



SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION

**JUNE 14, 2022
MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

MEMBERS, PORT COMMISSION

HON. WILLIE ADAMS, PRESIDENT

HON. KIMBERLY BRANDON, VICE PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN BURTON, COMMISSIONER

HON. GAIL GILMAN, COMMISSIONER

ELAINE FORBES, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

CARL NICITA, COMMISSION AFFAIRS MANAGER

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

June 14, 2022

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Port Commission Willie Adams called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. The following Commissioners were present: Willie Adams, Kimberly Brandon, John Burton and Gail Gilman.

The Commission Affairs Manager read the Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgment.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 10, 2022

ACTION: Commissioner Gilman moved approval of the minutes. Commissioner Brandon seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON EXECUTIVE SESSION

No Public Comment.

4. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Vote on whether to hold a closed session and to invoke the attorney-client privilege regarding the matters listed below as Conference with Legal Counsel.

ACTION: Commissioner Brandon moved to go into closed session and invoke attorney client privilege for Conference with Legal Counsel. Commissioner Burton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

(1) CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL REGARDING ANTICIPATED LITIGATION MATTER (Discussion Item)

Discussion of anticipated litigation matter pursuant to California Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(2) and (d)(4) and San Francisco Administrative Code §§ 67.8(a)(3), 67.8-1(b), 67.10(d)(2) regarding disputed title to a portion of Custer Avenue in the vicinity of 1650 - 1680 Davidson Avenue.

Anticipated litigation: _X_ As defendant _X_ As plaintiff

Present: President Willie Adams
 Vice President Kimberly Brandon
 Commissioner John Burton

Commissioner Gail Gilman

Also present: Elaine Forbes, Executive Director
Carl Nicita, Commission Affairs Manager
Michael Martin, Assistant Port Director
Rebecca Benassini, Deputy Director for Real Estate
Jamie Hurley, Development Project Manager
Michelle Sexton, General Counsel
Rona Sandler, Deputy City Attorney
Kristen Jensen, Deputy City Attorney

(2) CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL REGARDING EXISTING LITIGATION MATTER (Discussion Item)

Closed Session discussion pursuant to California Government Code, Cal. Govt. Code § 54954.5(c); San Francisco Administrative Code §§ 67.8(a)(3), 67.8-1(b), for the purpose of conferring with, or receiving advice from, the City Attorney regarding the following existing three separate litigation actions filed in the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco, by the Port against Aclima, Inc., entitled *City & Cnty of SF operating by/thr SF Port Comm. v. Aclima Inc.*; the lawsuit is an unlawful detainer action to recover possession of the following three properties and a portion of unpaid rent owed to the Port by Aclima Inc. for each of the three properties:

- a) Pier 19, Bays 8-18 (Case Number CUD-22-668860)
- b) 10 Lombard Street (Roundhouse Two), 3rd Floor (Case Number CUD-22-668861)
- c) 1101 The Embarcadero, Sandhouse Building (Case Number CUD-22-668862)

Present: President Willie Adams
Vice President Kimberly Brandon
Commissioner John Burton
Commissioner Gail Gilman

Also present: Elaine Forbes, Executive Director
Carl Nicita, Commission Affairs Manager
Michael Martin, Assistant Port Director
Rebecca Benassini, Deputy Director for Real Estate
Kimberley Beal, Assistant Deputy Director for Real Estate
Michelle Sexton, General Counsel
Grace Park, Deputy City Attorney
Phil Wilkinson, Deputy City Attorney

**The Commission recessed Closed Session at 3:15 p.m. for Open Session. The Commission reconvened in Closed Session at 4:30 p.m.*

- (3) CONFERENCE WITH 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)

Property: Seawall Piers 38 and 40

Person Negotiating: Port: Rebecca Benassini, Deputy Director of Real Estate and Development

Negotiating Parties: Simon Snellgrove, San Francisco Waterfront Partners III, LLC

Under Negotiation: Price Terms of Payment Both

In this executive session, the Port's negotiators seek direction from the Port Commission to provide negotiation direction on factors affecting the price and terms of payment, including price structure and financing and other factors affecting the terms of payment of the proposed Piers 38 & 40 Development project. The executive session discussions will enhance the capacity of the Port Commission during the public deliberations and actions to set the price and payment terms that are most likely to maximize the benefits to the Port, the City, and the People of the State of California.

Present: President Willie Adams
Vice President Kimberly Brandon
Commissioner John Burton
Commissioner Gail Gilman

Also present: Elaine Forbes, Executive Director
Carl Nicita, Commission Affairs Manager
Michael Martin, Assistant Port Director
David Beaupre, Deputy Director for Planning & Environment (attended remotely)
Michelle Sexton, General Counsel

Closed session adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

5. RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

- A. Possible report on actions taken in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.1 and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.12.

No Report.

- B. Vote in open session on whether to disclose any or all executive session discussions pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.1 and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.12.

ACTION: Commissioner Gilman moved reconvene in open session without disclosing closed session discussions. Commissioner Brandon seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The 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 and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. The Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person responsible for the ringing of or use of a cell phone 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 public comments on each agenda item unless the Port Commission adopts a shorter period on any item. Public comment must be in respect to the current agenda item. For in-person public comment, please fill out a speaker card and hand it to the Port Commission Affairs Manager. For remote public comment, instructions are on the first page of this agenda. During public comment, the moderator will instruct you to dial *3 to be added to the queue. An audio prompt will signal when it is your turn to speak.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA

No Public Comment.

9. EXECUTIVE

- A. Executive Director's Report
 - Update to the Port's 2021-2026 Strategic Plan – Resilience goals, objectives and strategies
 - Key Project Updates

Director Forbes: Good afternoon, President Adams, Vice President Brandon, members of the commission, public and Port staff. I am Elaine Forbes, the Port's executive director. First and foremost, happy pride.

Pride recognizes the heroism and activism of members of the LGBTQ++ community who came before us and fought in violent and dangerous times. And we stand on that bravery with a more inclusive world for queer people where we're welcome to be ourselves.

And this summer, it's time to celebrate pride. This is the first year back with in-person events, another sign of revival and emergence from the pandemic. And speaking of revival, this past weekend, we saw the return of Juneteenth on the waterfront and a celebration at the Ferry Plaza. The Ferry Building area was packed. It was very much like pre-pandemic.

The Juneteenth event celebrated black-owned businesses with a day of community and delicious food, kicking off Juneteenth celebrations throughout San Francisco. The Port, once again, hosted a booth and joined in the festivities. And we look forward to welcoming even more visitors to our waterfront during the summer months.

