

**JOINT MEETING OF THE CENTRAL WATERFRONT ADVISORY GROUP (CWAG)  
AND THE SOUTHERN WATERFRONT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)**

**JANUARY 15, 2020**

**DRAFT MEETING NOTES**

**Potrero Power Station**

**420 23<sup>RD</sup> Street, San Francisco**

**6:00 – 7:30 p.m.**

**Central Waterfront Advisory Group Members Attendees**

Toby Levine, Mission Bay Resident

Katy Liddell, South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay Neighborhood Association (SBRMBNA)

Jamie Whitaker, SBRMBNA

Katherine Doumani, Dogpatch

Neighborhood Association

Chris Wasney, Historic Preservation Architect

Marc Dragun, The Brannan HOA

**CWAG Members Absent:**

Ralph Wilson, Potrero Boosters

Jasper Rubin, SFSU Geography Department

Ritika Puri, The Watermark HOA

Howard Wong, Heritage/SPUR

Ted Choi, City Kayak Pier 40

**Southern Waterfront Advisory Committee Attendees**

Michael Hamman, India Basin Neighborhood Association

Mike Bishop, Hanson Aggregates

Kevin Lawson, Port Tenant & Bayview Representative

Kevin Gibbons, ILWU Local 34

**SWAC Members Absent**

Olin Webb, Bayview Representative

Shirley Moore, Bayview Representative

Karen Pierce, Public Health Coordinator

**Port Staff:**

Mark Paez, CWAG Coordinator

Dominic Moreno, Wharfinger

Byron Rhett, Chief Operations Officer

David Beaupre, Development Project Manager

Diane Oshima, Deputy Director for Planning & Environment  
Patrick Foster, Waterfront Planner  
Ricky Tijani, Development Project Manager

**Audience**

Sam Yoo, SGH  
Stewart Morton, NEWAG  
Tim Chang, CBC/Power Station  
Enrique Landa, Associate Capital/Power Station  
Takja Gardner, YMCA of San Francisco  
Karen Alschuler, Perkins & Will  
Philip Gerrie, Golden Gate Audubon  
Stefee Knudsen, Hacker Architects  
Edward Tingley, Loft A+D  
Abbey Lubniewski, Loft A+D  
Erin Epperson, Associate Capital/Power Station  
Catherine Reilly, Brookfield  
Scott Kuopf, Silverado/Zacor  
Philip De Andrade, Mission Creek Homeowners Association  
Jon Lau, Office of Economic and Workforce Development  
Roscoe Mapps, San Francisco Giants

## **1. Announcements and Introductions**

Mark Paez announced the upcoming Port Commission agenda items of interest:

### **February 11, 2020**

- Informational Presentation on proposed lease for the Power Station Development Project
- Informational Presentation on Port 2019 and 2020 Federal and State Legislative Program
- Informational Presentation of Financial and Operational Performance of South Beach Harbor

Dominic Moreno announced the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) proposed a training at Pier 96, due east of Herons Head Park, that would include a controlled explosion of a vehicle as part of a training for the police bomb squad. The training will be held on a Wednesday morning at 9:30 am in April or May and that there will be a public information officer who will respond to public inquiries. Dominic explained that SFPD had outreached to area tenants and their patrons to inform them of the training. CWAG and SWAC members expressed support for the training and thanked Dominic for providing them the opportunity to comment on the proposal.

David Beaupre announced that the Request for Proposals for Piers 38 and 40 had been released and that the pre-bid conference would be held on Friday, January 17, 2020.

## **2. Approval of Meeting Notes**

July 24, 2019 SWAC Meeting Notes – Approved

September 25<sup>th</sup> SWAC Meeting Notes – Approved

October 16, 2019 Draft CWAG Meeting Notes – Approved

December 5, 2019 Draft Joint CWAG/SWAC Meeting Notes – Approved

### **3. Power Station Mixed-Use Development Project**

Enrique Landa and Tina Chang, representatives of Associate Capital, the project sponsor, introduced the project. Their presentation can be viewed [HERE](#) and is summarized as follows:

#### **Background**

Associate Capital has coordinated with many City and State agencies to develop agreements for the proposed development including an agreement for the lease of Port owned lands at the shoreline area of the site that will support the project's parks, open space and access to the Bay.

The site is the former Potrero Power Plant that operated Unit 3 with its 300-foot smokestack and six Peaker Units that ran on jet fuel and served as a backup to Unit 3. The power plant closed its operations in 2004 thanks to the hard work of the Potrero, Dogpatch and Bayview communities. Enrique specifically recognized Joe Boss for his contributions to the closure of the power plant.

