real estate.

Commissioner Brandon - When we come back for planning, that means the goal is going to go up, right?

Finbarr Jewell - That's correct.

Commissioner Brandon - I will look for it.

Commissioner Woo Ho - Rebecca, you mentioned the volume of the work. Sometimes, we try to also get our developers in their proposal to help us with some of the funding. I want to know how much of these contracts are they

subject to where we might have the developers help us with the funding so they are not purely Port funds by themselves. Is that correct?

Rebecca Benassini - Yes. That's a very good point. I don't have a number to provide to you but I can definitely come up with that. Much of this work will be funded by Mission Rock and Pier 70 developments. If we are successful in the solicitation for historic piers or Seawall Lot 330 and 30/32 and we select a developer, then in our ENA, we would certainly have them reimburse us for outside costs such as this consulting contract. At present, we have three developers who reimburse us for consulting contracts: Mission Rock, Pier 70 and Teatro ZinZanni. Those are our three reimbursable contracts. Going forward, once we have more developers we're working with, we would put that in any negotiating agreement that we sign with them.

Commissioner Woo Ho - Yeah. So that's part of the reason for the increase.

Rebecca Benassini - Yes.

Commissioner Woo Ho - The other reason that I just mentioned is that when we put out the RFI or RFPs, sometimes we get the feedback that we're not addressing things as fast as possible because we have our own capacity constraints. Not that you could always keep throwing more volume or more resources to be able to do more, but it does obviously increase our capacity as staff. So that was the other point to make that, by using third parties and consultants, part of the way to stretch our resources too and to be able to do more at a faster pace, which is obviously always something that we're interested in doing if we can.

Rebecca Benassini - That's right.

Commissioner Makras - I'm not sure who may be able to answer it but I had a harder problem saying we can go from 13 percent to 15 percent or 15 to 18 or 20 percent. If you just take one of the contracts at \$750,000 and allocate the 13 percent we are allocating, it's \$97,500. There's some firms out there willing to take that work and do it. Are we being told that, if we give them \$150,000 worth of work, they don't have the capacity to do it?

Elaine Forbes - I think that's a question for CMD.

Finbarr Jewell - Commissioner, when an LBE firm is certified, the firm isn't certified on its capacity. CMD doesn't know what the capacity of the firm is. It is up to the firm to take on the work that they're offered. They ensure that they deliver the product in a timely manner and in a quality manner. I can't speak for the LBEs on what their capacity is because they may be working on multiple different city projects. The consultants who are sitting here today would better be able to answer that question. I can only reiterate that the LBE requirement was lowered through consultation with Port staff and with the understanding of

the limited number of LBEs who are certified in the specific disciplines or the anticipated disciplines for the projected work for this new contract.

Commissioner Woo Ho - But could we not answer the question to say 13 percent is the minimum. If someone was able to do \$150,000 worth of the contract and the consultant felt that they could give them the work, there's no reason they wouldn't get the \$150,000. I think that's a minimum bar, not necessarily saying that's the limit of what they could do. We have had contracts in the past which Boris reports on all the time where we exceed the LBE requirement. We could say that President Brandon is always encouraging us to exceed that. There's no reason you can't exceed. It is the minimum to reach is the way I think about it.

Elaine Forbes - That's right. It is the minimum.

Finbarr Jewell - Yes, commissioner, that is the minimum. The Port is always strenuously working to try and increase the LBE participation on the CSOs to ensure that they maximize the LBE work.

Commissioner Brandon – We can see with the existing contracts that no one is breaking their neck to exceed the minimum. We're just trying to start from the forefront to figure out ways that we can help encourage more participation from our LBEs.

Commissioner Makras - These programs have caused very good results. As warranted, a few companies are going over. Our goals are what pushes more participation. It's the policies that we implement that rear the results of the success of these programs. If that's not the case, I've never seen at least Port staff come up and ring the bell and say this contract has just gone out of the ballpark on meeting MBE, WBE goals and local goals. For all intent and purpose, generally speaking, they're a met goal.

Elaine Forbes - We have some that go over. Boris does the quarterly report. Some go over. Some come right in. Some, we struggle with to have them meet through contract compliance. It's across the board but our LBE rates are very high relative to the citywide goal. At our last report, were at north of over 40 percent. Sometimes we're over 50 percent. We do strive to get way over. Where we have a lot of success is in our micro set-aside contracts. When we set aside the work specifically for micro LBEs and that's part of why we're able to achieve those figures. Here, it's an issue of availability of certified LBEs to do this type of work and that's why the goal was reduced.

