



**Meeting of the Port Northern Advisory Committee (NAC)
January 18, 2023 (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
Flicka McGurrin, Pier 23 Café
Bob Iwersen, Gateway Apartments
Ted Choi, City Kayak, Pier 40
Stan Hayes, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Bob Harrer, Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association
Bruno Kanter, North Beach Neighbors
Mahesh Katwani, Alternate for Ritika Puri
Carol Parlette, Golden Gateway Commons Resident
Ritika Puri, Watermark Homeowners Association
Vivian Perez, Metro Events
Shani Krevsky, Exploratorium
Stewart Morton, San Francisco Heritage
Marc Dragun, President, Brannan Homeowners Association
Alec Bash, Alternate for Bob Iwersen

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
Sandra Oberle, Real Estate and Development, NAC Coordinator
Luiz Barata, Waterfront Resilience Program
Rebecca Benassini, Real Estate and Development
Kim Beal, Real Estate and Development
Amy Cohen, Real Estate and Development
Ricky Tijani, Real Estate and Development
Wyatt Donnelly-Landolt, Real Estate and Development

Presenters

Luiz Barata, Port of San Francisco
Clarke Miller, Strada
Jesse Blout, Strada
Andrew Byrne, Grimshaw Architects

Audience

Gregory Chiampou
Richard Harrington
Jacques Benghiat
Diana Drue
Alice Rogers, SBRMBNA
Laura Waxmann
Earl Gee, Portside
Pat Ash
Thomas Weber, Portside
Bhaskar Himatsingka
Leon Zektser
Linda & Bill
Suni Petersen, San Francisco Research Institute, LLC
John Lauppe, Resident of The Brannan
Carol Mitchell
Xiaofan Yin
Bob Harrer
Jean Allan
Rich Hoppe
Penny Wells, SF Bay Water Trail
Sandy Drew, The Brannan
Ellen Johnck, Ellen Joslin Johnck, RPA
Pacific Waterfront Partners
Jehana Jalil, Portside Condominiums
Megan Saunders, HRA
Steven Hao
Judy Dundas
Erin H.
Hoang Nguyen, Grimshaw
Linda Moriarty
MaryLou Heslet
Kelly Moran
Mark MacDonald
Michelle Browner
Jean Dowdall, Brannan
Michael Mazzaferro, Retired
Jen San Juse
Srijhari Sureddi
Simon Snellgrove
Carli Kim
Paulina Ponce de Leon
Amit Kapoor

1. Announcements and Introductions (5:30 - 5:45 pm)

- Next NAC meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 15, 2023.
- Roll call for committee members.

2. Approval of Draft Meeting Notes: NAC November 16, 2022 meeting (5:45 - 5:50pm)

- Meeting notes were approved by Katy Liddell and Jane Connors.

3. Waterfront Resilience: Presentation on Adaptation Strategies for The Embarcadero waterfront. The Port of San Francisco, in partnership with other City agencies and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, has developed seven Draft Waterfront Adaptation Strategies based on over five years of public engagement. Adaptation Strategies are different ways for the City to create a resilient, sustainable, and equitable waterfront for the next 100 years. – Port Waterfront Resilience Team (5:45 - 6:30pm)

Q&A

- Carol Parlette – With 3.5ft sea level rise projection, how high would The Embarcadero need to be built?
 - Luiz Barata – This will depend on the strategy we select. Once you build defense along the shoreline you need to consider grade change. The closer the line of defense is built to The Embarcadero, the more impacts there will be to the roadway. Some strategies propose more bay fill to push the line of defense toward the bay. Different strategies will affect Embarcadero differently with different degrees of raising and/or narrowing the roadway.
 - David Beaupre – Generally the higher you elevate, the wider the roadway can remain. It's possible to elevate lanes higher than the promenade as long as we think about the transitions from other roads that feed into The Embarcadero.
- Alec Bash – BCDC and Save the Bay will have a lot of interest in this. They will be looking at the whole bay where some areas will be flooded and enlarged, as well as areas where bay fill may be added for protection. Do you think there is a possibility BCDC will look at the overall bay size and take these changes into account, e.g. could new larger inundated areas be mitigation for fill in other areas of the Bay?
 - Luiz Barata – BCDC is trying to understand what each city is doing and what impact that will have overall, as well as regional costs. The Port's resilience team is communicating with BCDC staff, and we will have more direct engagement with them as part of our ongoing stakeholder outreach. BCDC seems to understand the value of fill in certain locations, especially with potential nature-based solutions.
- Shani Krevski – If you choose to raise the bulkhead and move it bayward, are there different strategies for the finger piers?
 - Luiz Barata – We are looking at different ways to adapt buildings, e.g. where it may be best to transition between piers and The Embarcadero. One of the more complex issues is that each pier is at a different state of repair, so cost implications and solutions will likely need to be different for each structure.

