

**Meeting of the Port Southern Advisory
Committee (SAC)
February 22, 2023 (6:00 – 8:00 pm)
Virtual Public Meeting via Zoom**

Meeting Notes

Accepted by SAC on 3/29/23

SAC Members in attendance:

Edward Hatter, Chair
Howard Wong
Chris Wasney
Chris Christensen
Katherine Doumani
Karen Pierce

SAC Members Absent:

Toby Levine
Roscoe Mapps
Mike Bishop
Kevin Lawson
Shirley Moore

Port and City staff in attendance:

Planning & Environment Division: David Beaupre, Jai Jackson, Ryan Wassum, Ming Young

Real Estate & Development Division: Kim Beal, Christine Maher

Maritime: Dominic Moreno

Others in attendance:

Patrick Bayer
Joel Bean
Jamie Choy
Sonia Taneja
Corey Mann (BCDC)
Laura Waxmann
Ted Choi
Sharon Prager
Samantha Beckerman
Itzel Monzon

Bettina Cohen
Rudie
Tina Chang
Covallm
Andrew DeWitt
Y. Jewett
Jessica Doremus
Ellen Johnck
Patrick Bayer
Penny Wells

AGENDA

1. Introductions and Announcements (6:00 – 6:10)

- **Administrative/Housekeeping** – Edward reminded attendees that members would be called on first for questions then general audience members.
- **In-person meetings** – In response to a request that the SAC get back to in person meetings, question was asked if SAC members and general public were comfortable in doing so. SAC is not a legislative body and therefore not subject to the Brown Act. SAC members are in favor of moving to hybrid meetings to maximize participation and it's believed the Southeast Community Center has a room that will work. Port staff to confirm.
- **Communications** - Port staff is trying to determine the best way to contact SAC members. SAC member suggestions included a calendar invite that would automatically post to members' calendars, having a more meaningful subject header for emails, and adding "response requested by" with a date in the subject line for time sensitive items such as letters of support.
- **SAC Meeting Schedule** – It was asked if meetings should be changed to every other month (6 meetings per year as opposed to 12). Meetings will remain monthly and be canceled if there aren't sufficient items to discuss. Shorter virtual meetings can also be considered if there is only one item on an agenda.

2. Acceptance of Draft 12/7/22 Meeting Notes (6:10 – 6:15) – Meeting notes were accepted

3. BCDC Seaport Plan Amendment in Alignment with Piers 80-96 Eco-Industrial Strategy - David Beaupre, Director of Port Planning & Environment, Cory Mann, BCDC - (6:15 - 6:45) -

Cory Mann, Coastal Scientist with the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) provided an update on BCDC's efforts to update the Bay Area Seaport Plan ("Seaport Plan"). The Seaport Plan is part of the San Francisco Bay Plan used to coordinate the planning and development of port terminals across all five bay area seaports to minimize Bay fill.

With the Seaport Plan:

- Certain areas are designated as Port Priority Use Areas (PPUAs) and are reserved for port related uses and other uses that will not impede development of the sites for port purposes.
- Each of the five Bay Area ports have requested changes to the PPUAs to reflect where port activity has shifted since the last Seaport Plan update.
- A draft will be circulated this spring.
- A public Seaport Planning Advisory Committee (SPAC) meeting will be held to review the draft plan followed by a BCDC Commission hearing and then a second Commission meeting vote to adopt the final plan.
- New plan will focus on policies and process that apply to the PPUAs, simplifying and combining policy sections, removing cargo specific policies, adding new topic areas including policies on sea level rise, environmental justice, and social equity.
- Goal is to have new plan finalized by this summer.
- BCDC has asked each of the ports to undertake outreach to stakeholders about the map changes.

If there are additional questions or if people wish to be notified about upcoming meetings, Cory's email address is cory.mann@bcdc.ca.gov.

To illustrate the changes the Port of San Francisco is requesting to the Seaport Plan, David Beaupre, Deputy Director of Planning and Environment presented a map of the four facilities that will be affected by the amendments: Pier 48 and 50, the ship repair yard at Pier 70, Pier 80 and Piers 90-96.

