



# **SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION**

**JULY 11, 2023  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

**MEMBERS, PORT COMMISSION**

**HON. KIMBERLY BRANDON, PRESIDENT  
HON. WILLIE ADAMS, VICE PRESIDENT  
HON. GAIL GILMAN, COMMISSIONER  
HON. ED HARRINGTON, COMMISSIONER  
HON. STEVEN LEE, COMMISSIONER**

**ELAINE FORBES, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
JENICA LIU, COMMISSION AFFAIRS MANAGER**

# CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING JULY 11, 2023

### 1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / RAMAYTUSH OHLONE LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Port Commission President Kimberly Brandon called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. The following Commissioners were present: Kimberly Brandon, Gail Gilman, Ed Harrington, and Steven Lee. Vice President Willie Adams was absent.

The Commission Affairs Manager read the Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgment.

### 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – June 13, 2023

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

### 3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON EXECUTIVE SESSION

No Public Comment on Executive Session.

### 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.

#### (1) PUBLIC EMPLOYEE APPOINTMENT/HIRING

Title/Description of position to be filled: Chief Financial Officer.  
Discussion and possible action pursuant to California Government Code Section 54957(b) and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.10(d).

Present: President Kimberly Brandon  
Commissioner Gail Gilman  
Commissioner Ed Harrington  
Commissioner Steven Lee

Also present: Elaine Forbes, Port Director  
Jenica Liu, Commission Affairs Manager  
Carmel Dula, Executive Secretary

Suzette Love, Port Director of Human Resources  
Michelle Sexton, General Counsel

(2) CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL REGARDING ANTICIPATED LITIGATION MATTER (Discussion and Possible Action)

Discuss anticipated litigation matter pursuant to California Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(4) and San Francisco

Administrative Code Section 67.10(d)(2) (Discussion and possible action):

\_\_\_ As Defendant X As Plaintiff

Discussion of anticipated litigation by and among the Port, Chevron Environmental Management Company, BP Remediation Management, and Union Pacific Railroad related to contaminated sediments in the vicinity of the Mission Bay Ferry Landing site and Pier 64 and possible action approving an extension of an existing tolling agreement.

Present: President Kimberly Brandon  
Commissioner Gail Gilman  
Commissioner Ed Harrington  
Commissioner Steven Lee

Also present: Elaine Forbes, Port Director  
Jenica Liu, Commission Affairs Manager  
Carmel Dula, Executive Secretary  
Michelle Sexton, General Counsel  
Molly Alarcon, Deputy City Attorney  
Julie Wilensky, Deputy City Attorney

**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.

REPORT: Commissioner Gilman reported that the Commission approved the appointment of Nate Cruz to CFO, Chief Financial Officer for the Port of the City and County of San Francisco.

- 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 to reconvene in open session without disclosing further closed session discussions. Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**6. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**7. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- 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, 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**

Public comment is permitted on any matter within Port jurisdiction that is not an agenda item. No Port Commission action can be taken on any matter raised other than to schedule the matter for a future agenda, refer the matter to staff for investigation or respond briefly to statements made or questions posed by members of the public. (Government Code Section 54954.2(a))

No Public Comment on Items Not Listed on the Agenda.

**9. EXECUTIVE**

**A. Executive Director's Report**

- **Economic Recovery**
- **Equity**
- **Key Project Updates**

Director Forbes: Good afternoon, President Brandon, members of the commission, members of the public and Port staff, I am Elaine Forbes, the executive director of the Port. First, I want to acknowledge a very historic anniversary we're having on Thursday.

The Ferry Building is turning 125 years old. There will be a celebration for the public that opens at 11:00 a.m. And the first 500 in line will get free ice cream sundaes from Humphry Slocombe. The Gemstone Band will perform on the back plaza.

And for our young people under 17, you can ride the ferries all day for free. At 12:30, Mayor Breed will lead a ceremony. And we will produce a time capsule of mementos, well wishes and other important items that will be stored in the clock tower until 2048 when the building will be 150. And that time capsule will be opened and enjoyed.

Later in the afternoon from 4:00 to 6:00, Fort Point Beer Company will host a happy hour in their beer garden with \$5 pints. That will not be available to the free 17-and-under ferry riders. But there will be fun for all. So please come if you are able to join.

I'm excited to start with good news on our key three strategy areas of economic recovery, growth, equity and resilience. Last Thursday, the California State Transportation Agency, or CalSTA, awarded us \$21 million to modernize our maritime terminals in the southern waterfront at Pier 80 to reduce emissions in the Bayview community.

The state made a major contribution of \$1.2 billion for the supply chain, a huge investment in California ports. This \$21 million award will advance three key projects at Pier 80: to accommodate larger ocean-going vessels with higher cargo volumes; to support the rebuilding of Amador Street -- and this is a major vehicle artery to our Port maritime eco-industrial areas; and to study the development of a 100-vehicle electric truck fleet at Pier 96 to reduce carbon emissions.

We hope our ultimate goal is to have -- build a battery or a hydrogen fueling station that will move us much closer to the city's zero-emission goals. Notably, this is the first time ever, ever that we have received supply-chain money from the state government.

I am very, very pleased. We believe that all our efforts really have put us in the game and recognized as part of the supply chain in that ecosystem of the supply chain. I really want to thank our commissioners, also the work of the California Association of Port Authorities, who have seen our value and our delegation at the state that has made this happen with a sincere thanks to Assemblymember Phil Ting, who is on that budget committee.

Because of these external funds, we have now an ability to put ourselves in a much stronger position for offshore wind operations including fabrication opportunities. Simply put, this really provides a roadmap for us to build a greener and cleaner southern waterfront of our future, providing good jobs and resources for an underserved community. We're very grateful.

