

Port's Southern Advisory Committee (SAC)
December 8th Special Meeting Notes
6:00 – 8:00 pm Virtual Public Meeting via Zoom
Accepted by SAC on January 26th 2022

SAC Members in attendance:

Edward Hatter, Co-Chair
Karen Pierce
Howard Wong
Roscoe Mapps
Chris Christensen
Katherine Doumani
Mike Bishop

SAC Members Absent:

Shirley Moore
Jessica Fontenot
Toby Levine, Co-Chair
Michael Hamman
Kevin Lawson
Chris Wasney

Port and City staff in attendance:

Planning & Environment Division: Diane Oshima, Mark Paez, Jai Jackson, Ming Yeung, Carol Bach, Kathryn Purcell, and Ryan Wassum
Engineering Division: Paul Chasan
Real Estate & Development Division: Kim Beal, David Beaupre, Phil Williamson
Communications Division:
Finance and Administration:
Maritime: Dominic Moreno, Patrick Forrester

PG&E Representatives in Attendance:

Maggie Trumbly, PG&E Sr. Remediation Manager
Luke Vernagallo, PG&E Remediation Project Manager
Tom Holden, Haley Aldrich, Engineer of Record
Helder Costa, Haley Aldrich, Principal Scientist
Nathan Lee, Haley Aldrich, Project Manager

SF Regional Water Quality Control Board:

Ross Steenson, Senior Specialist, Case Manager

Bridgette DeShields, Integral Corp. Principal Scientist/CEQA Project Manager

Mission Rock Representatives in Attendance:

Yennga Khuong, Mission Rock Partners

Iwayna Pena, Mission Rock Partners

Others in attendance:

Al Williams, Consultant

Dorka Keehn, Art Consultant

Ellen Johnck, Chair Port Maritime Commerce Advisory Committee

Samantha Beckerman, Brookfield Properties

Kim Walton

Devin Hasset

Terry Seward

Jen San Juan

Morris Titanic

Carolyn Huynh

Sharon Prager

Joshua Karlin-Resnik

1. Introductions and Announcements

Diane Oshima announced that Toby Levine has stepped down as SAC co-chair but will continue as a member. SAC members expressed their appreciation for Toby's years of service on Port advisory committees.

2. Acceptance of Draft 10/27/21 Meeting Notes

Due to the lack of a quorum of SAC members acceptance of the meeting notes was postponed.

3. [PG&E Follow-up Q&A/Discussion on Piers 39-43.5 Offshore Sediment Remediation Project and Pier 96 Construction Staging and Sediment Material Handling Facility](#)

Kathryn Purcell, Port Planning & Environment Project Manager, introduced the item by explaining that the Port, PG&E, and the Water Board prepared today's joint slide presentation to respond to the questions raised by the SAC at the October 27th meeting. The joint slide presentation for this item can be accessed by clicking on the highlighted title above. She noted Port staff had worked with Water Board and PG&E to review questions raised at the October 27 SAC meeting, and as requested, the Port posted additional project reports to the SAC meeting site, along with

responses to SAC member questions in the form of a Fact Sheet prepared by PG&E.

Kathryn recapped that the PG&E dredge material handling operations proposed for Pier 96 are consistent with the Port's cargo and maritime uses and essentially the same activity the Port has conducted at Pier 96 in the past when it had to complete landfill disposal of dredge material from its own maintenance dredge sites. As detailed in the Project FS/RAP Study, based on the project construction staging and sediment handling needs, the Port's Pier 96 was the more favorable alternative due to San Francisco Bay access, location in relation to the Pier 39 site, permitting, ability to provide useable and available berths and terminal acreage, the condition of the pier structure will support the project equipment and material load requirements, and trucks routes to the highways are through nonresidential areas. She also noted that a Port lease agreement for PG&E at Pier 96 will require a site-specific operation plan detailing site plans, controls, minimization measures and monitoring to ensure no adverse impact to workers, neighboring facilities, the southern waterfront community, or environment.

Maggie Trumbly from PG&E followed by addressing the risk to human health and stated that levels of PAHs in the sediments across the Pier 39 to 43½ project area are not a hazard to humans, but some of them pose a risk to aquatic life and can have impacts on water quality. She explained that the risk to human health is very low, would increase if there was long-term direct contact or ingestion of the contaminated sediments. She talked about the risks being more ecological in nature stating that if wildlife are exposed there could be potential risk to the food chain.

Maggie explained that the remediation work would not limit the Port's future use in the remediation area due to the protections that are included in the remediation plan. She stated that PG&E's clean-up of the Potrero Power Station offshore sediment site was essentially the same scope of work proposed for Piers 39 to 43-1/2 in the Northeastern Waterfront. She also stated that the sediment material handling operations performed at Potrero was a successful operation in the Dogpatch neighborhood and that there were no complaints received by PG&E.

Ross Steenson from the Regional Water Board then addressed the Investigation Report and Feasibility Study and Remedial Action Plan (FS/RAP) prepared by PG&E and approved by his agency that provide the basis for the clean-up plan for the Piers 39- 43-1/2 area. Ross talked about the CEQA environmental review process and identified how the public is afforded opportunities to comment on the clean up plan and the environmental review document that can be accessed using these links:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/board_decisions/tentative_orders.html

He also explained that the Regional Water Board has an on-going regulatory oversight role in the process and that the Tentative Site Cleanup Order is available for public review through December 17, 2021. The Board will consider approving the

CEQA Study for the project and Final Order to be presented to the Board in January or February 2022.

Ross explained that Task 3 of the Order requires plans to appropriately manage materials delivered and removed from the materials handling facility so that onsite workers, the community, and the environment are protected. A Community Protection Plan, to be submitted for agency approval, will require the project perform site inspections, air monitoring and reporting. Water Board staff will also perform routine inspections and documentation.