Today, my report is about resilience. And I'm very honored to present the update of the resilience section of the strategic plan. In reflecting on our resilience program, we see clearly that this is a ground-up Port project.

The Port Commission and this Port staff forged -- or I could say blazed -- a path to protect our waterfront, city and the region from the immediate risks of insurmountable earthquake damage and from the absolute threat of sea-level rise.

We will remember those maps in the early days, the future without project, where we were underneath a light blue color of sea-level rise. And we were not in the picture. The waterfront is a celebrated and remarkable place. And it's integral to what makes San Francisco a premier city.

Our Port organization is the lynchpin curating all the waterside and landside experiences and vibrancies. We were insistent. The Port will be in the 2050 and 2100 pictures. We also learned that our transportations systems, stormwater, sewer systems and, very importantly, emergency-response infrastructure and 500 acres of San Francisco's core relies on the Port providing flood protection.

This shows we all need a future with project. And we took very bold steps. This commission, in particular, took bold steps. And I want to thank the officers. We went out for a general obligation bond and earned city support very early in our understanding of the project.

This commission made a bold step of expanding our project from our three-mile seawall to the entire Port waterfront. We didn't have the funding to do so. But we knew it was the right thing. And we later identified funding.

We worked hard for the new start, an Army Corps flood study, even though we knew it was rarely given. And we built a team capable of building the waterfront resiliency program to tackle all of these challenges.

The seeds of this program grew out of our own engineering division with a concern about the seawall and a request to study. And when the results came in, our officers and our staff were vigilant in telling everyone far and wide of the importance of protecting our waterfront.

From city hall to the state capital to Washington D.C., we were literally everywhere. And we found support everywhere. The relentless pursuit of the new start for a flood study is something I remember so well.

We traveled to D.C. year after year to describe what we needed. And eventually, they said yes. This securing federal expertise and resources for a Port-wide flood study is such a critical part of this program.

Yesterday, the Army Corps and Port staff met for a project update. The Army Corps leadership called our study an innovative one for a premier city and spoke about our partnership in terms of decades, not years. We have come a very long way, commissioners. And of course, we have a long way to go.

The strategic plan lays out objectives and actions we will take through 2025. I am pleased the informational presentation today dives into one of the key actions: development of waterfront adaptation strategies and ending with a preferred plan.

This program tackles very complex sets of problems: dual risks, implementation over time, many systems and system owners, needs for geographic-wide solutions, public funding that addresses only a down payment at this time with difficult regulations not designed to address sea-level rise.

But the basics remain the same: build a stable foundation and adapt to rising tides. In the strategic plan update, you will see what we're planning to do. And I'll report out on some of the innovative strategies.

As you know, there are seven goals in our strategic plan. And this one today, we're focusing on resilience. Resilience is a key of our values and is a lynchpin of our economic recovery, equity and resilience strategies.

Resilience is especially important because we need to understand our plans clearly. We need to reduce our risks smartly. And we need to adapt to changing conditions. This foundational pillar is weaved into all Port work.

We are in conversations with city residents and stakeholders to ensure a safe waterfront. And we want to protect city neighborhoods and infrastructure. The specific goal of our resiliency section is reduce seismic and climate risk to protect the waterfront, city neighborhoods and infrastructure.

So now to our strategies -- the first is collaboration. Collaboration is very key in delivering this project properly. We're working with city partners, regional agencies, community-based organizations, tenants, the public and other stakeholders in resilience planning and implementation.

The next section is the early projects. As you'll remember, the team has identified 23 early projects to most smartly reduce our risks. We don't have enough funding to implement all of these projects. But we have advanced 11 through early stages of predesign, which will happen this year.

And we will advance some of these projects to conceptual design in 2023. And this commission will guide our way in selecting those projects. For the remaining 12 Embarcadero early projects, we're in discussion with city partners, Port tenants and other stakeholders to figure out how to get those projects done.

The second objective is focusing on funding. Funding has always been very challenging here. We're focusing now on state and federal funding and private partnerships like development projects at 38 and 40 and at 30/32 and Seawall Lot 330.

We will return to our local source of funding which we've been using for the entire program, the GO bond. We have another GO bond slated for 2026 for waterfront resilience. The Port has submitted over \$40 million in grant requests. And we're working hard on funding. We expect the first award announcement early this summer, fingers crossed.

Our third objective is risk analysis. After completing the very complicated, multi-hazard risk assessment on the three-mile Embarcadero seawall, we have turned to the southern waterfront to collect our seismic information. And we will complete our conceptual risk assessment this year.

And our last objective that you'll see much about today is the adaptation strategies. And this is to guide our long-term efforts. A few ways we will achieve this key objective is to work closely with city department partners and regional and private entities who own and manage infrastructure on our waterfront and to develop draft waterfront adaptation strategies.

Then, that will address seismic and flood risks. And we will have our preferred plan in 2023. This is a big effort. And we expect to work hard with our stakeholders to get there.

We will implement a strategy for workforce development and local business enterprise outreach in 2023 so that our project is equitable and brings different communities to the table to participate. And we will look at upcoming resilience jobs and contract opportunities.

And we will implement that living seawall pilot in 2022 to see how critters live best along our seawall and provide food for our fisheries. Lastly, we'll continue to work with our Army Corps of Engineers partners to complete our coastal flood study.

And we will remain laser focused on working with our tenants and partners to ensure a resilient waterfront. We had several -- obviously, many, many, many parcels that are under long-term lease with upcoming lease negotiations. And we will work through our lease negotiations to advance resilient improvements.

Finally, we will look to our capital projects, city projects, Port projects to include resilience in our capital works through 2025 and beyond. I do want to note that the Port enterprise does not have enough funding or even funding for this seawall program and our resilience projects because we have such a backlog in our own capital work.

So we've been clear our enterprise is far too small. And that's why we are looking for public, private sources of funding and doing so aggressively. We will also continue our training. Part of this project that's been so important is the intersection with our disaster response and our incident command center. So we will continue training to be prepared for an eventual emergency.

Finally, I want to express again my appreciation to this commission for their vision and policy direction and how we grew this program inside of the Port. I want to thank Port staff for their ingenuity, their ability to build consensus and partnerships and collaborate and to really move so far in this program from where we started.

And I know, eventually, this effort will be transformative. And we will have a waterfront and Port enterprise for future generations as a result. We will publish our updated language online. And we will have new sections for economic recovery, equity and resilience, which are our key initiatives at this time. And that concludes my report. I'm available for any questions. Thank you.

Public Comment on the Executive Director's Report:

No Public Comment.

Commissioners' Discussion on the Executive Director's Report:

Commissioner Burton: No questions, just a very fine report.

