



**Meeting of the Port Northern Advisory Committee (NAC)
January 19, 2022 (5:30 to 7:30 pm)
Virtual Public Meeting via Zoom**

Meeting Notes

NAC Attendees

Jane Connors (Co-Chair), Ferry Building, Hudson Pacific Partners
Katy Liddell, (Co-Chair), South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay Neighborhood Association
Alec Bash, Alternate for Bob Iwersen
Ted Choi, City Kayak, Pier 40
Marc Dragun, President, Brannan Homeowners Association
Robert Harrer, Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association, Government Affairs
Bob Iwersen, Gateway Apartments
Bruno Kanter, North Beach Neighbors
Mahesh Katwani, Alternate for Ritika Puri
Shani Krevsky, Exploratorium
Stewart Morton, San Francisco Heritage
Ritika Puri, Watermark Homeowners Association
Flicka McGurrin, Pier 23 Café
Carol Parlette, Golden Gateway Commons Resident
Kimberley Patten, Metro Events

NAC Members Absent

Diana Taylor, Alternate for Bob Harrer

Port Staff

Patrick Foster, Planning and Environment, NAC Coordinator
David Beaupre, Real Estate and Development, NAC Coordinator
Don Kavanagh, Real Estate and Development, NAC Coordinator
Josh Keene, Development
Ming Yeung, Planning and Environment
Rebecca Benassini, Real Estate and Development
Ricky Tijani, Development

Presenters and Audience

Clarke Miller., Strada
Jesse Blout, Strada
Andrew Byrne, Grimshaw
J. Benghiat

Reid Boggiano, California State Lands Commission
Michael Borden
Andrew Brooks, Portside HOA
Terry Chiu, Brannan
Kevin Conger
John Cornwell
Edward Cymers
Rick Dickerson, Maynard/Rich Management Co.
Robert Domingues
Mark Eliot
Abe Fahim, Brannan
April Fame, PWP
John Faricy
Earl Gee
Joseph Goodman
Kristina Hansen
David Hartzell
Kate Hartzell
Bhaskar Himatsingka
Mark Hornberger, HWI Architects
Erin Huang, H Inc.
Jehana Jalil
Richard Kennedy, James Corner Field Operations
Joel Klein
Kimco Klein, Portside
Ryan Kopa
Lih Loh, Strada
Linda Moriarty
Hoang Nguyen, Grimshaw
Claus Niemann
Suni Peterson , SF Research Institute
Brian Bianca, Trammell Crow
Caesar Purisima
Saurabh Rai
Alice Rogers, SB|R|MB NA
Jennifer San Juan
Simon Snellgrove, PWP
Margo Sulmont, Trammell Crow
Greg Taylor
Adam Voelker, Trammell Crow
Penny Wells, SF Water Trail
Debbi Wong
Xiaofan Yin, Grimshaw
Weber

1. Announcements and Introductions

Patrick Foster started off the meeting by providing a round of Zoom instructions, including muting, turning on video, participant identification and affiliation, process to ask questions and provide comments (raise your “hand”), and participating in chat.

Participants were reminded to introduce themselves before speaking.

David Beaupre, Patrick Foster, and Don Kavanagh of the Port are available to answer questions or address comments.

The Committee was advised of the following potential agenda items for the balance of 2022:

- Pop Up Uses for Piers 30/32
- Project Updates
 - Piers 38/40
 - Teatro Zinzanni
 - Embarcadero Enhancement Project
- Port Budget and COVID Impacts
- Port Waterfront Resilience Program

Next NAC meeting scheduled for March 16, 2022.

2. Approval of November 17, 2021 Meeting Notes

The NAC Meeting Notes from the November 17, 2021, meeting was approved.

3. Piers 30/32 & SWL 330 Community/Stakeholder Workshop

Focused review and discussion of the proposed Seawall Lot 330 concept, with a following presentation by the development team.

Presenters:

David Beaupre – SF Port, Real Estate & Development

Jesse Blout, Strada Investment Group

Andrew Byrne, Grimshaw

Richard Kennedy, James Corner Field Operations

Clarke Miller, Strada Investment Group

Q&A

- Marc Dragun
 - Can you breakdown what the percentage contribution split is from the proposed office versus residential towards the \$369 million infrastructure investment?