Unlike Pier 70 the 29-acre Power Station site is not subject to the Public Trust because the land parcels were sold prior to 1870 and historically the property was used as the Spreckels Sugar Refinery. The large brick building know as Station A is all that remains from the sugar refinery operations on the site. The eastern half of Station A was demolished many years ago by the power plant operator and the remaining building walls are in deteriorated condition due to exposure to the elements since the roof was removed in the 1990's.

The project site consists of 21 of the 29 acres of the former power plant site and has not been accessible to the public for 160 years. Ongoing PG&E operations occupy five acres at the west end of the site and the Port of San Francisco owns three acres at the shoreline.

The Power Station development is one of several large projects in the City's Southern Bayfront including development at the following sites:

- Mission Rock Development Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48
- Pier 70 Mixed-Use Project
- The Chase Event Center (Warriors)
- India Basin
- Hunters Point Power Plant
- Hunters Point Shipyard
- Candlestick Point
- Executive Park

## **Project Details**

The project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Design for Development Agreement (D4D) call for:

- 2,682 Dwelling Units
- 30% Affordable Housing in every phase of the project
- 107,000 Square-Feet of Retail
- 597,723 Square-Feet of Office
- 645,738 Square-Feet of Life Sciences
- Active Recreation (rooftop ballfield)
- 25,000 Square-Feet of Community Facilities (YMCA)
- Building heights would range from 65 to 240 feet
- Future funding to explore the feasibility for a “Water Bus”
- Construction of a “Water Bus” service stop/dock
- Louisiana Street paseos
- Two onsite childcare centers that will accommodate 260 children
- 1.7 acres added to the Public Trust
- 36 units of on-site housing for women in workforce training

The project included extensive community outreach:

- 169 Events
- 82,000 People
- 10 Workshops
- 57 Presentations to neighborhood organizations

Highlights from the community outreach include:

- Preservation of Station A
- Adaptive reuse of Unit 3 and the smokestack
- The number of residential towers were reduced from 4 to 3 (reduction of 81 units)
- Connect the site and Bay to the Dogpatch Neighborhood
- Connect Crane Cove Park and Warm Water Cove to the Blue Green Way

Upcoming Opportunities for additional public input:

- Port Commission informational presentation February 11<sup>th</sup> and consideration of approval of the lease/MOU on February 28<sup>th</sup> 2020.

- Planning Commission approval of the Draft EIR, Special Use District and D4D on January 30<sup>th</sup> 2020.
- Project introduced at the Board of Supervisors Spring 2020

**Advisory Group Comments and Questions:**

**Question:** What’s the project timing and phasing and who would be the lead agency for the proposed “Water Bus”

**Response:** The “Water Bus” feasibility study will be funded with project transportation impact fees that will be available in one or two years and the start date for water transit service is unknown. Jon Lau from the Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) added that the City would be establishing the parameters for this service and that when these parameters are met the City would release the funding. Associate Capital will rely on water transit providers to develop the water transit service. It’s anticipated that two to three buildings would be constructed each year and the first users and residents would be onsite in 2025.

**Question:** The project buildout will be from 10 to 20-years?

**Response:** The earliest the development would be built out is 15 years but it’s most likely it will take 20 years.

**Question:** Will the “lookout” at Unit 3 be retained as a part of the project?

**Response:** Yes, the “Lookout” will be incorporated into the proposed hotel.

**Question:** Will the YMCA be a part of the project? Also, will the grocery store be codified as a project requirement in the development agreements?

**Response:** Yes, the San Francisco network of YMCA’s will be part of the project. Capital Associates will create a space for a grocery but it will not be required by the development agreements. If Associate Capital cannot find a grocery the space will be put to another use.

**Comment:** It will be important to provide a large premises (more than 20,000 square-feet) in order for the grocery to be a viable use.

**Response:** The plan includes a 35,000 square-foot premises for a grocery but retail tenants are not likely to be identified until very near the completion of the project and Associate Capital is not expecting the grocery to be a revenue producing use.

**Comment:** This community is underserved by community facilities and really needs the proposed facilities and the YMCA has great programs.

**Comment:** The grocery will be more successful if it provides some amount of on-site parking for patrons. Gus's Market in Mission Bay is a good model of how providing parking supports the retail use.

**Response:** The project will provide a strict ratio of on-site parking like the Pier 70 Mixed-Use Project. The project will include a Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM).