President Adams: Okay. Commissioner Gilman?

Commissioner Gilman: Thank you, Director Forbes, for your report. I just have a couple of comments I wanted to make, not really questions. First of all, I

do want to say I've really appreciated you incorporating this into your director's report.

I know we're only halfway through our strategic plan categories. But I just wanted to add that I think this has been a very nice addition to your reports. And I'm looking forward to hearing the remaining three other categories that we have.

Maybe also, when we publish these updates online, I think we should be reminding the public as much as we can that we are an enterprise department. I think it's hard sometimes for the citizenry to understand, when they hear about the city's budget as a whole, that we don't really receive any general fund and that we create our own revenue.

I think it just might add to sometimes why we're moving slower than sometimes the public perceives we should be. So I just wanted to add that comment. And I also wanted to say how proud I am that the Port is participating both in pride month celebrations and in our new state holiday.

This is the one-year mark that Juneteenth is a statewide holiday. And from the gate, from last year to this year, we have had Juneteenth celebrations. And I think that's something that we should be commended for and celebrated as a city department. So thank you for your report.

President Adams: Vice President Brandon?

Vice President Brandon: Elaine, thank you so much for your report. And happy pride month, everybody. I just want to reiterate what Director Forbes said about the Juneteenth activities on the waterfront this past weekend. It was extremely successful for the second year in a row.

And the mayor came. And I had the opportunity to tour the booths with her. And she stayed for over an hour. She had so much fun just talking to people and enjoying being on the water in the wonderful weather. And I know that last year we discussed, you know, maybe being able to do this on a more regular basis.

But this year, on the site, we put together a working group of Hudson, CUESA, Foodwise, HRC, OEWD and the Port to make sure that this happens on a more regular basis. I say quarterly. The mayor said monthly. [laughter] So just hope that you can come back in the July meeting and let us know --

Director Forbes: Mm-hmm. Yes.

Vice President Brandon: -- what the working group has done to make sure that we can at least start to do it quarterly because this is a great opportunity for minority businesses that don't have a brick and mortar, that don't have a place to

sell their wares, that at least on a monthly or quarterly basis, they'll have an opportunity to earn revenue for their businesses.

And of course, I know we want to be a part of that. And thank you so much for the update to the strategic plan with the resilience strategies. I think that's absolutely wonderful and a necessity with all the work that we still have to do with our resilience efforts. So thank you so much for your report.

President Adams: Thank you, Director Forbes, for an impeccable report. Happy pride month and then Juneteenth. I want to say a special thank you to Carl and Boris and congratulate Commissioner Gilman. We were at [rules] committee yesterday. Thank you for your support, Carl and Boris and Commissioner Gilman. You did an excellent presentation. Thank you.

I also want to give a shout out to the staff in the back. You're the best. Thank you for keeping the flag high. And also for Juneteenth -- in the ILWU on Monday -- we're celebrating it on Monday. The Port of Oakland, Seattle, Tacoma, L.A. Long Beach, we will be shut down for eight hours in honor of Juneteenth on the day side. We will work that night.

Last Friday, I had one of the highlights of my career. I met -- I had a private meeting with President Biden, Secretary Marty Walsh, the former mayor of Boston, myself and the head of the Pacific maritime. President Biden was holding court in L.A. for the Americas Conference.

And we met on the U.S. Iowa, the same ship that FDR did back in the '30s and the '40s. And he just wanted an update what was going on up in the ports and the West Coast negotiations. I tell you, I never would have thought a kid from Kansas City would have had an opportunity to sit right across from the man whose shoulders the world depends on.

And I understand that, as I told the president, you've got a big ship to drive. It's a lot going on. And I can understand, when you're the president of the United States, the most powerful man in the world, why you only get four hours sleep a night. There's so much going on in the world, whether there's shootings in schools, a war in Ukraine, what's going on with the economy, interest rates, everything that's going on.

I can understand that definitely there is no let-off time. You're always under the gun. You just try to do the best that you can do.

10. CONSENT

- A. Request approval of a resolution adopting findings under new State urgency legislation to allow certain members of this body to attend meetings remotely during the COVID-19 emergency; continuing to allow certain

members to attend remotely for the next 30 days; and directing the Commission Affairs Manager to agendize a similar resolution at a Commission meeting within 30 days. (Resolution 22-28)

- B. Request approval of a new lease with Aardvark Storage Unlimited, Inc., a California corporation, dba American Storage Unlimited, Inc. for approximately 274,163 square feet of paved land at Seawall Lot 344 for a term of five years with a one (1) year option to extend. (Resolution 22-29)
- C. Request approval of a resolution authorizing the settlement of a lawsuit filed by Karen Lange and Kevin Lange against the City and County of San Francisco for \$175,000; the lawsuit was filed on December 17, 2020, in San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-20-588530; entitled Karen Lange and Kevin Lange v. City and County of San Francisco; the lawsuit involves alleged personal injuries on Port property. (Resolution 22-30)
- D. Request approval of Lease No. L-16873 between the Port and Cross Link, Inc., dba Westar Marine Services, for Premises located at Pier 50 for a term of 5 years. (Resolution 22-31)

ACTION: Commissioner Burton moved approval of the consent calendar. Commissioner Brandon seconded the motion.

No Public Comment on the Consent Calendar.

All Commissioners were in favor.

President Adams – Resolutions 22-28, 29, 30 and 31 pass unanimously.

11. WATERFRONT RESILIENCE PROGRAM

- A. Informational presentation on the process for developing Draft Waterfront Adaptation Strategies.

Brad Benson: Good afternoon, President Adams, Vice President Brandon, commissioners and Director Forbes, staff and the public. I'm really pleased to be here on the agenda today. It's perfect to be presenting on the adaptation strategies after Director Forbes presented on the resilience update to the strategic plan.

And I just want to echo thanks to the commission, the officers, Director Forbes for really leading in the face of these challenges, to identify the bond, the flood study opportunity. We have a lot of work ahead of us in terms of that advocacy. And we really look forward to collaborating with you on it.

Today, I'm really just going to introduce Adam Varat. Adam is our deputy

program manager in charge of planning for the waterfront resilience program. He leads our planning team in developing waterfront-wide adaptation strategies through an inclusive, multi-stakeholder process.

Prior to coming to the Port, Adam was deputy director of the San Francisco Planning Department's resilience -- citywide planning division where he oversaw the department's resilience and sustainability and urban-design functions. He was with the Planning Department for 17 years. So Adam really knows the city well.

Among other projects, he managed the better streets plan and the San Francisco sea-level rise vulnerability and consequences assessment. So I'd like to introduce you to Adam.