- Jesse Blout - cannot provide an answer on the fly but will as a follow up. Good question.
- Flicka McGurrin
 - How is sea level rise being dealt with? What is projected height of the pilings?
 - Jesse Blout – The only infrastructure that floats with tides is the swimming pool using a barge and gangways. Everything else is stable. We are having open conversations about where to start raising the grade to provide a line of defense - still evaluating that along with Port. Project will be elevated along the Embarcadero and piers at a level that can accommodate a high tide event.
 - David Beaupre – Current height is about 12 feet, and the Embarcadero promenade is at 11 feet. The likely scenario in 2100 requires City’s line of defense to be at 15 feet or up to 18 feet for the 1:200 scenario. At minimum, construction between seawall and pier will be 15 feet to provide protection for the waterfront. Piers will likely be constructed the same elevation.
- Terry Chiu
 - Will the proposed \$85 million in Tax Increment bonds be used towards future maintenance?
 - Jesse Blout – no, this is a one-time bond amount that goes into capital investment. Strada TCC will be responsible for overall maintenance. The City and the Port will not be responsible for maintenance or repairs for duration of the ground lease.
- Flicka McGurrin
 - Support for pool but concern of taller buildings potentially blocking light for outdoor pool.
 - Why not step it all up into a point so southern side is not so rigid?
 - Consider smaller apartments
 - Andrew Byrne - Most of the year there will be great sun access to the pool. There will be impacts in late afternoon sun only in winter months. Other buildings such as the Watermark cast shadows – we will continue to study this. The central valley between apartment towers allows afternoon sun to reach the pool.
- Bruno Kanter
 - Good to see alternatives, would like to see more exploration of new designs. Alternative 1 is already a vast improvement to reduce the height of the buildings.
 - Some of the terraces might be better on the outer corners of the building to reduce the scale on the north and south side. Other alternatives that shift massing to other areas of the site may integrate the buildings better. Articulation at a smaller scale would be helpful for texture and integration.
- Marc Dragun
 - Will you be sending presentation out?
 - David - Yes, we will post it online.

- Helpful if you can show existing height limit on images in presentation. What is existing height limit?
 - Andrew Byrne – The height limit by zoning is 105’ and base level is 65’.
- Compliments on the alternatives. Apartment structure should be consistent with existing height limits. If not, is it possible to make the north tower the taller one? The rationale is the Bay Bridge is very large, but neighborhood is smaller. A taller north tower will scale down into neighborhood. Please show us this alternative if possible.
 - Andrew Byrne – The challenge is that change would have adverse effects on views from other buildings including Watermark and Portside. We are trying to navigate these impacts as best we can and are not playing favorites on this site. We want to work together to build consensus.
- What if you raised the central valley level but cut hole through, like creating a portal from public space in back?
 - Andrew Byrne – interesting idea, would include tradeoffs between height and visual bulk.
- Bob Iwersen
 - Can see the deference to Watermark and Portside, but as result the backside of the apartment building feels like a large wall on the Embarcadero. Understands this is a difficult problem.
 - Why do we need to develop the piers? Is the housing component sufficient?
 - David Beaupre – a deep water self-scouring berth as proposed is important to the City and Port for disaster response and maritime commerce. The City needs the piers to move goods and people in case of disaster [*major goal*]. The site has good proximity for temporary power and other utilities. The cost of the Waterfront Resiliency improvements cannot rely solely on public revenue, and private development partners can help close resilience funding gaps. The Port’s Waterfront Plan process encouraged maximizing public benefits and a desire to activate the Embarcadero along this stretch.
- Bob Harrer
 - This is a very long structure along the Embarcadero that could feel massive. It helped at Broadway Cove with two corridors separating two buildings. Some sort of portal or corridor could help break up the mass.
 - As far as using the state density bonus to go above height limits, I thought projects exceeding current height limits would need vote of people to approve it.
 - Jesse – Our position is that state law takes priority over local zoning as it pertains to the state density bonus. The City will need to make the final determination on this proposal. The revenue from apartment component of the project is needed as part of the capital to fund the rest of the infrastructure.
 - David – the Port is working to confirm the assumption being made by development partners and will share the result of this assessment.
- Earl Gee
 - Would like design team to use accurate footprint of the Portside building, which is more undulating than monolithic.
 - Jesse – yes, we can absolutely do this.
 - A higher north tower is deeply flawed logic because at 16 stories the project towers over the Portside. Hope you will not entertain adding height. Is there any way to set back the corner? Recovering that tiny amount of lost space would make a big

difference to Portside residents. The sharp corner facing Portside obliterates views of residents on the Main and Bryant Streets. A set-back in from the corner would help. This abrupt corner interaction is problematic for the Portside.