Commissioner Makras - I'm understanding somehow how you got there. I just don't agree that the depth is not in the marketplace. If the commission wanted to explore a different participation number, I would be supportive of that.

Commissioner Brandon – If we have to do a set-aside in order to be able to achieve that, maybe we can because there are firms out there.

Elaine Forbes - Finbarr, do you have the list of micro and LBEs that are certified in this arena. How many firms are we talking about?

Finbarr Jewell - I don't have it at hand, but I can get it to you.

Commissioner Brandon - Okay. What do we want to do here?

Commissioner Makras - The maker of the motion will go forward but if there's a number to amend it, I'm happy to tabletop the number. But my simple mathematical equation says, if there's enough for \$97,500 worth of work, we can set a number of \$120,000 or another, even though it's arbitrary, if someone can demonstrate that the marketplace cannot do the work, that's the cap we should go by.

Elaine Forbes - I don't think we can just amend the LBE goal because it was set as part of the solicitation process. Only CMD sets these LBE goals. We don't do it but I'm trying to think of what we could do at this point.

Commissioner Brandon - Yeah. It's kind of frustrating that, year after year when it comes to professional services, we always have issues with LBE participation. It's kind of frustrating that the goal has gone down, but the amount of the contracts and the work has gone up. That's really frustrating. I'm not quite sure what our options are.

I don't want to take away anything from the firms that bid on this because they are great. We have done wonderful work with them over the years. I'm not trying to take anything away from them. On a policy level, year after year, when it comes to professional services, whether it's real estate, whether it's planning, construction management, we hit it out the park. But when it comes to professional services, we have issues with not just availability but getting firms to bid or getting our primary firms to bring in LBE firms. How long is this contract for? Four years?

Commissioner Woo Ho - I think we can take it a separate informational discussion at some point to understand the status of professional services in San Francisco. If you step back even further to think about it, we've had a very strong real estate and construction market. So that has not made perhaps working for the city as interesting as it might be going forward. We need to understand what stage of the real estate cycle we are in terms of the availability. It may be that there are firms out there but they find working in the private sector is easier. Therefore, they haven't been as interested in city contracts. We're just making assumptions and guessing here. We need to have a few more facts to understand whether this is really an availability issue, whether it's an interest issue, and it's an outreach issue. We're jumping to conclusions without knowing.

Elaine Forbes - Generally speaking, what we would try to do is do an open house and bring people in that are interested in doing this work who are not

certified or look to the old list to see who has fallen off or isn't any more certified or taking work and do the analysis we've done for like engineering where we were struggling with the as-needed engineering, which has changed as of this last go-round. And that was a lot of groundwork to see who is not coming in. Who do we need to get certified working through CMD? Here, we haven't laid that groundwork to be able to say to you this is the number. You could get that for us, Finbarr.

Finbarr Jewell - Yes.

Elaine Forbes - We haven't done the outreach to see how we could grow it. Maybe they're engaged in private-sector business, and they've lost faith in the city process and they've given up. They could be brought back to the table. Maybe they don't know about the program. These are things we've done in other arenas where we've really struggled with the numbers. I'm thinking mostly on engineering. We could pursue some efforts in this regard in this proceeding four-year period. We will also always encourage our primes to do better on their LBE goals with their teams. So we can give that message as well. Do you have any other ideas, Boris or Rebecca?

Boris Delepine - We do have one firm that committed to an 18 percent goal. That's KMA. I think that it is the change in scope. The lease negotiations, there are fewer firms. This is a small community of firms that provide this service. I did look to other agencies like the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development and the PUC that issue similar as-needed real estate economic contracts. It's the same firms and the same LBE subcontracting percentages but we always do our outreach events. We will continue to push and to widen the net on these firms in the future.

Commissioner Brandon - Thank you. I really appreciate everyone's involvement and all the effort that's going into increasing the pool. I'm encouraged that we're going to continue to do better.

ACTION: Commissioner Makras moved approval; Commissioner Woo Ho seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners in favor. Resolution No. 19-19 was adopted.

12. PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT

- A. Informational presentation of draft amendments to update the Waterfront Plan for public review and comment and approval of Resolution dedicating the Pier 52 Public Boat Launch in memory of Waterfront Plan Working Group member Corinne Woods. (Resolution No. 19-20)

Diane Oshima, planning and environment division – I'm representing the waterfront plan team. We are here to give you a little bit of a teaser preview of the waterfront plan. I'm sorry that I don't have it here to give to you today. Unfortunately, I'm not going to be here at the next commission meeting. So I

wanted to be able to give you this heads up. We've been before you several times to give you the steps through which the whole waterfront plan working group has worked to develop recommendations that you endorsed. We are heavily at work now to actually get that through the production process to produce the plan. I want to acknowledge we have a number of working group members here today. And I thank them for coming.

Janice Li was actually planning on coming. She sends her regrets that she won't be able to join us. As you may recall, there were 161 recommendations on the waterfront plan that the working group brought to you that you endorsed. There are additional policies in the plan right now. So the staff's work has been about trying to take the existing policies, figuring out which ones are still current or need to be updated, which are obsolete and then bringing in all of the new content that the working group recommendations brought plus working with the city departments.

There are a number of city policies that have taken place over the last 20 years. There's a big range of content that we've put together in this update of the plan. There are nine Port-wide goals in the plan as it's updated now, two more than what the 1997 version of the original plan set forth. I'm going to walk you through what those goals are and give you a flavor for the content that's covered.

Clearly, number one, the maritime goal to maintain the very diverse portfolio of maritime businesses that we have here in San Francisco, Prop H, which required this plan, requires the Port Commission and the Port to give first priority to maritime uses and to focus in on the piers and the shoreline areas.

The waterfront plan has always gone further than that where it included all of the Port's properties, always gave first priority consideration to the maritime needs. The working maritime Port has been a central point from which all of the other topics have really tried to balance around. Some of the topics that are covered in terms of the policies are not just all of the different categories of the industries. But how do we generate capital for maritime improvements? How do we balance berthing and public access competing needs along the piers? How do we provide for water recreation, which is a new water-dependent activity that has found popularity here? How do we prepare for cleaner, greener maritime industries so that we can have clean-fuel cruise ships and cargo ships? That gives you a flavor of some of the issues that we were covering in the plan that you will see in the update.

Diversity of activities and people, clearly, the waterfront plan set forth an objective to have a very diverse range of activities not just for maritime, not just for recreational and entertainment but also for work. The Port has been a place of work. The waterfront plan is trying to find ways to work with the city's policies, stay within our public trust responsibilities but still offer a very broad diversity of activities that keep the waterfront vibrant in this urban edge.

That said, we have also the need for interim uses. There was a lot of discussion about the need for interim leasing and the revenues that flow from that. These are all germane to another Proposition H requirement that dictates the need to identify acceptable land uses on Port properties. The plan will set forth tables that show acceptable uses on the properties based on these Port-wide policies.

Clearly, there's been a lot of progress made on the waterfront open-space network front. If you compare this waterfront today with where we were 20 years ago, it's pretty inspiring to see how much has been done to bring a connected waterfront open-space network across the full seven-and-a-half miles.

The Blue Greenway, the Embarcadero, a system of open spaces and major parks that have been developed have all been memorialized in these updates. Largely, the planned network of open spaces is complete. But there is one new major open-space investment that's identified and that is to create a ferry plaza here right behind us, behind the Ferry Building. That is a civic center of the waterfront. There are policies set forth to try and make the case for getting the funds necessary to make that improvement over time.

That said, there's a lot of discussions that have been had about how do we try and use these parks and public open spaces more actively, more interestingly, to offer more different recreational opportunities? The policies and the plan update will speak to that as well.

Urban design, historic preservation are the characteristics that frame a lot of what we consider to be the desirable types of additions that we want to see along the waterfront. In the last 20 years to have two National-Register-listed historic districts added to the federal register at Pier 70 and along the Embarcadero, those have given more clarity of thinking for all of us about how it is that we bring about new waterfront revitalization and still balance the historic maritime heritage that the public clearly values.