Adam Varat: Thank you, Brad. Good afternoon, President Adams, Vice President Brandon, commissioners, Director Forbes. As Brad mentioned, I'm Adam Varat, deputy program manager for the waterfront resilience program. And I'm here today to talk to you about the development of our waterfront adaptation strategies.

So I'm going to talk first about the process that we are currently in the midst of to develop these strategies. This is sort of setting the stage for coming back to you at the end of summer, early fall with kind of the rolling out of these strategies.

We're going to talk about some of the community-driven conversations that we've had that are informing and providing information to develop these strategies and shaping them. I'm going to talk kind of high level conceptual about the adaptation approaches that we are using that are helping us inform the development of the strategies and then briefly on our next steps.

So you're all familiar with the waterfront resilience program. This vision statement has been developed and affirmed through robust community engagement. The waterfront resilience program takes actions to reduce seismic and climate-change risks to support a safe, equitable, sustainable and vibrant waterfront.

This is very consistent and aligned with the strategic plan, vision and goals that Director Forbes set out just a few minutes ago. And the program has been through and created a lot of information to date.

It's come a long way with developing existing-conditions work, putting together the multi-hazard risk assessment to assess detailed flooding and seismic risks on the Embarcadero, entering into and launching the Port Army Corps coastal flood study and launching and heading into predesign for the Embarcadero early projects, among many other related efforts going on.

This is also building on past work that the city and the Port have done including

the Port and SPUR Mission Bay adaptation study and Islais Creek southeast mobility adaptation strategy which was a partnership between the Planning Department, the Port, SFMTA and SFPUC.

So this work to develop waterfront adaptation strategies is building on the back of all of this work that has come to date. And as Director Forbes mentioned, the program is supporting and aligning with the goals of the Port's strategic plan, not just the resilience goal but really all of the above in different ways.

So for example, it supports the Port's goals around engagement by providing a robust and inclusive public outreach and engagement program that helps inform all of the materials and decisions that come out of the waterfront resilience program including the development of the waterfront adaptation strategies.

We'll also be putting together a program-wide racial-and-social-equity strategy and, in particular, doing an equity assessment and evaluation of the different strategies that we come up with, so we can see how they benefit and minimize burdens to BIPOC communities and other communities of color and disadvantaged populations.

And of course, it's leading the way on resilience from leading the city's efforts to make a more seismically and flood-hazard-resilient city. This map is showing some of the overviews of some of the hazards that we are looking to address.

This map shows the coastal flood risk through 2100. We're seeing a real tipping point between 2030 and 2040 where the flood hazards become more and more unsustainable. And we really need to start planning now to start addressing those hazards so that we can do something about it by that timeframe.

This map is showing sea-level rise of between three-and-a-half to seven feet which is a sort of end-of-century projection for sea-level rise and the sort of 100-year flood storm that would happen. And you can see the area here in bluish and purplish of the city that would be inundated.

So this goes well beyond the Port's jurisdiction, as you can see. I believe it was the recommendation of this commission that we engage with other city agencies who own and operate and maintain and regulate assets and infrastructure in this zone in order to kind of get their feedback and their input in helping to develop these strategies.

So as you can see in a little bit, that's what we've been doing. This map is showing a little bit further out in our work with the U.S. Army Corps. That study is looking out to 2140 or 2150. You can see the area of inundation is going further. The depths are deeper. The damages are greater.

The project is not going to be designing a project that is resilient out to 2150 to

date. But it's important to help us assess the damages and understand how far a project can go and start thinking about the planning that we need to be doing, some of the things that take more long term such as land-use changes that can help us think about this long-term, 100-year-plus time horizon.

And here is our friendly seal. This is just a poster that we're going to be starting to use in public outreach and engagement kind of showing, what does it mean? This would be two scale. Out on the waterfront, what does it mean to have seven feet of sea-level rise? Higher than the height of most people.

And you can see the sort of three-and-a-half feet likely scenario by the end of century and seven feet kind of plausible but high-impact scenario by end of century. And that's really what we're building towards.

And the elevation of the waterfront varies. Some areas of higher. Some are lower. And so the amount that we would need to build up varies too. But this is the amount of the rising seas that we would be building towards.

So we know that, even today, San Francisco faces urgent seismic and coastal-flood risks. You can see flooding today across the waterfront from the northern waterfront all the way to the southern waterfront. Those happen during high tide and storm events.

And it will only get worse. The flooding will only get worse as seal levels rise. So we're starting to plan for this challenge. And we want to see this as an opportunity to use the drivers of these climate and seismic hazards to help us preserve and reimagine the waterfront so that it can meet the goals that we share in the strategic plan and that the community has voiced to us.

So we are going to be starting to develop these waterfront adaptation strategies, rolling them out and determining a sort of publicly selected strategy that we want to move forward with so that we can address these hazards in time.

So now, I'll talk a little bit about the process for developing the draft waterfront adaptation strategies. As you can see and I've mentioned, we've come a long way through assessing existing conditions and risks and hazards, developing seismic and flood measures.

And now, we are at the point of starting to develop strategies for the waterfront that will turn into ultimately projects that can be designed to a greater level of detail and implemented and built.

And when I talk about waterfront adaptation strategies, these are the components that we're talking about. It would include a location for a coastal-flood-defense system, basically the high point of the coastal flood defense where it keeps the water from coming from the bay into the city, the height of that

system and then the area of elevation change that's needed in order to grade back to the existing elevation of the city.

So what's that area of change that we're talking about if we build up at the waterfront recognizing that we don't necessarily want to build a vertical wall which wouldn't take up any horizontal space. But it would not meet the city's goals for access and visual connection to the waterfront. It's going to take some city area.

We're also going to be looking at what are the types of measures, the physical changes, whether it's a seawall or flood wall, a berm or levy, nature-based features or asset-specific features such as flood proofing, elevating structures or elevating sensitive equipment.

All of these in combination will combine to be the measures that this flood-defense system is built out of. And finally, we'd be looking at kind of associated policy changes such as flood-resilient building codes, operations changes, disaster warning systems and land-use changes such as voluntary buyout programs or land-use and zoning changes in sort of longer-term scenarios.

And as I mentioned, this is not going to be built overnight. It's not going to be built in one project. This will be implemented over time, building on investments that came before starting with our early projects that you had a presentation on in December and then moving to a sort of mid-term 2040, mid-century adaptation move that would build flood-defense systems that would essentially be able to keep the city's flood risk at a tolerable level through the end of century.