Proposed Amendments to the Seaport Plan

- **Pier 48/50** - Removes Pier 48 and some of the western portions of Pier 50 that are not suitable for cargo because of the water depths but leaves those portions still able to accommodate maritime commerce.
- **Pier 70** - Removes areas not associated with ship repair or the future of the ship repair facility and removes a triangle area that was removed from the public trust which will allow flexibility.
- **Pier 80** - There are no changes proposed to Pier 80 as it's used for cargo today will be used by maritime in the future.
- **Piers 90-96** - The Pier 94 wetlands will be pulled out as it's not anticipated to be needed or used for cargo. Martin Marietta, Hanson Aggregate and Central Concrete's current uses are maritime dependent so the areas where they are operating today will be put back in. The area on the south side of Amador Street will be integrated into the larger backlands area and will be coming out.

David presented a map showing current uses at Pier 80 – 96 (maritime and long-term leases, short term leases, open space and natural habitat and the Blue Greenway). He then shared a map showing the eco-industrial strategy zones following the changes to illustrate how the Port of San Francisco has rationalize its seaport designations.

Questions/Comments and Responses:

Most people would think the different ports are competitors. What's the impetus for regional planning of the seaports?

- BCDC is a regional agency, but not a Port authority. The context when the original Seaport Plan came out in the 90s was quite different. Idea was they would develop a cargo forecast and allocate cargo across the five ports in order to minimize bay fill. This proved challenging. The previous plan was difficult to enforce. Trying to step back to allow flexibility in the Seaport Plan recognizing ports have different priorities and goals and objectives. Moving away from capital projects focused and moving towards policies and standards in place to be responsive to different needs ports have.
- The Port of San Francisco doesn't really compete with other bay ports. Bay Area ports all have their niche. Oakland is primarily container, Richmond is a big roll on/roll off automobile; Redwood City does bulk primarily aggregate, but doesn't have water depths of San Francisco so they have some limitations. Benicia also does autos. We work closely to complement the other ports in the Bay Area so we aren't competing, but filling the needs of the Bay Area.
- The original Seaport Plan was a collaborative effort between BCDC and MTC, but MTC's focus has shifted to Plan Bay Area. Current updated Seaport Plan will therefore be a bit more limited in scope and more focused on the question about bay fill. They are looking to see how to sync up BCDC's Seaport Plan scope with Plan Bay Area to update on the same planning cycle as MTC to leverage outreach and coordination.

You talked about BCDC focusing more on policy and stated policies will include environmental justice and social equity. How will BCDC incorporate this in its overall plan?

- BCDC is still working on drafting policies, but there are certain actions an applicant may take along the shoreline triggering BCDC to issue a permit or make an amendment to the Bay Plan. New policy will have guidance for outreach and engagement as part of the process.

With any new policy for the Seaport Plan, are you planning on having special hearings before going to the Commission?

- Three public meetings associated with the Seaport update are still required. Next one will be a meeting of the SPAC to review draft Seaport Plan and provide feedback on the findings and policies. The date is not known at this time but believe it will be sometime in April. After feedback, BCDC will review and make changes to the plan, then a public hearing late spring or summer for the commissioners to have an opportunity to do the same thing, then a final vote.

4. Pier 70 and Parcel A Design Update - Samantha Beckerman, Brookfield, Sonia Taneja, King Street Properties, and Patrick Bayer, Perkins & Will - (6:45 - 7:15)

Sam Beckerman with Brookfield Properties began the presentation by providing the following status:

- The project is currently in Phase 1
- All streets are public right of ways and will be accepted by the City or the Port.
- All utilities, final street paving and specialty pavers, sidewalks, street trees, planters, street benches, bike racks streetlights and trash cans have been installed.
- Notice of Completion from the City was received for all streets and infrastructure for Phase 1 in November 2022.
- A Temporary Certificate of Occupancy for Building 12 was received in January of 2022 and will provide approximately 50,000 gross square feet of manufacturing production distribution and repair (PDR) space.
- Given the current market, Brookfield is working with Port on timing of the vertical buildings of Phase 1.