The waterfront plan right now has two volumes. One has all the urban design and open-space policies in one called the design and access element. The land-use policies are in another. The update is going to integrate and collapse them all under one cover. A lot of work is being done to try and get those policies organized. A financially strong Port, all of the work that the Port Commission has done to set up a very stable and comprehensive capital planning and budgeting system has been a really helpful thing that is being recognized in the plan and the topic of a lot of deep discussions with the public during the public planning process.

It's that way that they were able to understand the financial feasibility requirements and the necessity of revenues that has driven a lot of the discussions such that we hope that the policies that are being incorporated into the plan update will be instrumental in bringing about real change. With that, of

course, comes the responsibilities as you were just speaking of for making sure that there is an economic equity that's extended to all sectors of our community to make sure that everybody has a space at the table to be able to participate in the benefits.

There were a lot of discussions about transportation, congestion, parking, transportation demand management, safety, bicycling along the Embarcadero. We had all of the transportation agencies participate in those meetings. The underlying concern for the Port is that it's those relationships with the agencies that are the most fundamental means by which we can make improvements to transportation along the waterfront because the Port has very limited or no control over most of those systems.

It's only through collaborating and making sure our objectives are aligned with larger city and regional objectives that we're able to get in line to get the kinds of increase in services that we need. For the Port, one of the things to flag for our attention is that we do still have industrial and maritime uses.

Some of those truck and industrial access requirements that we need for the cargo and the fishing industry or for cruise ships has been a topic that we will continue to have to keep out there because there is a move for pedestrian and bicycle access. The safety issues of making sure that we can still have a working maritime port are addressed in the policies in the transportation goal.

Environmental sustainability. Through many of the presentations that Carol Bach has brought to the commission previously, it starts to reveal the depth of the environmental sustainability and management stewardship programs that the Port has which I don't think were fully addressed or revealed until this planning process. This goal is one of the new ones that we're highlighting specifically to talk about the different faces of what environmental management and sustainability means along the waterfront. They're about smart, clean, responsible operations as well as habitat and wildlife management. It's about environmental education and making sure that we address the coming regulatory needs for cleaner air emissions, soil management to make sure that we're doing right by the Bay and the ecology.

The more that we can make progress on the environmental sustainability front, the more that we're helping ourselves on the resilience front as well. I don't need to go into too much detail as to how much energy the Port is working on behalf of the city in the context of the seawall and the flood study.

The waterfront plan working group has recognized that the recommendations that they put forth that are going to inform these policies are not intended to be the solutions for the seawall or the solutions for sea-level rise but to provide input as to what are the things that the public values so that our planning efforts on the seawall and flood-study front will take those into account in coming up with the different solutions.

The seawall program, the strengthen-adapt-and-envision framework that we have developed highlights that where we are now with the waterfront and the types of improvements and investments that need to be made put us into this adapt category. How do we try and maintain what we've got and make it better and adapt it to a more resilient waterfront? In doing that, the Port will be a laboratory of solutions for what does adapt look like? What is working well?

Hopefully, that will help all of us to understand better how to make resilience work and to do all that partnering, this is another new goal that is being added to the plan specifically focused on what it means to work together and to be truly inclusive, to expand all of our equity programs to make sure that all populations that don't typically get to come to the Port Commission, that there's still a way for us to be able to reach out to them.

It includes our business partners as well as our public agency partners. In particular, the State Lands Commission staff has been a true partner walking through us on all these long meetings to help us develop recommendations that we think will align our public-trust interests and then our work with the city to align the public-trust interests with the city's land-use-and-policy interests as well.

These recommendations for community partnering include the process steps for lease and development proposals and RFPs. There is a step-by-step process that we would be covering for the Embarcadero RFP as well as Piers 30-32.

Those were the nine silos of goals that I was just trying to go through as succinctly and quickly as possible. Those goals drive the statements about what it is that we're trying to achieve in the various geographic areas along the waterfront.

There are five subareas from Fisherman's Wharf down to India Basin indicated here. Fisherman's Wharf, the northeast waterfront which goes from Pier 35 down to Pier 14 and includes the Ferry Building area, the South Beach subarea going down to China Basin. And then, south of China Basin, we have Mission Bay, which is largely developed already. We've got a few properties left and then the southern waterfront where you've seen so much activity to the south.

In these subarea sections of the plan, we will talk about how the Port-wide policies apply to those areas. There will be a map that also shows all of the properties within that given area and a table that shows all of the acceptable land uses for each of the properties located within those subareas.