And then, longer term, we would be looking at these longer-term adaptations that we will be planning for now, again not be part of the project that we identify and implement now but keeping that in sight and keeping those concepts in play because we recognize that the sea levels will continue to rise over time.

But we don't necessarily know how much because the projections as you go further out are less certain. So we need to kind of keep that in mind but not move forward with it immediately.

This slide is showing the process for us to develop the draft waterfront adaptation strategies. Right now, we're in this first light-blue phase called develop. We are in the process of putting together two to three draft adaptation strategies.

These will be different combinations of the different elements that I showed you in the previous slides. And those will be brought to the Port Commission in the early fall and then rolled out to the public. And then, we will go through a phase of evaluating and selecting a preliminary preferred adaptation strategy so taking those two to three, combining them, picking the best elements of each of those, doing evaluation and cost-benefit analysis, working closely with the Army Corps

of Engineers study, doing a robust public-outreach and engagement process to understand what the public values and likes and doesn't like about the different strategies, doing an equity assessment to understand who is benefitting and who is burdened by these different strategies and how they might be remedying past structural inequities and selecting a sort of preliminary preferred strategy.

And then, we will be refining that through continued public outreach and engagement with continued evaluation to get to a final preferred strategy. At each phase, we'll be bringing this before the Port Commission.

And ultimately, this will be going into the Army Corps and Port flood study as what they call the tentatively selected plan which would be next summer, 2023. And that selected plan will then go through more detailed design and engineering, environmental review, NEPA/CEQA review and ultimately approvals and will ultimately be a selected project that would be presented to Congress for potential funding.

That's sort of our strategy. Our major milestone here is this next summer 2023 milestone of getting to a preferred plan. And our phasing approach is getting us there. So our next touchpoint will be this early fall where we'll be coming to you with two to three public strategies to roll out.

So as we've heard, it's really important to work with the other city local agencies in developing these because it impacts the city as a whole as well as agency-specific assets and infrastructure. And we've been talking -- meeting weekly with a group of kind of agency representatives from these agencies, the Port, the MTA, PUC, public works, planning and the city administrator's office, the office of resilience and capital planning and then starting to brief up through their executive teams to make sure we can get to alignment around these different strategies from a city level.

And these are some of the key themes that we've heard from them. So they all, including the Port, have mentioned the importance of maintaining functioning and operating assets for the agencies and connecting them to not just the asset themselves but to system-wide networks whether it's a transportation network, open-space or utility network.

It's not just the particular asset that gets impacted whether it's a bus yard or a utility station or something like that. It connects to everything else and impacts the whole system. We've heard a lot about the need to understand the design for the implications of building a coastal-flood-defense system on the city's stormwater and sewer system.

What that means is, when we build up a coastal-flood-defense system, a seawall or a levee or whatnot, we still need to let the water out from -- that's coming from precipitation-based flooding that is only projected to get more extreme as well.

So that may require additional pumping of water or storage of water or other strategies to get that water back out even as we keep the bay water from coming into the city. We've heard from agencies as well as from the public that they really want to see projects that bring multiple benefits such as jobs, more open space, mobility enhancements, nature-based and ecological features and improved waterfront access.

That's only a partial list. But really, if we're just building a flood-defense system and it doesn't bring these other benefits, then it's not really working for the city in terms of being able to provide what it could and responding to that feedback that we've heard.

And then, finally, any flood-defense infrastructure that we build needs to enhance not just the flood resistance but also the seismic reliability of the waterfront and the ability of the waterfront to play a key role in disaster response.

So now, I'm going to turn to talk a little bit about the public outreach and engagement that we've done to date and what we've heard and how that's informing the different strategies that we've created.

Some of this, you may have seen before. But we've worked with over 150 community and stakeholder groups as well as provide waterfront-wide presentations in a number of forums and work closely with the Port's advisory groups to give regular presentations and opportunities for input from them.

We've also done kind of outreach going to where people are so local events like farmer's markets and street fairs, partnerships with a number of organizations. And we're going to continue to do this and then hosted events such as walking tours along Islais Creek, Mission Creek.

And we're starting to do all up and down the waterfront. These events were kind of -- in-person events were put on pause for a time during the pandemic. As of last fall, they've restarted in person. And we've started doing these sort of in-person street-fair, walking-tour, etcetera, events again. They're very popular.

And then, we've also done digital engagements, asked people to map out what are their assets that they care about most that are along the waterfront, weigh in on what their values, goals and evaluation criteria should be. And then, what do they like and don't like? What do they want to see in the future along the waterfront?

And these are all different surveys. And we've just completed another survey which I will touch on towards the end. And here are some of the assets that people have stated that they really see as important and want to protect.

So you can see there are a lot of kind of iconic and visitor assets here. But there are a lot of more utilitarian and functional assets that people recognize the significance of things like the Southeast Treatment Plant or the Recology plant in terms of providing needed services and utilities for the city in addition to things like the Ferry Building and the Giants Ballpark and Fisherman's Wharf.

And from all this work, we also identified these sort of future vision statements. There were sort of four themes that emerged. One was having a more connected city, bay and region with better transportation options that can really bring people to access and enjoy the waterfront.

One is around social and economic sustainability, thinking about things like equity, job diversity, job equity, affordable housing, things like that. We heard wanting to see things be clean and green, connecting people to nature, having ecosystems and open space and adaptation measures and having open spaces along the waterfront and really protecting that and finally having a vibrant and active and accessible public waterfront where people can really get to it, enjoy it, integrate the maritime uses and kind of build on the historic character of San Francisco's waterfront.

And all of those went into this development of these draft program goals which we affirmed through this public engagement and brought to this commission as draft. We're working also with the city agencies around alignment around the set of goals.

So we may update these and bring them back to you at a future date. But you see some of the same kind of themes and goals as well as from the Port strategic plan around resilience, life safety, flood and seismic resilience, protecting the Port's public trust and cultural resources, utility and mobility enhancements, ecological enhancements, achieving equity and remedying disproportionate impacts and improving economic opportunities and financial stability for the Port and the city.

So these are the goals that have been previously brought here as draft but not finalized. And we're continuing to work with the city agencies on them right now.

So my last section, I'll talk about the kind of adaptation approaches that we are using that are helping us to kind of frame and think about the strategies as we put them together. When we talk about adaptation approaches, we really think about kind of three major types of things that we can do.

We can defend, which is keeping the coastal water out but keeping our city in place. We can accommodate, which is letting the coastal water in while keeping the city in place and doing things like flood proofing. Or we can retreat. We can move out of the area over time.

And none of these is a panacea. None of them works on their own. There are places for all of these. It will be some sort of hybrid. I'll go into them a little bit more in detail. So here, you can see a vignette of what it means to defend.