- Marc Dragun
 - In a future presentation, please discuss the density bonus. I didn't think a density bonus allowed development to avoid public vote. Please provide sufficient details so we have a communal understanding of the density bonus. The other proposals for Pier 30/32 complied with the height limit. Do you have an unusual interpretation that the other developers did not?
 - Earl Gee makes a good point – what if you cut corners and make a “pyramid” building that softens the hard lines for surrounding residents.
 - Jesse – we can speak further to Prop B at a future presentation and/or office hours.
- Earl Gee
 - Can you specify topics of future office hours? This would help attendees that want to join and make meetings more efficient.
 - Jesse – yes, we will specify topics.

Chat Records (answers in bold) *[Minor edits for brevity and clarity]*

- Cesar Purisima (219 Brannan) to Everyone (6:11 PM)
 - Is it possible to keep the height of the higher tower on the seawall lot the same as the lower tower.
 - **Jesse – Alternative 1 speaks to this**
- Terry Chiu to everyone (6:18 PM)
 - The slides indicate that the seawall and the pier will have approximately 1,300 parking spaces. How will the streets around the area be able to handle this amount of traffic? Will the environmental impact report clearly address this issue?
 - **David – The project does not propose 1,300 parking spaces, it is approximately 150 parking spaces – far less than current capacity of Piers 30/32.**
 - **Jesse – 1,300 parking spaces may include existing parking for entire seawall and entire pier. We will be studying the environmental impacts which include traffic.**
- Bob Iwersen to Everyone (6:21 PM)
 - Why do the piers need to be developed? Would only the housing be better?
- Linda Moriarty to Everyone (6:23 PM)
 - Please describe the use and the dimensions (height) of the building at Bryant and Beale Streets.

- Terry Chiu to Everyone (6:24 PM)
 - Why does the design accommodate the Portside and Watermark and not other nearby developments like Brannan?

- Michael Borden to Everyone (6:25 PM)
 - You mention that the Strada TCC proposal for Seawall 330 [*and Piers 30/32*] was the highest ranked of all the submissions. I don't understand how a project which exceeds the height limits mandated by Prop B (June 2014) was eligible for consideration. I'm not sure how to interpret this other than that the will of SF voters is being intentionally ignored. Can this be addressed?
 - **David – When we evaluated proposals by panel they were based on the whole project, not just SWL 330 or the Piers as a standalone, the rankings of the panel are presented in the Port Commission staff report dated September 22, 2020 and is posted on the web site**

- Brannan Owner to Everyone (6:26 PM)
 - The view corridor for the Brannan has been obliterated

- Joseph Goodman to Everyone (6:27 PM)
 - What will be the time sequencing of this project? Will Strada be able to build the residential units first and then back out of the pier improvements?
 - **David – No, we have learned our lesson from prior projects and would not allow that to occur.**

- Kate Hartzell to Everyone (6:28 PM)
 - Why is it necessary for the affordable housing and its residents to be segregated from the market rate?
 - **Jesse – to clarify, we are providing affordable housing within the market rate portion of the project. We are complementing the ~150 affordable units in the standalone structure by including ~58 units of affordable housing in the market rate portion. The standalone affordable housing allows developers to leverage subsidies that are not available in a market rate project. This includes cheaper sources of bond/construction financing. We can do a deeper dive into this during office hours.**

- Brannan Owner to Everyone (6:30 PM)
 - The project is turning its back to the City and original stakeholders of 20 years plus

- Kristina Hansen to Everyone (6:31 PM)
 - The presentation is about what's good for the developers and does not address the neighborhood. The bulky residential structure creates an ugly wall to the City.

- Kate Hartzell to Everyone (6:32 PM)
 - What happened to height regulations along the Embarcadero that were voted on by the residents of San Francisco?
 - **Jesse – This is a very important question and conversation. The height limit is currently 105', our base proposal is up to 160'. You can go above**

the limit due to state law (the recently passed State density bonus). Since the project includes affordable housing, it can exceed height limits up to an additional 35%. The law has been changed to allow an additional 50% more height. We are not taking the full 35% bonus with our proposal. Happy to discuss further during a future workshop.