Senator Toks Omishakin is the leader of CalSTA. And they are presenting a value-based criteria in which to do these awards: safety, climate action, equity and economic prosperity. While the words are different, we can immediately see

how the state's desires through CalSTA align with our goals: economic recovery and growth, equity and resilience. Congratulations to everyone who made this happen.

We're looking forward to seeing the ribbon cutting for these projects. More on economic recovery and growth -- first to cruise -- despite late week's Ruby Princess unexpected stay in San Francisco and her happy return to seas on Sunday, I'm very happy to report that, for this fiscal year, we have had the highest ever cruise calls in passengers and passenger numbers.

For cruise calls, we're at 110 calls with 390,967 passengers visiting San Francisco. And this is 100,000 passengers more than our previous record. I'd like to thank our cruise partners at Carnival Corporation, Princess, Metro Cruise, our labor partners at the ILWU, Port staff in the maritime division and maintenance division and other key stakeholders who have made this happen. It is absolutely a record-breaking year for cruise.

For wharf activation, I'm excited to say that we're formally launching the Pier Party at the Wharf. This is an outdoor summer concert series that starts this Friday, July 14th. And it is in partnership with the CBD, the Fisherman's Wharf Community Benefits District and calls on the sole-source award that this commission authorized of \$2 million investment.

This series will bring Bay Area artists to perform live at the wharf at the crab wheel every weekend to help revitalize and beautify the space. You'll all receive invitations to the Friday concert. And this will be where local artist Sam Johnson will play at the first performance. So we hope to see everyone there supporting the activation of our wharf.

Now, I'd like to speak about our credit rating and our budget -- more positive news. Over the last three months, all three bond-rating agencies have affirmed our rating. And two of them have improved us from a stable outlook -- from negative to a stable outlook. So we're A, A and Aa3.

And I'm really thankful to the finance team and all the work we've done with our capital budget to show that we have a plan for our financial future and that we are on good footing. This improvement was based on really our strong revenue recovery as well and our healthy, healthy reserve levels.

So after that pandemic where we spent down so much of our savings, I'm just so relieved that we received the ARPA funding. We were able to get ourselves back in shape. And the credit rating agencies are seeing that.

Last week at your request, the Board of Supervisors approved our supplemental appropriation, roughly \$1 million. This includes resources for the Mission Bay Parks that we are taking on, which will be transferred to us from the Redevelopment Agency, OCII.

Critically, these costs are reimbursed through the taxes that are set up. Also, Mayor Breed is going to join us and our partners at OCII and Rec Park on Thursday, July 20 for a community event that really officially marks our transfer of bay-front parks along Bay and Terry Francois Boulevard into our Port portfolio.

The details are still coming together. But the celebration will include residents and stakeholders and will be held from 5:00 to 6:30 at Mission Creek Park Pavilion located at 290 Channel Street.

Now, I'm turning to resilience. And I'd like to speak about one of our resilience projects. Our proposal at Piers 30/32 received unanimous support from the State Assembly Natural Resources Committee. AB273 passed through that. That's another important step to realizing this vision for Piers 30/32.

The project as proposed would provide \$400 million in investment in resilience, closely matching the entire size of our 2018 Prop A bond for the seawall. The bill was introduced by Senator Wiener. And it was authorized by the State Lands Commission, which allows us to consider a project on Piers 30/32.

Along with other things, we have numerous community amenities proposed here, public walkways, open-water swimming, recreational boating and an Olympic-size pool, retail and dining facilities.

I put this project specifically under resilience because of the proposed \$400 million, which is an incredible investment in addition to these other public amenities.

At the state hearing, I had the opportunity to present. But I was joined by a much better presenter, [Anjel Hudson], who is an avid swimmer in the Boys and Girls Club and talked about the opportunities swimming has provided for his life and his enthusiasm to see both pool swimming and bay-access facility that would be available for other youth.

I look forward to continue to work on this project with the team and Senator Wiener. And just for the benefit of the public, the project proposes office, which is a private use over water as a way to pay for all the other amenities. And that required the state legislature to look at our unusual site and see that that was appropriate for our State Lands.

Back to the resilience program, we will be coming to you next month to talk about the Army Corps study and the adaptation strategy. So this is an opportunity to really hear about all the work that's being produced and where we are landing with the Army Corps of Engineers, so you can guide us further along in this process.

And as always, I want to thank you, commissioners, for your dedication to keeping our waterfront clean, safe and vibrant and for advancing our very bold strategic plan. And that concludes my report. Thank you.

No Public Comment on the Executive Director's Report.

Commissioners' Discussion on the Executive Director's Report:

Commissioner Gilman: Thank you, Director Forbes, for that great report. And congratulations both on the 21 million -- I know there was a -- with the Port of Oakland, who also received an award, I know that there was an announcement. But that is phenomenal. And I really want to thank the government relations team and Boris, who I don't think is joining us today, for his hard work in getting this through.

It's the first time we've received these funds. So congratulations. And I also just also wanted to comment on getting through State Lands on Piers 30/32. I think it's going to be a game changer for our waterfront.

And let's not forget, our lonely seawall, which will also have housing and other amenities built on it and affordable housing, which is also part of this project. So just thank you for your report. And it's exciting to see these things move forward.

President Brandon: Thank you. Commissioner Lee?

Commissioner Lee: No. I mean, great report, Elaine, as usual. And it's good that every month we're always moving forward. So congratulations.

President Brandon: Thank you. Commissioner Harrington?

Commissioner Harrington: Thanks for the report. No comments.

President Brandon: Thank you. Elaine, thank you so much for the report. I want to, again, congratulate Nate on his new role. I really look forward to working with you. We've worked so well over the years. And I think you're perfect for this job. So congratulations.

There are so many congratulations. I mean \$21 million is just phenomenal. The fact that we were able to get an allocation is absolutely wonderful and then to also have our bond rating increase because of the amazing work our finance team is doing and the total team of just managing our affairs across the waterfront.