We're elevating at the shoreline either by raising up through a seawall or a berm or a more nature-based feature where you might have more space to do so. And here is an example from Auckland, New Zealand where you can see an elevated seawall and a new public promenade somewhat similar to the Embarcadero here.

There are other features of this that are not quite as evident. But again, when you do this, there are implications that require more stormwater pumping and things like that. So these are all costs that we're taking into account.

And here is the second theme which is to accommodate. And this is with letting the coastal water in but staying in place. So this approach is somewhat of a buy-you-more-time approach. So you can accommodate flooding -- occasional flooding.

But it becomes more and more difficult as flooding gets more frequent and ultimately permanently inundated as sea levels rise. So you might flood proof the ground floors of buildings. You might elevate buildings. You might move sensitive equipment.

You might build redundant equipment such as a backup power generator on drier land, things like that. And the image on the right shows a neighborhood that was built in Hamburg, Germany that was designed to have floodable public spaces when there are big storms as well as floodable buildings at the ground floor with second-floor entrances. And then, when the storm recedes, it goes back to normal. So this strategy is being used in other places around the world.

And then, finally, a more longer-term approach is retreat, which is to move out of the area over time. The building -- the image there is pretty straightforward. As the sea levels rise, you plan for and eventually relocate uses out of the area.

And this has happened in places like Christchurch, New Zealand, where the area near downtown was rendered seismically unstable. And so they actually moved buildings and infrastructure out of that area and replaced it with parks.

So this is something that takes a lot of time to do through land-use change, through voluntary buyout programs, through relocation of infrastructure. But if you see a need with the flooding concerns over time, you can start planning for it and ultimately implement it.

And as I mentioned, at the end of the day, none of these strategies is perfect in all circumstances. They need to all work together, sometimes redundantly where

you might defend and accommodate. Or you might do all three in one place. And that's what we're going to be looking at in these strategies.

And then, for all the strategies, we're going to be looking at integrating nature-based and ecological solutions. So we have convened an engineering-with-nature working group made up of local and global experts on the ecology that's going to help us figure out how we integrate nature-based solutions into any type of strategy that we use whether it's a more vertical hard edge like a seawall, as you can see in the upper left in Seattle's new seawall, or something more like a natural wetland or beach, as you see in some of the other examples depending on the type of features that you're building and the amount of space available.

So based on these different approaches, we recently circulated a citywide survey that showed those examples that I showed as well as a couple others about how cities made their changes. And we asked the respondents to consider these approaches for San Francisco's waterfront.

We got nearly 1,000 responses. We had about 10 percent of those in non-English language. We had underrepresentation of non-white respondents and southern waterfront respondents. So we need to do more outreach on that. And we are working to put together focus groups.

We're partnering with community-based organizations to get more detailed feedback from, in particular, southern waterfront communities. So that will be coming in June and July. And then, on the right here, you can see some of the just general feedback, very general, very qualitative at this point that we heard on these kind of high-level approaches.

As you can see on the defend approach, you know, it kind of minimizes changes and feels familiar. But maybe it has the opportunity to block views. It might cost a lot to build. There might be construction disruption.

In the accommodate approach, people saw it as sort of practical, also flexible, again could be costly. Maybe people didn't totally understand what was happening there.

And then, in retreat, people liked that it was sort of proactive, that there was open space. But it brought up issues of displacement. Who gets moved? Is this really a realistic strategy? So all of these bring up kind of thoughtful questions that we need to be addressing through our adaptation strategy development.

And this information that we got from the survey will help us refine and finalize those strategies before we bring them out to the public. And finally, in terms of next steps, as I mentioned, we are working on the waterfront adaptation strategies.

We plan to bring these out this fall followed by robust community engagement after a Port Commission hearing. As you know, the waterfront resilience program is also working on the Embarcadero early projects, which you heard in December, as well as the living seawall pilot, which you heard just a couple months ago, is moving forward right now.

And we're continuing to work with a variety of different stakeholders, our engineering-with-nature workgroup, historic preservation advisory committee, resource and regulatory agencies. We have an equity working group made up of equity practitioners from the city and then community-based organizations to get that sort of focus-group feedback all to inform the adaptation strategies, which we'll be coming back with.

So with that, I will end my presentation. We're excited to come back in the fall with the strategies. And thank you for your time.

No Public Comment.

Commissioners' Discussion on Item 11A:

Commissioner Burton: Thank you -- very informative. And I was watching the Senate hearing today where they were discussing the whole issues of water, water retention including such things as having solar panels over some watershed so that -- and I couldn't understand exactly what they were talking about.

But it then would somehow help melt the ice up in Greenland and be some beneficial to us. But the feds were -- and the main speaker was actually somebody from Farm Bureau, not the corporate farms but family farms.

But it seems like what you're doing is consistent with what they're talking about. And in fact, what you're doing shows that we might be ahead of the curve. So congratulations.

Adam Varat: Thank you.

President Adams: Commissioner Gilman?

Commissioner Gilman: Adam, thank you so much for this report. And it's really exciting that this is moving forward. I just have two questions. I was unfamiliar -- and this is my blind spot -- is ONESF the city administrator's office? Or --

Adam Varat: ONESF is the logo and branding for the city's capital planning program.

Commissioner Gilman: Thank you. Okay.

Adam Varat: It's the office of resilience and capital planning.

Commissioner Gilman: Okay. Thank you. I wasn't familiar with that. And then, my other question was, are we also coordinating with WETA? I'm wondering if any of these solutions could impact water transportation.

Adam Varat: It's a good question. You know, since I have been here, we haven't talked with them. We are planning to talk through with various regional transportation providers. So we've just recently started talking to BART.

We need to talk with Caltrain. We've talked to Transbay Joint Powers. And WETA should be on that list as well. It looks like Brad may be able to talk to past conversations with WETA.

Brad Benson: Commissioner, we did engage with WETA when we put together our disaster-response exercise, which informed those early projects.

Commissioner Gilman: Okay.

Brad Benson: So we're very concerned about how to maintain access to the downtown ferry terminal. And we will continue the conversations, as Adam said.

Commissioner Gilman: Okay. Thank you very much. I just want to say I'm super excited about the nature-based solutions and the living seawall. I think this is really exciting on multiple levels. And I hope we can provide education opportunities for the communities around the waterfront so that we can bring young people down to really see that.

So that just concludes my comments. Thank you so much for this report. It's such a critical issue that we need to tackle.

Adam Varat: Great. Thank you for your comments.

President Adams: Vice President Brandon?