In terms of schedule going forward, as I indicated, we are like busy beavers working on the production. We have a whole team of staff that are working together on this. We expect to have that plan out in early June.

We will provide a copy to the commission members and to the Port advisory group members and the working group members. We would like to spend some time first with those who spent the most time in all of those meetings to try and generate this before we take it out to a full breadth of public outreach and solicit public comments and address questions.

The plan comes out in early June. We will be planning on meeting with our Port advisory group members in late June after which we will send out a broader public notice and schedule meetings and workshops to meet with people and educate them about the plan.

At the same time, we're working with the planning department to get the environmental review process up and running. I saw some of our team members from ESA who are environmental consultants who will be helping us on that front as well as work that we're doing with BCDC because many of these changes in the waterfront plan will be seeking amendments in BCDC's plans as well so that we have those lined up.

I wanted to just spend a minute to talk to you about the depth and the breadth of the discussions and how they did not stop at just giving us advice as to how to update this plan. With these projects coming up, the Embarcadero RFP, the interest in bringing more public-oriented uses to our piers, those sprung from those public discussions.

What we have found as staff is that, when you invest in the time to talk through all of the complexities of what the Port has to do to keep the lights on, keep the operations going, keep the money flowing while we're trying to plan for the next improvements and why you are confronted with the kinds of questions and policy issues that you are and giving the direction that you do to the staff, that people are very interested in that.

We have found that the time that we spend walking through the details, the more people want to help and be problem solvers with the Port and that's reflected in the work that Becca and Mike will be doing on the Embarcadero Historic District.

Even for Pier 30-32 where they have already the knowledge that you have because of the previous discussions about the challenges of those two sites and why it is that we would be looking for advancing an RFP for those two sites and even going through all of the difficult public discussions around the Navigation Center, those are all part of our collective education that hopefully will help us to work together on making improvements on the waterfront.

Moving forward, we are the laboratory for adapt solutions. We are the place where we're going to be trying to make a difference on not just improving the Port but protecting the city. The more that we can build on the understanding that the voters reflected in their approval of the Prop A funds, the more that we

can get done in as efficient amount of time as possible because time is precious.

To that end, given the richness of the community engagement, it's natural for the staff to want to have this waterfront plan be dedicated to Corinne. She was the epitome of what a responsible citizen, what a responsible community does in looking for making their public waterfront better. We're very happy to honor her with this plan, which I hope that she'll be happy with it. We'll see what happens. Our plan is that it will be dedicated to her and to all of the work that everybody put into it.

This is not to take anything away from Rudy Nothenberg and Janice Li. They were stellar co-chairs as were Alice Rogers, who is with us today, and Ellen and Stewart are here. Linda Richardson and Pia Hinkle as well. They did some yeoman work along with my colleagues, David, Brad, Kari, Carol, and Byron.

We just couldn't have done it without everybody pulling in. With that, we hope that you will approve the attached resolution that we have in the staff report to permanently celebrate and recognize Corinne's contributions and her dedication to the city and to this waterfront by naming the Pier 52 boat launch in her honor.

Alice Rogers - I'm here to cheer on the staff for this work of finishing up the draft of the plan. As Diane said, it's an exceedingly complex document. It may be the first time we're really happy that we can link to the Internet because there will be no executive summary to get through the meat of this document. We're going to need all of those links. I've gotten a little sneak peek. I feel really confident of the areas that I worked on, that the synthesis is keeping the gist of all of those many meetings that we had. But there's a lot of detail.

People are really invested in lots of those recommendations and exactly how they were worded. These links are going to be really important. I also want to stress what Diane said about keeping this process moving forward so that the community doesn't lose all of this information that you spent three years educating not only the working group but the community at large. The decisions that you make every meeting and that the community is going to want to weigh in on and need to weigh in on are as complex as they get. We need all of this rich education that we have so that we don't resort to just simple sloganeering on solutions. That's not going to work. I think the values and the plan diversity and authenticity and preservation combined with the information or education that we've gotten will hopefully, if we can move fast enough on these RFPs, make the collaboration with the public meaningful and productive.