Congratulations on the 110 cruise calls. I mean, that's the first since I've been here that we've reached 110. And that many passengers coming to the waterfront helping us with our economic recovery is just phenomenal.



So there's just so much to be thankful for and so much to congratulate the entire staff on. I think we're doing an absolutely wonderful job. Thank you so much for acknowledging it, Elaine. Jenica, next item, please.

## 10. CONSENT

- A. **Request approval of a Cooperative Agreement Between the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (“BART”) and the Port of San Francisco for the Repair and Replacement of a Fire Water Line and Fire Hydrant and Delegation of Authority to Enter into Future Agreements to Repair Property for Tenants and Government Agencies. (Resolution 23-32)**
- B. **Request approval of Consent to Sublease (“Sublease”) between Blue and Gold Fleet, L.P. and Worldwide Foods LLC, dba Cousins Maine Lobster (“Subtenant), under a month-to-month term to operate a café area, retail space, and mini food cart all totaling approximately 1,824 square feet located at Pier 41 on the Embarcadero near the foot of Powell Street. (Resolution 23-33)**
- C. **Request authorization to advertise for competitive bids for Construction Contract No. 2788, Hyde Street Harbor Repairs. (Resolution 23-34)**
- D. **Request authorization to advertise for competitive bids for Construction Contract No. 2796, South Beach Marina Repairs. (Resolution 23-35)**

ACTION: Commissioner Gilman moved approval of the consent calendar.  
Commissioner Lee seconded the motion.

No Public Comment on the Consent Calendar.

Resolutions 23-32, 23-33, 23-34 and 23-35 pass unanimously.

## 11. REAL ESTATE & DEVELOPMENT

- A. **Informational Presentation to Consider and Possible Action to Approve the Proposed Fiscal Year 2023-24 Monthly Rental Rate Schedule, Monthly Parking Stall Rates and Special Event Rates (Parameter Rates). (Resolution 23-36)**

Kimberley Beal: Good afternoon, President Brandon, commissioners, Executive Director Forbes. My name is Kimberley Beal. I'm the acting deputy director for real estate and development. And I'm joined today by Don Kavanagh, senior property manager with the Port, and Santino DeRose with Maven Properties to present an informational presentation with possible action on our parameter rent.

In addition to Don, I want to acknowledge and recognize a lot of other Port staff members who helped with this report: Jennifer Gee, Sandra Oberle, Monico Corral, Joyce Chan, Josh Keene, Andre Coleman, Dominic Moreno and Demetri Amaro.

So first, I'd like to provide a little background for these rates and how we set them, looking at our property in relation to the other market and the market performance. I'll then discuss the rates, proposed incentives and clarifications and end with questions and staff's recommendations.

So parameter rates, which include landing fee schedule, harbor rates, land and our water-use rates, reflect current market value and are one of the directives used to manage our properties and the basis of our delegated authority that gives staff the ability to enter into property agreements without competitive bid provided the terms conform to Port's leasing policies.

When we go through this process, it's done with staff and a third-party consultant team. The consultant reviews and analyzes comparable market data to then provide staff with their market findings.

We look at our own leasing activity and review all the existing rates along with the consultants to determine if a rate should increase, remain the same, decrease to then come up with a proposed rental schedule which is attached in the staff report.

The consultant team -- this year, we used Keyser Marston economics along with Maven retail, who is a broker. That is subcontracted through Keyser Marston. Findings are attached to the staff report.

So through our consultants and their market analysis, we learned that, with office space, there is a lot of vacancy, which includes a number of turnkey spaces in all classes.

To stimulate leasing, landlords are offering incentives such as free rent, higher TI allowances, furniture, smaller security deposits as well as parking incentives and also upgrading their buildings to meet the needs of modern businesses, which include adding high-speed Internet and smart building systems.

For industrial properties, tenant demand has remained relatively stable as supply has remained limited with the majority of construction activity focused on life sciences and retail. There's been an increase in vacancy and flex space, which is a combination of office, warehouse and retail space and where the vacancy for logistics space, which is primarily used for distribution and fulfillment centers remains close to its long-term average.

For hospitality, which includes food and beverage, there we see a significant - or the businesses there are significantly impacted due to employers adopting full-remote or hybrid work policies. Although there are no hotels on Port property, we note that the hotel occupancy has increased and is a sign of tourism returning.

So in looking at the Port's performance, our Port directly manages approximately 330,000 square feet of class B and class C office. While there is class A office space on Port property, it's managed by master tenants such as Hudson, Prologis and Orton.

Currently, we have about 17.2 percent vacancy for office, which is higher than the city's rate of 16.8 percent for class B and 15.3 percent for class C office. Vacancy for industrial space, which includes our sheds, many of which have limitations on what you can do with them or in them due to lack of high docks, old electrical distribution systems, weight limitations, etcetera, is about 11.9 percent, which is higher than the overall industrial vacancy for San Francisco, which is about 5 percent, but similar to vacancy for flex space.

We have other property that's either land under a master lease or parking leases. And that has a low vacancy rate of about 6 percent. So with regard to rates, once the rates are set and approved, these are the delegated authority, which allows Port staff to enter into leases with rates not below the approved rates for terms up to five years up to a million dollars and on our boilerplate lease.

The last change to parameter rents was adopted in August of last year, at which time 115 rates listed. Approximately 40 percent of those rates remain the same. Ten percent were decreased, and the balance increased slightly.

For fiscal year '23-'24, we are proposing to keep the majority of the rates the same. This pertains to locations where we might have trouble finding tenants given the current market. Or we may have tenants that are interested, but their use is not compatible with what we have to offer.