Kathryn Purcell followed Ross by explaining how the proposed project would contribute to the Southern Waterfront Beautification Fund and more generally how the project would benefit the Port and its maritime operations.

SAC members expressed the following comments and questions:

- Bringing contaminated material from the affluent Northern Waterfront to the Southern Waterfront presents an environmental justice conflict. Approval of this project would exacerbate the history of distrust in the Bayview. Rather than importing the contaminated material to an environmentally impaired neighborhood where residential uses are proximate to the Port's industrial lands, why not remediate the material in place in the Northern Waterfront using barges?

Joint team response: The use of a system of barges at the Pier 39 – 43.5 project sites is infeasible because it would pose hazards for labor and the environment as well as permitting challenges with the U.S. Coast Guard and the Army Corps. of Engineers. Use of barges for the dewatering process is not a proven practice and not practical. Additional barges would be needed for materials, equipment and staff and it would be difficult to implement measures to protect health and safety while working on the water rather than on land.

The Pier 96 operation would result in the stabilization of the contaminated soil by the addition of Portland cement to dewater the dredge material that would be trucked off-site for treatment and disposal elsewhere.

- We understand that there are logistical challenges but find it disingenuous to learn that PG&E has considered other sites but has not been forthcoming with this information. How much material will be transported and where can you take it outside the Bayview Neighborhood, and have you considered issuing an RFP for someone to store the material elsewhere?

Joint team response: PG&E studied two alternate Bay Area port sites including the Port of Oakland as well as beneficial reuse, but these were not preferred because they would require transport across the shipping channel in the bay.

An estimated 88,000 cubic yards will be handled over the 5 to 6 years. Not all of this volume of material is considered hazardous.

- What route will trucks use to transport the material out of the neighborhood and what's the treatment, storage and/or disposal location? Is there an opportunity to use rail to transport the material as an alternate to trucking?

Joint team response: The proposed truck route will use Cargo Way, Third, Cesar Chavez to I280, or Jennings to Evans, Third, Cesar Chavez to I280. On similar projects, PG&E used a landfill at Keller Canyon in Pittsburg in Contra Costa County.

The landfill sites for this project are located in the Bay Area and not accessible by rail.

- Have you contacted the ILWU regarding the use of union labor for the proposed operation and what role is the Port taking to enforce existing labor agreements regarding prevailing wage?

Joint team response: Dominic Moreno from the Port Maritime Division stated that the Port lease language recognizes existing labor agreements and prevailing wage and supports PG&E and labor collaborating and agreed to provide contact information so that the parties can discuss the matter.

Maggie Trumbly from PG&E stated that PG&E is open to discussing the proposed operation with ILWU but had not yet made contact as the contractor that will be performing the work and developing the Operation Plan has yet to be selected. Maggie agreed to obtain contact information and initiate conversation with the ILWU regarding the project. Maggie stated that once a contractor is selected for this project, PG&E will work with the contractor on outreach for local business hiring opportunities.

- What's the Port seeking from the SAC on this item and would it be appropriate for the SAC to send a letter to the Port Commission expressing its concerns about this potential lease and operation in the Southern Waterfront?

Port response: No action is required of the SAC on this item as the Port is bringing this to the SAC for informational purposes and to provide the Port Commission with community input with the hope that it might help provide solutions. Staff and the PG&E team would like the opportunity to respond more fully to the SAC questions at the next meeting before the matter goes to the Port Commission. It's the SAC's decision whether or not to write a letter to the Port Commission.

SAC members have more questions about whether there are safer ways to implement this project and recommend that the matter be prioritized on the next SAC meeting agenda. Further SAC members ask staff and the project team to review the transcript of this meeting and to come prepared to further respond to the SAC's comments and questions.

4. Mission Rock - Project + Construction Updates, Public Art Plan Summary, and Street Rooms

Paul Chasan, Port Engineering Project Manager, introduced the item by explaining the role of the SAC in the review of the proposed Mission Rock Art Plan and art pieces. Yennga Khuong and Iowayna Pena, Mission Rock Partners, followed with a

general project construction update. They talked about each of the development parcels, the blackwater recycling system, local hiring goals and the Mission Rock Academy. Their presentation can be accessed by clicking on this [link](#).

Yennga then addressed the Art Plan by explaining the goal of the plan is to provide world class art to enhance public spaces so that the public will experience art and beauty on a daily basis throughout the development. She went on to talk how the process will include a presentation of art pieces to the SAC for comment before the Port's Executive Director authorizes the selection. She also provided a location map and shared examples of art proposed for the creation of "Art Rooms" within the public rights-of-way.

SAC members expressed the following comments and questions:

- The Art Plan, the variety of art pieces and the ongoing role of the SAC in the review process is exciting.
- The selection of art should consider art pieces that will not become dated or look worn in 5 or 10 years and should reflect the neighborhood context where they are to be located to provide cohesion and a strong message. The art selection process could also include the use of artifacts with maritime historical meaning.
- The open spaces, parks and street rooms should include watering stations and other cooling amenities for the public's use.

The SAC members thanked the Mission Rock team and expressed their interest in being consulted further as the project development advances.

5. [Piers 80-96 Eco-Industrial Strategy – Continued Q&A/Discussion of S. Waterfront Maritime, Industrial and Community Needs](#)

Diane Oshima and Co-chair Hatter announced that Item 5 would be postponed to the January 26th SAC meeting as result of Items 3 and 4 running over their allotted time. They also stated that this item will be given priority on the January 26th agenda.

6. Quick Updates and Requests for Future SAC Meetings (7:45 - 8:00)

Next SAC Meeting: Wed, January 26, 2022