**Question:** Is it anticipated that there will be other non-grocery food providers onsite?

**Response:** The EIR allows for a marketplace, temporary uses such as farmers markets and special events for up to 180 days. The project will also include a curb management plan, a layover for MUNI's proposed 55 Dogpatch bus line at the foot of 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. Also, residential parking will be unbundled from the dwelling units to allow for more flexibility, increased affordability of the units and to support the project's transportation modal split.

**Question:** What makes you think that there will be demand for the proposed retail use? The advisory group thought it was getting site activating retail and cultural uses at Pier 70 and the site has turned into a corporate office park. Can you commit to providing retail use and if necessary consider below market rents as a means to support retail use on the site?

**Response:** While we know that retail use is in a transition period and consumers are more concerned with experiences there will be 25,000 residents in the Dogpatch Neighborhood. Also, historically retail uses near water, parks and open spaces are more likely to remain viable. Given the size of the Power Station Development project the proposed land use mix is light on retail use and we are open to ideas about what else can be done to activate the streets and site while supporting the retail use? Retail rents are not the only factor that must be considered if this use is to be successful on the site. Start-up costs including the City fees are a challenge to many retailers. The placement of retail within the project site is being carefully considered along Humboldt Street which will serve as the project's main street and near the waterfront, parks and open spaces.

**Comment:** It's important that the proposed retail use support and not cannibalize the retail that exists in Potrero Hill and Dogpatch

**Comment:** The phasing of the buildout will have a huge impact on the community and its important that the housing, parks and open space are built in the early phase of the development.

**Response:** The project phasing will be determined by many things including the remediation of site contamination and the Proposition M office allocation by the Planning Department. Additionally, it will be important to see how things proceed with Brookfield's development at Pier 70. However, the first phase of the project will include residential, a small amount of office and the hotel as Associate Capital is eager to open up the site to the community.

### **Comments from the audience:**

**Question:** Significant investment will be made in the iconic Unit 3 and the smokestack although these site features are not recognized as historic resources by the Planning Department. The historic preservation approach to Station A is to save the outer walls and this approach is considered “facadism” and not rehabilitation of this officially recognized historic resource.

**Response:** The question Associate Capital is struggling with is what is being preserved because only a portion of the original Station A structure remains. The building’s masonry walls are very poor condition and need to be supported and incorporation into a new building is one way to address these deficiencies.

**Question:** Will the YMCA program for the site include a swimming pool?

**Response:** While there’s been some interest in a swimming pool the overwhelming request from the community is for programs for active older adults so this will be our priority.

### **Advisory Group Request**

The advisory group thanked Associate Capital for the presentation and asked that the development team provide future project updates as more details become available. The advisory group also asked that the project sponsor work with interested advisory group members, members of the community and historic preservation experts to investigate the feasibility of a more comprehensive approach to preservation of Station A. It was the consensus of the advisory group members that a letter of support be presented to the Port and Planning Commission’s. The Co-chairs agreed to work with Port staff to prepare and present a letter of support for the project.

### **4. Port Advisory Group Refresh**

Diane Oshima presented the Port’s proposal to refresh and reorganization the NEWAG, CWAG and SWAC advisory groups into two advisory groups, one north of China Basin and one south of China Basin and distributed a summary of the purpose and goals of the reorganization that is summarized as follows:

#### **Fisherman’s Wharf Advisory Group**



- Retain this committee to preserve regular communications and forum for fishing boat, processors and operational needs in Fisherman’s Wharf.
- Include occasional reports on project or policy issues with implications for fishing industry from other Fisherman’s Wharf groups (e.g. FWCBD) and Northern Waterfront Advisory Committee discussions.
- Staff: Demetri & Dominic (consider including Maintenance staff member? Other division staff?)

### **Northern Waterfront Advisory Committee**

- Geography: Hyde Street Pier to China Basin Channel north
- Members: Current active members from NEWAG and South Beach/Rincon CWAG + new reps from
  - Fisherman’s Wharf CBD/commercial associations
  - community organizations, including larger city perspectives; consult with Sups Stefani, Peskin, Haney
  - more active member from Chinatown/North Beach
  - members that increase racial and social diversity
  - Draw from MCAC for maritime perspective
- Staff: Patrick Foster + need assigned staff from RE/Dev and on-call Maritime

### **Southern Waterfront Advisory Committee**

- Geography: China Basin south to Heron’s Head/India Basin
- Members: Current active members from Mission Bay/Dogpatch CWAG and SWAC + new reps from
  - community organizations, including larger city perspectives; consult with Sups Haney & Walton
  - members that increase racial and social diversity
  - Draw from MCAC for maritime perspective
- Staff: Mark P, David & Brendan

### **Maritime Commerce Advisory Committee**

- Keep committee in place, but have MCAC members represent maritime issues and input in Northern and Southern Advisory Committees, to support cross-cutting engagement
- Staff: Dominic, others?