There are two locations we are proposing a slight rate increase. And these are locations where we have a low vacancy rate or a high level of interest. This will impact interior space at the Ag Building and shed space at Pier 45, although for Pier 45, the increase does not pertain to fishing-industry uses.

We are also looking at a decrease at Roundhouse 2 where there is a high building vacancy. This is one of our office buildings. And again, given current market, we are looking to decrease the rates at that location.

So in looking at ways to try to entice tenants to come to Port property as well as to retain our existing tenants, we are unable to offer many of the incentives some of our other -- or some of the landlords are offering in the public sector. But we can provide incentives for longer terms.

We are seeing more office tenants take advantage of the ramp-up rate incentive that was adopted for fiscal year '22-'23. And we're proposing to continue this incentive again not only as a way to spur new leasing but also as a way to retain our existing tenants.

Based on the recommendation of the consultant, we would also recommend offering a half-month free rent for leases of three to four years with a ramp-up rate. This leasing tool would then be used where, if you have a three or four-year lease, we would ramp up your rate so that you would pay 70 percent of parameter the first year, 80 percent in the second year, 100 percent in year three.

For a four-year lease, that would be 70, 80, 90, 100 percent. And then, again, we would allow for a half a month free rent on the anniversary then of the lease term. We're still seeing that tenants are apprehensive in entering into long-term agreements.

So we would, as another tool, propose to keep the ability to offer tenants a termination right. So if they enter into a lease of three to four years and things don't go as they had hoped, they can get out by paying a termination fee equal to one month times the number of years remaining on the lease.

This is to account for the discount that they were given in the early years plus any unamortized leasing incentives and Port's administrative costs for processing the termination.

For shed space, with some of the challenges we are seeing in leasing our shed space due to, again, limitations such as lack of high docks, again the challenges with the electrical distribution, etcetera, we are proposing a ramp-up rate incentive for shed space.

The incentive would be similar to the office incentive where we would offer a half month free rent for leases of three years with, again, ramp-up rates of 70, 80 and 100 percent of parameter.

We are also proposing to continue excess rent sharing where, if a tenant is able to sublease and get a rate above market, we would split the excess revenues of not less than 50 percent to the Port. This is something that was piloted in 2021 and, while not a common scenario, it is a tool that would allow us to try to keep tenants in place if they are able to [step] lease even a portion of their space.

With maritime use, we are proposing to continue the maritime triple-threat incentive, which applies to new and existing tenants. With this tool, the use must include three of four of the types -- following types. That would be office, shed, apron and submerged land.

We could then offer a discount on the office rate, which would increase 3 percent per year. If a tenant is able to lease all four locations, we would then not charge for the submerged land, which is tied to use of their apron space.

For a couple of clarifications, this is pertaining to development items for what we're calling dual jurisdiction. So this is in cases where Public Works charges a permit fee for use of sidewalks and open space on city-accepted, port-owned streets to ensure that licensees are not paying Public Works fees on top of Port's standard license fee for the same use.

Port staff proposed to waive proposed -- I'm sorry -- delegated authority be given to allow a reduction in Port's license fee in an amount equal to the Public Works permit fee so, again, that way, tenants are not paying double fees.

Although we have come to an agreement recently with Public Works where they're saying they would not charge a fee and Port would be able to license those uses again, this is a concern. Things might change. People retire.

So since we don't have anything in writing, this is something that we would like to have delegated authority for. There are also some public improvements that Port will own. However, we'll be assigning all of the maintenance and liability to another party as part of development project.

Under the licenses or other real estate agreement covering the maintenance responsibility, the responsibility for taking care of these items will be at no cost. So again, we don't want them to have to pay us to maintain our improvements that are in these public areas.

So I just want to touch briefly on special events. So while we must charge parameter rates, special events are not a key revenue-generating item for the Port. Revenues for fiscal year 2022 were \$125,000 versus \$207,000 in 2019. And last year, it made up about \$73,000.

For fiscal year 2023, we are proposing the continuance of fee waivers for Port-sponsored events and fee reduction of nonprofits and equity-focused events. Fee waivers would be available for diversity, equity and inclusion events up to \$7,000 per event, which can cover the entire cost of the permitting.

We would limit the waiver to \$60,000 per year for all of the events during the year that might apply. And if we hit that \$60,000 max, we would then allow a 50 percent reduction for additional events. This is something that was adopted last year. I just want to mention we did not hit that max. So we're hoping to see more activity with this next fiscal year.

We are also proposing to update the fee schedule to increase the annual budget limits from \$2 million to \$3 million for nonprofit eligibility for a 50 percent fee reduction and proposing to keep discounts for our pop-up RFQ events,

offering them a discount similar to other -- to our nonprofits however adding that concession and ticket fees may apply.

So at this time, I would like to, again, recognize staff that helped put this together and take any questions that you may have and, if we are on a good path, ask that you consider approving this action. Thank you.

ACTION: Commissioner Gilman moved approval of the resolution. Commissioner Harrington seconded the motion.

No Public Comment on Item 11A.

Commissioners' Discussion on Item 11A:

Commissioner Lee: I mean, it's fine, you know, these rates. I'm just curious. Things similar to like restaurants or incoming people that maybe want to have an opportunity -- are we giving any other incentives besides a half-month's free rent?

Or is there going to be a separate category, you know, for people who want to take over say Alioto's and renovate and spend half a million dollars to at least get the restaurant up and running? Those are usually capital improvements.

But are we offering any kind of incentives to get these restaurants or even small kiosks going in some of these smaller spaces to keep the tourists interested and especially when we're getting so many more Port cruise ships coming in, especially in the situation where it got damaged and they had nothing to do for three days?

There should be a lot more of these smaller places around the Port that could be -- maybe attract other entrepreneurs to come in.