Parcel A Update

Sonia Taneja with King Street Properties announced that King Street will be managing the development of Parcel A on behalf of Brookfield, working with Perkins & Will Architects to design a best-in-class life science building.

Patrick Bayer, lead designer with Perkins & Will for the Parcel A project, talked about the inspiration and design process for Parcel A noting:

- A goal is to stay true to the character of the neighborhood and the history of Pier 70.
- The architecture of the neighboring industrial warehouses and maritime facilities was taken into consideration along with how the building would relate to Building 113.
- The base of building was inspired by adjacent warehouses and the higher elevations by ships.
- The design concept divides the building into thirds. The base of building relates to the pedestrian scale and is about active uses and pedestrian uses. The building above it is divided into areas that create planted roof terraces with views of the skyline. This respects historic view corridors, creates terraces and planted

roof top balconies on every level, creates a building that's less insular and helps reduce the perceived height.

- The ground floor plan will include retail suites that can be subdivided into smaller suites to market to local businesses.

Patrick then shared renderings of the building from various vantage points.

Questions/Comments and Responses:

Like the lower scale. Should have individual entrances into the gyms, retail or cafe so there's more points of entry and activation from the sidewalk to the spaces.

- Tried to promote transparency and connectivity from indoor to outdoor and grappling with sea level rise. Lowered 20th Street lobby and retail space so they meet grade and flood proofed them. Tried to create as many openings as possible.

Appreciate activated ground floor. Doesn't find the change in height from Building 113 to this building troubling. Feels planning of the building is sound. Perceived weight of metal elements – landing on a header that looks like a molding. How are you going to protect street furnishings, finish pavement, sidewalks, trees, pavers from the heavy equipment?

- Sam responded that Brookfield is contemplating some removal and replacement or relocating once construction is complete. They have agreements working with King Street and it will be true with all vertical developers. The VCA (vertical coordination agreement) details how street and furnishings are protected during construction and will be in place prior to the start of construction.

Ground floor unifiable with the continuous cornice line seems like there's one attempt to decompose the massing above and then an attempt to unify the massing below, wondering if best to indent the horizontal cornice where the entry is so there's a sense of separate building, instead of straight line, the cornice could have texture, similar to the adjacent building and provide a distinguished identity.

- Fascinating perspective would love to modify this and test the idea.

Wondering about fitness center concept. How does it relate to the YMCA?

- Due to safety concerns, the fitness center is contemplated to be a building amenity for tenants.

A Brookfield subsidiary defaulted in Los Angeles on two large buildings. Financially, how will this impact Pier 70?

- The reference is to Stonestown, another Brookfield project that's under entitlements. Brookfield is very much committed to San Francisco and Pier 70. The market is tough, but we are moving ahead and very excited about Parcel A and with getting streets accepted and moving forward with the other vertical parcels as well.

Impressed by beautiful pavers in the project. How will black top you see after you get out of Building 113 on the Piazza integrate with the pavers?

- The area is Orton's and not Pier 70 so this would be a question for Chris Gallet.

Comment made that the buildings at Pier 70 that everyone loves is contextual architecture. The building might be better if it's only doing one thing. What we love about the buildings is one thing or another not multiple things in terms of the envelope and massing.

- Appreciate the feedback and very good incite. This is how we make good places, with dialogue, and we welcome that.

What is the size of the building in terms of square footage and how much space is reserved for the life sciences tenant?

- The building is 6 stories and just over 300,000 rentable square feet and the vast majority of that, aside from the retail suites on the base level, are for life science.

To what level of sea level rise is being planned for?

- The conservative 100 year flood estimate.

Are the retail spaces locked in yet?

- The spaces in terms of location are locked in and can be divided into smaller spaces if that's what meets the market. The spaces will be leased to third parties.

Has this gone to the Historic Preservation Commission?