Ellen Johnck, co-chair of the maritime commerce advisory committee - I was honored to be the liaison for MCAC to the working group for the Waterfront Land Use Plan process. I'm missing a great buddy here today who was on the land use committee for the working group, Corinne Woods. I'll get into a couple comments about her later. I spent most of my time on the land use committee

but then attended as many of the other committee meetings as possible to bring the maritime interest through the other arenas.

I like to think that I was able to contribute given my other experiences in the city over many years in the broad arena of Port and city interests. MCAC is very eager to see the process move forward, as Alice said, as well as the RFP for the Embarcadero Historic District pier development and Piers 30 and 32. The future of the maritime mission at the Port is tied to the investment and the improvements that need to be made to the pier facilities on which the maritime operations depend. I'm excited about this Waterfront Land Use Plan as it goes forward because what it affirms a very vibrant mission, vision for preservation of the historic maritime piers within a new public trust - the new public trust objectives framework. The framework recognizes that we're going to need investment to maintain the facilities and that public-oriented uses and more public activation is certainly needed combined with maritime use and preservation. This is a broad new strategy that the land use plan will guide the RFP process going forward. I'm very excited to see this continue.

Even before I got involved with the Port, I've known Corinne for many, many years. She was the city's waterfront and Port collective sage and a checkpoint on reality. We would tag team a lot together to make sure that the reality check and the sage for what's happening here and all the manifestations of the waterfront of the Port over the years that people know about it and speak about it. I hope that, working with Alice and many, many others who were participating in the working group, that we can continue to be your sage, to be your reality check going forward.

The maritime committee heartily endorses your distribution of these masterful amendments that have gone forward with Diane and the staff's team, and heartily endorse the resolution supporting the dedication of the boat basin and the waterfront plan to Corinne Woods.

Commissioner Woo Ho - I want to commend everyone. If it wasn't Corinne Woods's name on this plan, it would be Diane Oshima's name. You have done an absolutely fantastic job. I know it's a team effort. I know that many, many people including the co-chairs and everybody that worked on this but you have been the guiding force. You've been patient. You've been persistent. You have put all the pieces together. You have kept us updated as all the pieces of the puzzle have come together. It hasn't been easy, as speakers have mentioned, in terms of the complexity, the depth and breadth of this plan, which probably has exceeded everyone's expectations including the first plan that was ever developed for the Port way back in the 1990s.

We're in a really great place. It is a framework to help us guide. It's coming at a great time when we are now embarking upon the actualization of some of the major aspects of this plan, which is obviously what are we going to do with some of the historic piers.

Commissioner Brandon and I went on a tour the other day to understand the strategy of how we go about prioritizing as part of now that we understand how everything fits together and how we'd like to see it together and how we execute it. I think the next step seems to me for staff is to give us sort of the timeline of the strategy of the RFP process that helps us to understand how you go about executing some of the major pieces of the Waterfront Land Use Plan.

Obviously, the plan is going to guide us on many, many different issues but there are some major pieces that we need to know what the timeline is as you continue to complete it. It's greater than War and Peace. I guess it's an encyclopedia. It's everything you want to know about the waterfront. We feel very fortunate at this commission that we have the waterfront plan. We have a strategic plan. We have things that can help us so that we are making decisions that are within a framework that makes sense, that we have a mission, a vision as well as a roadmap and that we have our community with us, as Ellen said, to be our sage and reality check that we also are not sitting in an ivory tower making decisions on our own at the commission level.

I endorse everything that I've heard today. I want to commend everybody involved, especially you, Diane. Thank you.

Commissioner Brandon - Thank you. I couldn't have said it any better.

Commissioner Makras - Thank you for the presentation. I have no questions. I'm supportive of the dedication.

Commissioner Brandon – I'm very supportive of everything. Thank you to all of the committee members and Diane. Thank you for leading the charge again. You've done a phenomenal job. You guys did a lot of work, spent a lot of time and energy. We can't thank you enough for all the efforts to come up with the draft amendments. Hopefully, they will all move through. I'm especially very excited about the dedication to Corinne.

ACTION: Commissioner Woo Ho moved approval; Commissioner Makras seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners in favor. Resolution No. was adopted.

13. NEW BUSINESS

14. ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Commissioner Woo Ho moved approval to adjourn the meeting; Commissioner Makras seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners were in favor.

Port Commission President Commissioner Brandon adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.