Kimberley Beal: Thank you for that question, Commissioner Lee. So if you've noticed, there was not anything mentioned here with regards to retail. That's because retail opportunities do require competitive bid unlike the parameter rents here.

So that is something that would be handled more on a case-by-case basis when we start receiving proposals for those opportunities. And then, two, there was the authority that was granted by the commission and the Board of Supervisors where we can provide certain dollars to businesses to do certain capital improvements. And that would come into play with those retail uses. So we do have some ability there.

Commissioner Lee: So these rates that are listed here do kind of -- are some of the spaces that have restaurants on them and whatnot that you could still work with, right?

Kimberley Beal: So these rates are primarily for our office as well as our shed, industrial, vacant land, berthing, parking, those types of spaces. So again, it's not pertaining to retail uses, which do require that we bid competitively.

Commissioner Lee: But a retail entrepreneur say --

Kimberley Beal: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Lee: -- wants to take over say a space for a parking lot or -- you know, that's on here that's -- it is possible.

Kimberley Beal: For parking, no, that would still require competitive bid.

Commissioner Lee: Right. But if they like that site, can they competitively bid for - - they could, right?

Kimberley Beal: Yes. If we were soliciting offers or bids, yes, they could.

Commissioner Lee: Okay. Yeah. I'm still new at this. So there are so many different things. So I just want to make sure that the small businesses get a chance -- and there's a lot of people that want opportunity. But it scares people.

You know, and I'm just wondering, with these rates, if it's actually helping to attract more people or scaring more people or not getting any offers at all. So --

Kimberley Beal: So again, with what we are proposing, we are hoping that it will actually attract people as well as incentivize our existing tenants to remain because there are -- we are reducing rates for them to enter into agreements of a longer term.

Commissioner Lee: Okay. Great. Okay. Thank you.

Kimberley Beal: You're welcome.

President Brandon: Thank you. I see your hand raised. But I'm sorry. The public comment is closed on this item. Thank you. Commissioner Harrington?

Commissioner Harrington: Thank you very much, Ms. Beal. Obviously, a lot of work went into this. I appreciate all that. I have a couple questions. And if you don't know the answers today, you can just send it to us. Don't worry about it.

I guess the first question is, what percentage or what dollar value of the Port's revenue are covered by these things? As we were talking a minute ago, it doesn't cover retail. Is 30 percent of our revenue covered by this kind of a process? Or can you give us any idea of what that might be? Or again, respond in writing later on.



Kimberley Beal: I would like to be able to respond to that in writing to make certain that I'm providing you with accurate information.

Commissioner Harrington: That's great. The second part of that is I realize, you know, 96 percent of these are staying flat, which is great. Some are going up. Some are going down. But I have no sense of the value of those increases or decreases. Is a quarter here worth \$50? Or is it worth \$500,000? So again, if you could give us some idea on those ones that changed, what the value of those changes might be.

Kimberley Beal: Yes. I will respond to that in writing.

Commissioner Harrington: Great. Thank you very much.

President Brandon: Thank you. Commissioner Gilman?

Commissioner Gilman: Those were great questions, Commissioner Harrington. I just had a couple of questions too. Could you just maybe walk me through the logic of why a half month as an incentive? Is that something we're seeing in the market?

How does that compare to other places? I just found it odd that it's a half month and not a whole month. So can you walk me through the thinking or the strategy there?

Kimberley Beal: So I don't know if Santino is on the line and would like to be able to respond to that. But I will say it was recommended by our consultant. So that being said, it is something that is being seen in the marketplace and something that we felt we could match. So we supported their recommendation and are presenting it here to you for consideration.

Commissioner Gilman: Okay. And same thing here, if we don't have this all today, you can respond to us back in writing.

Santino DeRose: Hi. I just wanted to jump in. This is Santino at Maven. If you can repeat that one more time, I can probably give you a rough --

Commissioner Gilman: Sure. My question just sort of was why a half month? Why not a full month, sort of what the methodology was and what the strategy was behind a half month as an incentive -- half month of rent forgiveness?

Santino DeRose: You know, this is in addition to a ramped up schedule. So what we look at is the effective rent, meaning what the rent that the Port is going to get at the end of the day after all of the free rent, after all of the half rent as you go.



We wanted to give the ability to -- we want to try to give the Port the tools needed. And again, this is parameter. So our assumption is that this isn't an automatic give. It's just providing staff with tools to negotiate a transaction.

Maybe we don't give away all of it. But we want to expand and try to give as much as we can away without -- you know, to try to incentivize and to try to compete with the private sector that can offer things that, unfortunately, Port doesn't have at its disposal.

So I think, if we have the 70, 80, 90, 100 ramp up and then we have a one-month free instead of a half month, we're really giving away quite a bit.

Commissioner Gilman: Okay. I was just curious. Thank you so much for responding to that question.

Santino DeRose: You're very welcome. Thank you.

Commissioner Gilman: Then, Ms. Beal, the other question I just had was, on the special events increasing the budget for the nonprofits, again this is just a curiosity question. I'm always supportive giving our nonprofit brothers and sisters a break when they capitalize Port property or use either for their nonprofits or for the community.

But have we seen that we've had nonprofits approach us that were above two million? Is that why we're moving to three again? What's the methodology? Why not move to five?

Kimberley Beal: No. We have not had -- thank you for the question. We have not had a number of nonprofits that are even at the two million that have approached us. So again, we were just trying to provide additional opportunity. Since we haven't had them come to us even with the two, we just thought we would increase it by three. So it was arbitrary.

Commissioner Gilman: Okay. Thank you.

President Brandon: Thank you. Kim, thank you so much for this report. I think my fellow commissioners asked a lot of great questions. I'm happy that we're keeping a large percentage of our rents the same, and we're not increasing too soon after -- you know, with the recovery that we're going through.