Vice President Brandon: Brad and Adam, thank you so much for this report. We can tell that a lot of work has been done. And there's a lot of details in this presentation. We're definitely headed in the right direction so just want to thank you for that. My question is regarding community outreach. Who is doing our community outreach?

Adam Varat: We have a stakeholder engagement team as part of our master contract. It's led by Civic Edge. And it has a few sub-firms that are InterEthnica, RDJ and Andrea Baker Consulting doing most of the sort of in-person outreach,

putting together the walking tours, the in-person events and things like that.

Vice President Brandon: Because it seems like we're still having an issue getting the southeast part of the city engaged in this process or doing outreach to them. I was really happy to hear that we're doing outreach to our community advisory committees -- CACs -- community -- yeah. [laughs] I'm really happy that we are using them and doing updates.

But I was just wondering, regarding the citywide survey that we did, who did we actually send it to? And how many did we send out?

Commissioner Burton: How many did you get back?

Adam Varat: So we started -- you know, there was online surveys that we were putting out there. We were not finding -- we finding even more kind of extreme skew. So we did two things. We ran ads on SFGATE to try and get a broader representation of people as well as we did in-person intercept surveys along locations in the southern waterfront.

And that did actually shift it about kind of 10 percent more towards kind of southern waterfront and demographics of communities of color, people of color taking the survey. But it didn't go far enough. That's why the survey is not enough. It's not going to be our --

Vice President Brandon: So what is a --

Adam Varat: -- only data point.

Vice President Brandon: -- what is a citywide survey?

Adam Varat: Well, it means it was just open. And --

Vice President Brandon: Okay.

Adam Varat: Yeah. It was open --

Vice President Brandon: It was open the city. But only select people within the city were able to have access to it.

Adam Varat: Well, anyone could have access to it. But it's more about who hears about it and who takes the survey. So we were trying to make sure that we got representation from --

Vice President Brandon: And I --

Adam Varat: -- areas of the city --

Vice President Brandon: Yeah. So I guess --

Adam Varat: -- that weren't --

Vice President Brandon: -- I guess --

Adam Varat: -- responding.

Vice President Brandon: -- we have to be a little more intentional because I know I didn't receive the survey. Did anybody here receive the survey? So it's who -- yes. It's open to anyone to take it. But they would have to know it's there to be taken.

Adam Varat: That's right.

Vice President Brandon: So it's about outreaching to communities that so far we have not had success with. And I know, in the past couple years, we had not used our minority consultants in this area in this way.

So I just really want to encourage you that, if we have consultants that have relationships within other areas than we normally do business, we should really take advantage of that because what we do -- we do want to expand this to all San Franciscans but especially those communities that about our waterfront and have an interest.

Adam Varat: Absolutely. We hear that.

Vice President Brandon: Yeah. It was just -- you answered my question about ONESF because that was the first time I saw that also. [laughs] So yeah. It was just -- I just want to make sure that we're d -- when we're doing presentations and outreach to the communities, that we're tr -- really trying to reach all communities. But thank you so much for this presentation.

President Adams: Go ahead.

Commissioner Gilman: I actually, on that point, just wanted to maybe make a suggestion.

Adam Varat: Sure.

Commissioner Gilman: This might be a little outside the box. But especially if it's an online survey that's in multiple languages, maybe we could send it also out to all the chambers of commerce and our LBE contractors list to have them in-reach to their communities to do the survey so asking the Chinese chamber, African-American chamber, etcetera, to send it out to their members to really

encourage sort of minority participation.

It was just a thought. Since we have this list that we use for contracting, maybe we should also be using them for things like this.

Adam Varat: I'll definitely take that suggestion back.

Vice President Brandon: Thank you.

President Adams: Brad and Adam, thank you. You know, this is a very, very complex process. Right. There's a lot of moving parts. I think, with something like this, because it's so big and you've got to try to get your head around that, I don't think a lot of people right now are focused or could even see the benefits -- how it's going to benefit all San Franciscans and people coming to visit here, right, because it's got so many steps to it.

And it's so far down the line, right, how it's going to happen. So I appreciate -- yeah. I don't know how -- I mean -- and I understand my fellow commissioners. We've got to get it out there. But how we get people to get their head around it, to be interested in something like this, right, this is not like building a new stadium or this or that. Right.

This ain't something that's sexy. Right. This is something that's just really so intense, so much work. And the rewards are going to be way down the line. But I really appreciate the effort, me personally, because I can tell this is very painstaking work.

This is not glamorous. And it's not a lot of that-a-boys. And this is something that has to be done. So this is heroic work, [selfish] work that you guys are really doing. I appreciate it personally because you can just see -- I just was looking at the presentation just thinking about all this and realize it's just one increment step after another that you have to take, processes, permits, funding.

And most people can't get their head around that. And I appreciate what you're doing. If the commissioners can be of some help, whatever. I don't know if the city -- if the mayor does commercials or the board of supervisors do commercials in their area.

Does Director Forbes do commercial -- I mean, is there something we can do on social media or commercials to really highlight this? Because this is big. This is huge what's happening. Right. And we're one of those leading the country in doing something like this and being progressive and out front.

And then, when something happens, we're going to be prepared. And the other people will be saying, man, I wish we would have had the vision and had the action that San Francisco had. They got off their butt. And they didn't wait for

anybody to help them.

They were motivated. And they went out and done it. So thank you very much. I appreciate when you come. And if the commissioners -- please use us in any kind of way possible. This is something great really.

Historians will be talking about this. This is just something huge that happens once in a century and a lifetime that we're going to see something like this that's going to just benefit so many and [just out front]. So thank you.

Adam Varat: Thank you for the offer. And thank you for your time today.

12. ENGINEERING

- A. Request authorization to award Construction Contract No. 2843, Pier 70 Shipyard Grading and Abatement, to Yerba Buena Engineering and Construction Inc., in the amount of \$1,162,090, and authorization for a contract contingency fund of 10% of the contract amount (or \$116,209) for unanticipated conditions, for a total authorization not to exceed \$1,278,299. (Resolution 22-32)

Erica Petersen: Good afternoon, commissioners. My name is Erica Petersen. And I'm the Port's project manager for the Pier 70 shipyard grading and abatement project. I'll be giving today's presentation requesting authorization to award this construction contract.

This is an action item to award Pier 70 shipyard grading and abatement contract to Yerba Buena Engineering and Construction, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder to the invitation for bids published on April 4th.

The amount of this contract is \$1,162,090. And authorization includes a 10 percent contingency request for a total authorization of \$1,278,299. The contract work is located adjacent to Crane Cove Park and will remove contaminated underground pipeline, regrade existing soil stockpiles on site and place durable cover over the entire unpaved site to create a level surface and prepare the space for future tenants.