Chat

- Gregory Chiampou - I thought city and state supported/preferred 7 feet rise preparation and 3.5 feet was federal emphasis? Here today I heard city/state was behind 3.5 feet prep. So who is pushing for 7 foot prep?
 - Luiz Barata – The city and state are aligned indicating a higher end sea level rise projection of 7ft. One of the adaptation issues is timing – what we build to address sea level rise by 2090 must provide protection 50 years after that. One approach on The Embarcadero may be to build maximum protection to 7ft all at once to minimize disruptions over the long term.

- David Beaupre – Another option is for Port to initially build 3.5 feet of protection, but with the ability to adapt to 7ft or higher in the future.
- Alec Bash, NAC Alt. -Gateway Tenants Assoc. - How feasible is it to elevate the Ferry Building? Are there comparable examples?
 - Luiz Barata – This would be very expensive and complex. It would likely require building a temporary seawall to work on the substructure and foundations.
- Bob Harrer NAC & BCNA - In strategy G what is driving the narrowing of The Embarcadero road and promenade? How narrow would they potentially be?
 - Luiz Barata – The existing seawall is driving the location, it may require a forward design, but will definitely impact the northbound lanes. The main issue is the transit system in the middle of the roadway, so in some alternatives we are trying to preserve this space to reduce costs for changes to the rail system.
- Gregory Chiam pou - can interactive 3-D models (like Google Earth's maps) of these strategies be made available to public?
 - Luiz Barata – We can look at ways to do this, for now we are working with GIS which is not easily accessible for the public but we will keep looking at creative ways to communicate concepts.
- Jean Allan - On some of the earlier options alphabetically, there appears to be some protection of Aquatic Park beyond Hyde Street Pier. On later iterations, there is nothing indicated in that area. What is the interplay between what the Port is doing, the NPS, and the City. My concern is that these options are too Embarcadero-centric and don't take into account how some of the more intense
 - Luiz Barata – The area for this project ends at Aquatic park but we are working with other departments to understand plans for other areas. This will require coordination with federal and state agencies to make sure we have a shared understanding.
 - David Beaupre – We focused in this presentation to NAC on The Embarcadero but we are looking at areas outside of this as well.
- Ellen Johnck - When you refer to the Wharf Zone, are you speaking specifically about the Bulkhead Wharf structures as listed in Embarcadero Historic District? Please define Wharf Zone. Also how do the Early Projects fit into Strategies A-G? From Ellen Johnck, environmental and cultural resources consultant and cochair of the Port's MCAC
 - Luiz Barata – The wharf zone includes bulkheads as well as other piers and structures closer to the existing seawall that will need to be elevated. We are working on understanding how these early projects are informing the approach to long term sea level rise.
- Marc Dragun - What is the estimated sea level rise over the next 20, 40 and 60 years? Marc
 - Luiz Barata – We have a set of different projections, all of which depend on carbon emission futures. Generally, we are trying to address more severe scenarios and have an adaptable plan to handle changing conditions over time.

4. Piers 30/32 Redevelopment: Presentation on the revised concept for Seawall Lot 330 as part of the overall Piers 30/32 redevelopment project – Strada TCC (6:30 - 7:30 pm)