So I think you guys did a great job. I would like to see the information that Commissioner Harrington requested because one of my questions was, you know, what's at Pier 45? What other type of uses are at Pier 45 besides the fishing industry? So I just wanted to know why there was such high demand at Pier 45.

Kimberley Beal: So with that, I don't want to put Don on the spot. But he is the senior property manager for Pier 45 and may like to answer that question.

Don Kavanagh: Hi. I'm Don Kavanagh, senior property manager for the Port. I handle Fisherman's Wharf. Pier 45 is primarily related to the fishing industry. And there's three sheds. Two of them are primarily fish processors. Then, at the very end of Shed D is gear storage and Shed A is primarily gear storage. And Shed C has the Port maintenance yard and some parking. So the primary tenants at Pier 45 are all related to the commercial fishing industry.

President Brandon: So in the report, it says there's low vacancy and high demand. And we're supporting a rate increase at Pier 45 for non-fishing industry uses. So are there other non-fishing industry uses? Or --

Don Kavanagh: Well, the typical tenant or prospect is fishing industry. It's set up for fishing industry. You know, the only thing at -- like maybe at the front of Shed B, there's prep space for like restaurants. So that's a very small triangle of the overall total.

So you've got that. There might be parking where the -- it's not available to the public. But it's for the processors, the restaurant workers and the -- like for example, the crab boat deck hands that go out. So there's very limited opportunities for anyone other than fish-processing-type people. You want to take --

Kimberley Beal: So I think one thing I would like to add is although, as Don has mentioned, the primary use is fishing industry and we would probably continue it as such, sometimes we do get requests for storage uses.

It might be a restaurant space. There are other retail spaces in the area or businesses in the area that might need storage space. So we could be approached by one of them, not to say that that is something that we would use the space for.

Or they might not even want to use it for that because, if you've ever been in 45, you'll know there is definite -- it's definitely used for fishing. So this is really just a way in being proactive if, for some reason, we were approached by a non-fishery fishing use and wish to lease it for that purpose although, again, I think the likelihood of that is very small.

President Brandon: Thank you. Commissioner Lee?

Commissioner Lee: Don, I just want to just caution th -- you know, our big draw is the fishing industry. You know, I'm all about balancing the books. But raising the rent on the fishermen, you know, I would really like to use that as a last resort and really push some of the other spaces that we could give more incentive to because I believe, if it's empty like so many -- we're not making money.

We're still losing money. So why not give a little bit more incentive for some spaces that are empty rather than raising the rent on workers and mom-and-pop operations just because it's just -- it's full. You know, it's been a spot there for years.

But I just want to caution not to -- okay. Yeah. It's doing well. Let's raise the rent -- because, you know, we've still got to keep them in business. And we know that the fishing and the crabbing and with the climate change, you know, they don't get to sell their products on time. So I just want to want to make sure that we're keeping -- let's not put too much pressure on them.

Kimberley Beal: Commissioner Lee, thank you so much for your comment, definitely appreciated and understood. I just wanted to mention again that what was proposed is not something that would affect fishing uses.

So again, it would really be for non-fishing uses. But again, the likelihood of us doing that is fairly small. We are just, again, doing this more as a proactive measure.

Commissioner Lee: Right. So somebody who wants a space there that they're not fishermen, we could basically go market value on those if it's available.

Kimberley Beal: Correct.

Commissioner Lee: Okay. Thank you.

President Brandon: Thank you. Any other questions or comments? So we have a motion and a second. All in favor?

Resolution 23-36 passes unanimously.

**B. Informational Presentation to Consider and Possible Action to Approve a Resolution Recommending the Board of Supervisors Waive any Applicable Requirements of the Competitive Bidding Process with Respect to the Unsolicited Proposal from Fisherman's Wharf Revitalized LLC for the Leasing and Phased Development of Portions of SWL 300/301 and Pier 45 Sheds A and C in Fisherman's Wharf Generally Located Bayward of Jefferson Street between Taylor Street and Powell Street. (Resolution 23-37)**

Mike Martin: Good afternoon, commissioners. Mike Martin, assistant Port director. I'm very happy to be here today to talk to you again about the unsolicited proposal we received back in February regarding the triangle parking lot area at the Little Embarcadero and Pier 45 Sheds A and C. If I could get the slides up, please.

So here's an outline of my presentation today. I'm going to review the process we've had with you and the community to date. We'll review the results of our request for information regarding interest in development proposals in these areas and then end with the analysis of those processes and our staff recommendation of where to go from here.

So to start out, I want to just frame this by, again, revisiting the proposal that we received. It was delivered by Fisherman's Wharf Revitalized LLC, which is comprised of Lou Giraudo, Seth Hamalian and Chris McGarry.

The proposal seeks the potential construction of one or more new buildings on the triangle parking lot on the eastern end housing a visitors center, a winery/brewery/distillery operation with an education component and potential short-term vacation rental units.

The western portion of the lot would be reserved for a second phase, so we can see how the first phase resonates or how the project sponsor can see how the first phase resonates as well as understanding how the area is evolving over that time.

This first phase of the project would also include an expanded waterfront walk along the Little Embarcadero with resilience improvements along that area as well as a more sort of open and inviting public plaza area, perhaps including the closure of the road to through traffic although we have to study that to understand if that circulation plan would work.

Turning to Pier 45, Shed A would include an experiential museum regarding the fish industry and the history of the wharf. It would include a wholesale market as well as a food hall, exhibits as well as a park-like setting.

And then, moving out further on the pier to the Shed C site, that would include more public-access areas for the vistas back towards Fisherman's Wharf itself as well as an event center to have events and attractions and bringing people to Fisherman's Wharf and out onto the bay.