- Brannan Owner to Everyone (6:34 PM)
 - This project does not belong in South Beach
- Bob Iwersen to Everyone (6:34 PM)
 - What is reasoning for higher south half and lower north half?
- Linda Moriarty to Everyone (6:39 PM)
 - If the project exceeds the existing height limits, it is essential to keep the entire project below the road level of the Bay Bridge.
- Brannan Owner to Everyone (6:39 PM)
 - Solution is to reduce the number of units. 850 units is outrageous
- S Rai to Everyone (6:40 PM)
 - Has a detailed traffic study done on the project? The apartments will experience move-in /move-out trucks constantly. One moving truck and food and Amazon deliveries block Beale Street between Watermark and Bayside Village and residents are unable to get cars due to Bay Bridge traffic. Please address how hundreds of moves will be handled.
 - Why is the waterfront height limit being ignored?
 - This building is a BIG pillar in front of the bay- very poor design. Why not go with same height as Bayside?
 - **David – we are not at a point where transportation analysis has been done, this would be completed as part of environmental review for the project.**
- Brannan Owner to Everyone (6:41 PM)
 - The first rendering is a nonstarter
- Brannan Owner to Everyone (6:43 PM)
 - You seem to be worried about people using the swimming pool. What about the poor people at the Brannan having their views obliterated? Exactly equal towers look great.
- S Rai to Everyone (6:48 PM)
 - Suggest equal towers like Bayside
- Claus Niemann to Everyone (6:48 PM)
 - Thank you for your presentation, it has been informative. You may sense degree of distrust from some residents because of previous experiences regarding this site while working with the Port and City. During the last proposal, very basic questions like traffic control/public transportation were inadequately addressed which was acknowledged at the time.

- Cesar Purisima (219 Brannan) to Everyone (6:48 PM)
 - I agree that the first rendering is a nonstarter. I think Alternative 1 is better and looks great from different angles.
- Terry Chiu to Everyone (6:50 PM)
 - Seconds Bruno’s comment about exploring moving units to the inside of the lot to reduce the height.
- Brannan Owner to Everyone (6:53 PM)
 - Maybe the apartment project is just too large
- Rick Dickerson to Everyone (6:54 PM)
 - Agree. The size of the project seems to be the elephant in the room.
- Brannan Owner to Everyone (6:57 PM)
 - And the Brannan
- Suni Petersen - South Beach Yacht Club to Everyone (6:59 PM)
 - I appreciate the fact that the buildings mirror the Piers which are extremely important historically and to provide access to many citizens. I also like that looking at the buildings from the Embarcadero side, it resembles a wooden ship under construction.
- Michael Borden to Everyone (7:06 PM)
 - Can you please address why projects that exceed the height limit are eligible for consideration? **(see earlier responses)**
- Brannan Owner to Everyone (7:08 PM)
 - The state density bonus allows 50% above existing limits - so that is around 150’ total after applying the bonus.
- Kristina Hansen to Everyone (7:10 PM)
 - Just because you can raise the height doesn't make it right for the neighborhood/city.
- Abraham Fahim to Everyone (7:10 PM)
 - It comes down to being allowed to build a “wall” on the waterfront low-income housing is included!
- Brannan Owner to Everyone (7:11 PM)
 - Hardly anyone walks to the back of the area north of the Ferry Building to enjoy the natural views
- Brannan Owner to Everyone (7:17 PM)
 - Proposed height is 50% above the existing limit
 - Prop B by law requires a citywide vote to change height limits.

- Rick Dickerson to Everyone (7:19 PM)
 - I would like to see views from the land side of the project looking out toward the bay to see how view corridors look from different areas.

 - Shani Krevsky, Exploratorium (NAC Member) to Everyone (7:20 PM)
 - Sorry - I can't stay on the meeting longer. Please share link to presentation when it has been posted. I look forward to learning more about the project as it evolves. I'm interested to learn how the massing relates to the proposed pier structures and how the pool relates to the total fill removed for the site.
- 4. Adjourn** – The meeting was adjourned at 7:20 PM.