You can see the location here in this photo next to an unfinished Crane Cove Park because it's an old photo. In this presentation, I will talk about how this contract meets the Port's strategic objectives, the background and scope of work, advertisement and Port's outreach, provide a comparison of bids, introduce the low bidder and subcontractors, discuss the funding and the proposed schedule.

This project supports the goals of the Port's strategic plan by raising the grade by approximately two-and-a-half feet at the site to protect it from sea-level rise. The contract also provides job opportunities. And the awarded contractor, as you'll

see, is a San Francisco minority business enterprise. And most of their subcontractors are LBEs. And I think most of them are minority-owned businesses as well.

This project will honor the Port's commitment to the regional water quality control board to provide a remedy for contaminated native soil at Pier 70 as described in the Pier 70 risk management plan. It will remove an existing storm drain pipe that was discovered during Crane Cove Park construction to have PCB contamination.

And lastly, the project prepares this space for potential future tenants. I know real estate is currently fielding inquiries about this space. So this site is formally part of the Pier 70 shipyard, as you can see in the photo, that red trapezoid area. And it is located east of Crane Cove Park.

In recent years, the space has been used for a variety of purposes. It's not open to the public. It's been used to store the crane tops for Crane Cove Park and soil stockpiles for construction during Crane Cove Park, a staging area during Crane Cove Park construction. And the Port recently initiated a lease with the marine contractor, Silverado, for the area on the right side of that trapezoid to use the area for laydown space and to demolish and dispose of small watercraft.

In addition to the environmental mitigation efforts, this project will create more leasable space for future tenants by grading the site and creating an even surface. In 2013, the Pier 70 risk-management plan, which I'll call RMP, was approved by the water board and public health.

This document describes how workers, the public and the environment will be protected from existing environmental pollutants in the soil and groundwater at Pier 70. So the goal of this project is to satisfy the requirements of the RMP to remedy the contaminated native soil at Pier 70 by covering the exposed native soil with six inches of gravel which is considered durable cover by the RMP.

Additionally, a contaminated storm drain pipe was discovered during the construction of Crane Cove Park. It's in that yellow area in the aerial diagram. The pipe was found to contain PCBs. And it was immediately plugged upon discovery.

Conversations between the Port and the EPA began immediately regarding the appropriate remediation. The EPA has approved the Port's work plan included in this construction contract to remove and dispose of the contaminated pipe, place a layer of activated carbon at the bottom of the excavation and then backfill the area with concrete on top.

The activated carbon binds the contaminants including any residual PCBs in the soil, effectively preventing the contaminants from migrating into the groundwater.

And that photo is a very poor photo pointing to where they plugged the pipe with that red arrow.

So this figure in this slide is an excerpt from our construction drawing. So it's a little more detailed than needed here. But I thought it was helpful to illustrate the summary of work. The cyan, light-blue-colored strip on the left is the PCB-contaminated drain pipe that will be removed and disposed of per our EPA-approved plan.

The green area shows where the existing soil stockpiles are. And they'll be spreading graded across that area. And then, six inches of gravel will be placed across the green and orange areas to cap the native soil.

This work will address environmental issues as well as prepare the site for future leasable space. We advertised this contract on April 4th and held an optional virtual pre-bid meeting on April 14th. A bid walk was held on April 15th.

Port staff conducted outreach to companies representing the trades for this contract during the advertisement period including LBE contractors. On all our contracts including this one, we advertised to the ethnic chambers of commerce and community-based organizations that support small businesses.

We also post to SF City Partners, which is widely accessed by contractors and vendors. The pre-bid meeting was attended by contractors from seven different firms, five of which are LBEs. On May 5th, Port staff publicly opened bids from three contractors.

Staff have reviewed the bids and determined that Yerba Buena is the lowest responsive, responsible bidder. Yerba Buena's total price of \$1,162,090 plus the 10 percent contingency is under the budget for work. And the final bid rankings are shown here on this table.

Yerba Buena is headquartered in the Bayview neighborhood. The firm is a certified micro MBE. The president, Miguel Galarza, is here today. Can you give a little wave? And he's a leader, I'm proud to say, in the LBE community and a member of the LBE advisory committee.

They have extensive experience working in the City of San Francisco and on projects with similar scopes of work. Some of their recent projects in San Francisco include concrete seawall on Parcel E-2 Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, repair and alteration of Crissy Field promenade and rehabilitate east Black Point landscape.

I'm glad to see other city agencies have lengthy names of projects just like us. [laughter] The LBE goal for this contract was 20 percent which was met as shown in this table. Yerba Buena's team includes 98 percent participation by

LBEs when you include them as the prime.

Yerba Buena's bid of \$1,162,090 plus an authorized 10 percent contingency is within the budget for this project. And the funding is through Port capital. If you approve this authorization to award today, we anticipate notice to proceed construction in August and would be on track to have substantial completion in December of this year.

In conclusion, we respectfully request that you authorize the award of this contract to the lowest responsible and responsive bidder, Yerba Buena Engineering and Construction. Myself and Miguel Galarza from Yerba Buena are here to answer any questions you may have. Thank you for your time.

ACTION: Vice President Brandon moved approval of the resolution.
Commissioner Gilman seconded the motion.

No Public Comment on Item 12A.

Commissioners' Discussion on Item 12A:

Commissioner Gilman: Erica, thank you for the report. Miguel, congratulations to you. I support the item and have no questions.

President Adams: Commissioner Burton?

Commissioner Burton: No questions.

President Adams: Vice President Brandon?

Vice President Brandon: No questions. [laughter]

President Adams: President --

Vice President Brandon: Thank you for the report, Erica.

Erica Petersen: Thank you.

President Adams: President Adams, no questions. We have a motion and a second. All in favor, say aye.

Resolution 22-27 passes unanimously.

13. NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Brandon: The only one I recommended is that you come back in July with the results of the working group for the future activation of Ferry Plaza.

ACTION: Vice President Brandon moved to reconvene in Closed Session. Commissioner Gilman seconded the motion. All commissioners were in favor.

The Commission met in closed session at 4:30 p.m.

**See above for Closed Session items.*

ACTION: Vice President Brandon moved to reconvene in Open Session without disclosing discussions in closed session. Commissioner Gilman seconded the motion. All commissioners were in favor.

The Commission reconvened in Open Session at 5:00 p.m.

14. ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Commissioner Gilman moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Burton seconded the motion. All commissioners were in favor.

President Adams: Meeting is adjourned 5:00 p.m.