So as we discussed with you in an information item we brought to you shortly after receiving the proposal in February, the waterfront plan lays out a series of policies and processes that are recommended to be followed upon the receipt of an unsolicited development proposal because the idea is this outreach would be conducted before seeking Board of Supervisors' consideration of the waiver of the competitive bidding policy so that they'd have more information for Port stakeholders and the commission as they consider that action.

The process that's laid out in the waterfront plan is for the developer to provide their written submittal that describes the proposal. Then, Port staff would convene an advisory committee meeting or meetings for review and comment.

And then, we'd bring back the results of those meetings to the Port Commission for a discussion at an informational meeting to review where that landed and to summarize where things look in terms of the Port Commission's reactions.

Stepping off into that process, we scheduled three meetings in March: two meetings in Fisherman's Wharf and one meeting of the northern advisory committee to review the proposal. We came back to you on April 25th to review stakeholder comments regarding the locations selected for development, the proposal as a whole and its impact on Fisherman's Wharf.

We analyzed the proposal's relationship to the goals of the waterfront plan you recently adopted. And we summarized the exclusive negotiations process that would jump off from here if there was a waiver of the competitive bidding policy.

As an additional step coming out of that April 25th discussion, Port staff issued on May 19th a request for information to determine where there were other actionable proposals to lease and develop the areas called out in the Fisherman's Wharf Revitalized proposal along the same lines.

The Port received two responses by the deadline of June 21st. And both were attached to today's staff report. One letter was a follow-up submittal from Fisherman's Wharf Revitalized. The second was a letter from Dan Giraud, chairman and CEO of Boudin Bakery, the operator of the Port's tenants at the Boudin flagship and the Chowder Hut, which each flank the triangle parking lot.

We attached the letters in their entirety. So you could all -- and the public could all understand those receipts. But I want to just summarize the letter from Boudin Bakery as really focused on opposing the proposal, saying that Fisherman's Wharf has very current needs that the proposal would not address because of the time it would take to get to approvals and construction.

And then, the impacts of construction could push back Fisherman's Wharf from its recovery rather than moving it forward into a recovery. The letter also included an attachment that discussed the type of project on the triangle parking lot and the Little Embarcadero area that the respondent would be interested in participating in if an ENA was approved.

So today, we're back to talk to you about how that sort of augmented the conversation we've already had with you. And I want to lay out, I think, two main points in terms of staff's analysis and reaction.

The first is as to that urgency of Fisherman's Wharf. I think we definitely recognize there is an urgency there now. And I think you've seen us over the last two meetings come to you with really what I would call pretty decision actions to say we need to do something.

We need to do something about the empty storefronts. We need to do something about the clean, safe and vibrant waterfront we want to see up there. And we want to do something that attracts visitors and residents back to Fisherman's Wharf so that economic engine can come back to life.

So you've approved a grant to the Fisherman's Wharf CBD that the executive director called out in her report that we're moving forward on activations. We're moving forward on more ambassadors.

We're moving forward on working with law enforcement to try to address criminal activity associated with street vending. So we do feel that current urgency. But the thing that we, at the Port, and you, as the commission, know is that we have a number of urgent issues along the waterfront.

And another set of urgent issues that may not be a today issue but it's very soon is seismic risk and resilience risk. And we know that our portfolio needs a significant amount of investment that we can't pay for from our own budget.

So we see not that this proposal from Fisherman's Wharf Revitalized ignores that urgency of now. We think it's a necessary and responsible way to think about the urgency of tomorrow as well.

And we think it's really important for us to consider that this investment might help us along the path to recovery and, if we can shape it in the right way, not undercut the things we're doing in the short term to try to get to that recovery.

The second point I want to make is process. The competitive bidding policy is in place for a reason. As a public agency, we want to give everybody a fair chance at public opportunities. We showed you this slide back on April 25th, which is the development process that jumps off when you start an exclusive negotiations agreement.

This process takes upwards of 24 months in a good situation. And this is the process where we actually go out and do studies and understand what is the impact. We do detailed designs. We do detailed financial projections.

We engage on the challenges that the project poses like how are we going to deal with circulation of cars and Fisherman's Wharf when we lose a big parking asset and potentially lose the Little Embarcadero?

How are we going to find a way to accommodate this investment while not having negative impacts to the fishing industry that the investment is designed to elevate and to bring into the center of Fisherman's Wharf?

And this is also the exact same process that jumps off when you select someone after a competitive process. We're not losing any of that by not having a competitive process. What a competitive process does is allow project sponsors to bring very conceptual ideas of what they envision for Port property and very conceptual ideas of what it will cost and how they'll get there.

And you get a chance to look at those and say, this is the path we want to go down. And that has value. But what the RFI shows is that there isn't another actionable development proposal that wants to invest in a way that this one does.

So a competitive process right now to Port staff really would be a delay, a use of time that isn't practical, that doesn't advance any public policy because it's in this process here that we're going to figure out the questions that people have that we heard during the stakeholder engagement earlier this year.

So to close, Port staff's recommendation is that this proposal provides an opportunity for needed investment at Fisherman's Wharf that can be shaped through an exclusive negotiations process.

This picture is not developed yet. We want to go develop it. So we do not believe there's another vision that's worthy of that consideration right now. We haven't heard it through five months of talking to the community and inviting people to tell us what they want to do.

Accordingly, we recommend that you adopt the resolution we attached to today's item and you direct us to go ask the Board of Supervisors to give us the waiver of the competitive bidding policy to let us figure out what's possible here. So that concludes my presentation today. But I'm very happy to answer questions.

**ACTION:** Commissioner Gilman moved approval of the resolution. Commissioner Harrington seconded the motion.

Public Comment on Item 11B:

John Barnett: Thank you, commission. I'm president of the Crab Boat Owners Association. [beep] I haven't even started -- president of the Crab Boat Owners Association representing to the fishermen that have the gear storage in Pier 45.