### **Subcommittees/Task Forces**

- Use subcommittees or task forces for detailed, nimble address of specific projects and focus issues, to report back to N and/or S Adv Committees
- Subcommittees can cover “cusp” topics like Mission Rock, near the border of N and S Adv Comm areas
- Northern and Southern Advisory Committee meetings may be less frequent if there are active subcommittees and meetings; full or subcommittee meetings should all be open to public

### Agenda Setting and Management

- Establish advance planning and forward calendar structure similar to Port Commission agenda setting, based on coordination of RE/Dev, P&E & Maritime divisions; engage other divisions as needed
- Proactive scheduling to provide advance time and opportunity to incorporate public comments and recommendations
- Consult with advisory committee co-chairs to create agendas that clearly convey community input objectives, and co-chair briefings to support strong meeting management
- Work with project sponsors to provide guidance on presentation content and focus that aligns with community input objectives of the meeting
- Reinforce no voting rule and provide consistent guidance to support practices aimed at building consensus

### Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC) & Development Design Advisory Committee (DAC)

- Port design review committee members and process for major development projects, and Mission Rock and Pier 70 Special Use District (SUD) projects will continue unchanged for now, consistent with Planning Code Section 240 (major development projects), and Mission Rock & Pier 70 SUDs requirements.
- WDAC procedures and geography will be revised as part of Waterfront Plan project/CEQA review, to expand WDAC design review process to any non-SUD major development projects on Port property (full 7 ½ mile waterfront)

Diane talked about how the proposal would allow staff to achieve a higher quality of stakeholder input by cross informing the members. She stated that many of the Port's projects have Port-wide implications for how to prepare for change and improve upon our communities. She explained that the Waterfront Plan Working Group experience provided a model of how to balance specific topics with understanding the larger context. Diane said that there had not been a hard and fast decision on this proposed approach and that tonight's discussion is an example of the enriched conversation that transpires from a broader membership participation. She concluded her remarks by stating that staff would begin the process by reviewing the advisory group membership rosters with the goal of increasing diversity of members and member perspectives.

### CWAG/SWAC Comments and Questions:

**Question:** How big would the advisory group membership be and would all members of the CWAG and SWAC be merged into one large advisory group?

**Response:** Given the active membership of the advisory groups it's likely that each advisory group would consist of approximately 15 members. The Port assumes that all active

members from each advisory group will continue. However, South Beach neighborhood representatives will become members of the Northern Waterfront Advisory Group since that area will be within the geographic boundaries of the Northern advisory group. The Port needs its advisory group members to maintain active communications with the networks and communities that they represent.

**Comment:** The Port's rationale for the restructuring of the advisory groups makes sense for larger projects like the seawall and Embarcadero Historic District but more neighborhood specific issues will get less attention and the local voice is not going to be heard in this larger context.

**Response:** Neighborhood specific issues could be delegated to a subcommittee or task force. For projects that are of interest to both advisory groups or that are near the geographic boundary there may be a need to establish a joint subcommittee. Also, members of one advisory group are free to participate in the meetings of other Port advisory groups and will be recognized at each other's meetings.

**Comment:** Transportation is a key issue for Port advisory groups and it would be good if there was an SF MTA specialist member since the Ballpark Transportation Coordinating Committee is ineffective.

**Response:** The Port is not the lead on City transportation issues but perhaps there's work that can be done to improve the effectiveness of the Ballpark Transportation Coordinating Committee. Also adding a community member with expertise in transportation to the advisory groups could be helpful.

**Question:** Are you going to reach out to a broader city interest and has the Port considered one Portwide advisory group?

**Response:** The Port will start out with a Northern and Southern Waterfront Advisory Group and see how it goes leaving open the possibility of future changes if necessary.

**Question:** Where's the dividing line between the Northern and Southern Advisory Group?

**Response:** The dividing line between the north and south would be China Basin Chanel.

In closing the discussion of this item Diane explained that the next step would be to make this presentation to the Northeast Waterfront Advisory Group (NEWAG) at their next meeting to get their perspective.

## 5. Public Comment

- No general comments were received.

## 6. Adjourn