Q&A

- Marc Dragun – Thanks to Strada, you have taken into account many of the concerns expressed by the community. I’m still opposed to anything exceeding the 105ft height limit, and any increase in this height limit should need a public vote according to Prop B. The state density bonus should not override Prop B, and we are hoping the City Attorney will find the city is still protected by Prop B. That said, the redesign is good. Moving the tower closer to the bridge is a good design choice and helps protect smaller building elements in the neighborhood. This keeps in scale with the low-rise nature of south beach and improves view lines. Another advantage of a single tower is that if more money can be found to subsidize this project it should be easier to redesign and lower the height of the tower. Encourage the City and Port to keep looking for additional ways to subsidize the project and achieve a smaller tower. Port has attempted to fund the rehab of the piers by intense development, but if more funds can be found a tall tower will no longer be necessary.
 - Clarke Miller – Thanks for that feedback. As far as additional money, we will reduce floors if additional funds are found to offset the cost for resiliency on the pier side. As far as the state density bonus, we have not received an opinion from the City Attorney, but a recent case from San Diego (2662 Garnet Avenue) is encouraging. It involved a project proposing to exceed a voter initiative height limit zone. The developer asked for a technical assistance letter from the state to interpret which found that a state density bonus law should prevail over a voter initiative limiting heights. Many other projects in the City are taking advantage of this density bonus and we are feeling positive about our chances.
- Ritika Puri – Thank you to Strada for the partnership and many compliments for the new design. It looks much better than previous versions.
- Alec Bash – I’m also happy about the new design, especially thinking about the experience of walking along ground-level nearby. If the height of the tower were spread out across the whole site it would not have been as good of a plan. For downtown revitalization, the state and others are saying there is a drastic need for additional housing units in the city.
- Bruno Kanter – This is a vast improvement over version one. Still, the corner on the east side meeting The Embarcadero is rather strong, especially with the small scale residential buildings. This corner could be stepped back or shaved off in some way. Can you talk about the retail envisioned along The Embarcadero? I’m trying to get a sense of the anticipated activity.
 - Andrew Byrne – We have avoided saturating ground level with retail and are attempting to activate the full perimeter of the site while considering the market hall activation across the street at the piers. We are aiming for the piers to be a large regional draw, and a pedestrianized paseo on the seawall lot felt like a strong complement. Some stoop style ground level apartments could be a good concept, and we are still developing the final ground level design.
- Ted Choi – Thanks to the team for improving the design. I particularly like the retail spaces that improve the foot traffic experience. In this area there are not many blocks with small ground level shops, and this could be very interesting. I’m not so concerned about the height limit, and appreciate the focus on reducing the impact of the tower to neighboring properties as you have done instead of sticking with a thicker, shorter tower.

Chat

- Linda Moriarty - In the future would you provide renderings of the seawall lot proposed building from another point of view, namely a view from both the bay toward Brannan Street and also looking from 219 Brannan to the bay bridge from approximately an elevation of somewhere below the top of the Brannan to give a realistic and understandable view.
 - Clarke – We would be happy to develop those images and we are working with different HOAs to address other specific image requests.
- Katy Liddell, NAC Co-Chair - Is parking 1/1?
 - Clarke Miller – there will be one spot for every 4 units, with additional parking for the retail and pierside development (there will be no parking on the piers).
- Bhaskar Himatsingka - Why not push the single tower to the south - seems like it impact everyone in adjacent developments the least? Also how many feet is the tower offset from Bryant?
 - Andrew Byrne – I think the tower is about 75 to 80ft back from Bryant, a significant distance. As far as pushing tower to south, we tried different arrangements to see how views were obscured and found that moving to the south would further impact the watermark and other surrounding buildings.
 - Clarke Miller – Orienting the tower towards the north also allows for design with a natural progression stepping down toward the water.
- Shani Krevsky - NAC (Exploratorium) - Can you remind me if this is all market rate housing?
 - Clarke Miller – we are maintaining 25% affordable rate, the 85ft building will be 100% affordable, and there will be inclusionary affordable units throughout the entire market rate project. The 100% affordable building allows for impact fee funding and low-income tax credits which makes the financing more affordable overall.
- Mahesh Khatwani - I think this is a much better plan than we have seen in the past. Looking forward to a presentation at Watermark.
- Judy Dundas - Are you confident about getting approval for the density bonus to exceed Prop B height limit?
 - Clarke Miller – we are feeling confident about this given recent precedent.
- Jacques Benghiat - the increase in height cannot increase more than is necessary to accommodate the density bonus, and prop B on port property raises other serious issues. The State density bonus law may prevail on non public trust property.
- Jean Allan - How many stories would be lopped off if 105' was the height limit on the tower?
 - Andrew Byrne | Grimshaw Architects - The tower as proposed here is 23 stories. A reduction in height to 105' would limit the tower to 10 stories, so a reduction of 13 floors.
- Shani Krevsky - NAC (Exploratorium) - I also want to commend the team on bringing in a more pedestrian friendly/vibrant streetscape with this scheme.