- This does not need to go to the Historic Preservation Commission due to the D4D which did go to the Preservation Commission.

Is there a way to incorporate some sort of cooling amenities around the buildings? This neighborhood and the next one south is the hottest in the city, with older houses with no AC. No answer needed. Hope that they consider where and how to put in more tree canopies or something to provide relief from heat.

- We appreciate the comment.

5. Mission Bay Parks Management Transfer back to Port and RPD – David Beaupre, Director of Port Planning & Environment (7:15 – 7:45)

David started his presentation by saying the Mission Bay Parks will be returning to the jurisdiction of the Port, which owns some of the underlying land, and the City, earlier than anticipated.

As background:

- Mission Bay parks are comprised of 41 acres of open space developed through the original redevelopment plan.
- The way the parks would be built, maintained and managed is outlined in a multi-agency agreement called the Owner Participation Agreement (OPA).
- Currently the parks are leased through a ground lease from the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII), the successor to the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, and OCII is responsible for maintaining the parks.
- The State Department of Finance mandated the Redevelopment Agency dissolve and develop a plan on how it would divest itself from the redevelopment.
- OCII entered a contract for the management and maintenance of the parks with Parks and Open Space Management (POSM) which will expire in June.
- There is minimal availability of private entities to maintain parks which puts City and Port at risk.
- Port and Rec and Park Department (RPD) are ready to take over the parks July 1, 2023 and have been working with OCII on how to divide parks and the existing resources that OCII has used to maintain the parks, and how to distribute funds for maintenance from the CFD to Port and RPD.

David shared a map showing the ownership of parks in Mission Bay (City vs Port) and mentioned some parks are split jurisdiction.

Looking at how the parks operate and function as an open space system and ownership, access, Blue Greenway system and operation efficiencies, Port will manage and maintain, 1) the boat launch parking lot; 2) P22 across from Chase Center that's under construction; 3) P23 and P24; 4) P18 and P19. A Memorandum of Understanding between Port and RPD will allow RPD to manage parks with split jurisdiction.

The Board of Supervisors will need to approve the disbursement of the responsibility and the funding that for maintenance. OCII will stay involved, distributing the CFD funding.

David indicated budget was approved by the Port Commission in February which includes adding four new positions. He will return to the Commission in May to get

approval for taking over the parks. This approval will be through the end of the year. Staff will then have to go to Board to get approval on interagency MOU

Questions/Comments and Responses:

Seems it would be easier to have one entity to manage all parks and open space. Seems like there should be a way to combine departments into one single uniform manage entity.

- These will be treated like we manage other parks around the city where Port has jurisdiction on waterfront parks and RPD has jurisdiction on the other parts. Have discussed ways to collaborate in the past. Believe there are opportunities. Believe the way we've divided them up will work. Will continue to work with RPD to make certain we are managing in the most effective way we can.

There's no enforcement at Crane Cove Park of the rules regarding dogs. What is the Port's capacity to manage additional parks if the parks Port currently has are not being managed in terms of enforcement, leading to a lot of community conflict?

- Bringing on more parks in Mission Bay gives Port the ability to scale resources. There will be some efficiencies by adding these parks. We are staffing up. Also recently brought on a new security company that is not living up to our expectations to address some of the concerns raised. Talking with RPD about potentially using some of their rangers to help with some of the enforcement. Hoping some of the efficiencies with managing more open space will address some of the issues we're having with Crane Cove Park today.

That's wonderful to hear and obviously an answer and solution. Hard for anyone trying to help folks as there is no signage about use of Crane Cove about dogs and locations, so when you do staff up, they can point to signage.

- We are working on new signage actively for the park. Should see it rolling out this spring and hopefully we'll get better security out there.

Rec and Park has been poor on maintenance of parks in Bayview and Hunters Point. Happy Port is taking over and getting the jurisdiction correct.

Because of the time, Edward Hatter suggested the topic be reviewed again at the next meeting to allow for additional questions.

Meeting adjourned at 8:02 pm