Agree with [Stephen] -- this proposal makes -- it's kind of using a space that's already being rented to the fishermen, a really accessible space that we can keep our gear in. It's very fisheries oriented. It's not really pleasant for the public to be in there.

It's gear. It's got men working, nothing that people really want to see. We're not opposed -- I also have a charter boat, depend on the tourism, which is - - I know the cruise ships are way up. Tourism at Fisherman's Wharf is way down.



Besides the COVID year, in 25 years of doing tours and fishing trips down there, this is the slowest year partly because of the salmon closure but still the slowest business year I've seen at Fisherman's Wharf.

And what I propose is the use of the buildings that are empty. I agree with the competitive-bid topic These restaurants are empty. You don't need a competitive bid. Nobody's taking them over. There is no competition to take over Castagnola's right now. They couldn't rent it out for what they need to get for it.

So some incentive needs to be done to get these restaurants to open. To revitalize the triangle parking lot, great. But to move on to Pier 45 when you have vacant buildings around there, it makes no sense. It makes no sense.

You're going to build a brand-new structure on a pier next to vacant buildings. And it's still going to be the same right there. People are walking to Pier 39, maybe to Boudin's. And then, they're not finishing the walk down to the Maritime Museum or the Argonaut or even to the cable cars. They're going around to go to the cable cars.

Fisherman's Wharf is dead right now. So -- but anyway, we are supportive of keeping fishermen's gear storage in Pier 45 and keeping it for fishing, the main reason I wanted to speak. Thank you, guys.

President Brandon: Thank you. Sarah Bates?

Sarah Bates: Yeah. Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity. My name is Sarah Bates from the Crab Boat Owners Association. Our association represents the individual fishing boats and small businesses that have been delivering seafood to San Francisco for over 100 years.

And I understand -- first of all, thank you very much for considering projects that are going to revitalize Fisherman's Wharf because we do need some help in that department, as I'm sure everybody here knows.

And I understand that this project was -- or proposal was unsolicited. But I don't really understand why the Port Commission is considering it so enthusiastically. I don't understand how we can call it Fisherman's Wharf without a fishing fleet. I don't understand the location for this project.

We just heard that there's an 11.9 percent vacancy rate in the shed spaces of the Port. Pier 45 is not vacant. We have a waiting list for those storage spaces. I am currently on the waiting list. And I know people who have been on that waiting list for a very long time especially after Shed C burned down. We do not have enough storage for the things that we needed there.



I don't understand where the fleet is supposed to do business. You know, the saying that, "We have other storage space, and we can send you down to the ballpark, or we can send you down to 48 or whatever," is a fundamental misconception of how we use that space.

This is not just storage. This is the space where we work. It would be like asking you guys to do 50 percent of your job here and 50 percent in city hall except that you have to go back and forth 10 times in one day. And that's just not -- it's just untenable for the way that we actually use that space.

And that's a misconception to just call it storage. I don't understand where we are with the environmental review process for this. Maybe we're too early for that. What's the structural integrity of that pier? What are we doing about traffic and egress for all of the people, for all of the vehicles?

If this is exposition space and museum space, what happens when there's another fire down there? How are all those people going to get out? It's a dead end. I don't understand why the other stakeholders are not involved more at this stage of the process.

I know that this is just the competitive-bid portion of the whole project. I know that there's many steps beyond that. But where are the other local businesses, the hotels and the restaurants that are currently down there already? Where is the fishing fleet in all of this?

You know, this is Fisherman's Wharf. And without fishing fleet, there is no Fisherman's Wharf. I mean, if we're being quietly evicted from our spaces, then I think we've been there long enough that we deserve the courtesy of you just telling us that straight up because, if we're being quietly evicted, we're all just g -- I mean, we can't do business without that space.

And if we're being evicted from that space, then we're all going to start making phone calls to Half Moon Bay, you know. They've got a working ice machine, for example. So thank you very much for your time. We appreciate your consideration on this.

President Brandon: Thank you. Larry Collins?

Larry Collins: Yeah. Good afternoon, Director and commissioners. My name is Larry Collins. I got my first lease from the Port in 1984. And I've had continual leases down there ever since. My wife and I fished for the first -- most of our career. And then, in '11, we started the co-op down there, so the fishermen could have their own buying station.

And now, there's like 25-plus boats that are members of that co-op. You need three things for a commercial fishing port to work. You've got to have access to the fish, access to the buyers and access to infrastructure.

Infrastructure is a place where you can store your gear. It's also a working fuel dock that hasn't worked for four years and an ice machine, which the co-op has kept working miraculously for the last 12 years.

You know, there isn't enough storage area down there now for us to give up any of A shed. And the likelihood that the Port is going to rebuild C shed -- I've seen, you know, a thousand foot of dock space tore out over in Fish Alley, which will never be put back.

I mean, things are tough right now for the fleet. We don't have a salmon season this year, the whale problem with the crabs. You know, it's all gloom and doom right now. And then, we're going to talk about moving us out of our storage.

Now, there could be some bright future in commercial fishing. They're tearing out the dams in the Klamath right now for the salmon. We had really good rain this year. So three years from now, it could be a phenomenal salmon season.

The whale populations are booming back. So the restrictions from that could be taken -- lessened and lessened as it goes along. So basically, our future could be bright in four or five years. But if we don't have the infrastructure there to take big quantities of fish over that dock and store our gear, then we're not going to thrive, and neither is Fisherman's Wharf.

Like Sarah said, we've been there over 100 years, the fishermen. And we're basically -- you know, if this happens and we lose our storage down there, you're taking our future. And I understand why the Port's doing it because somebody wants to put big money in the Port. And I get that.

One thing I've learned is it's all about money. It took me a long time to figure that out, but I'm old enough now that I figured that out. So don't take our future from us, please. Thank you.

President Brandon: Thank you. Matt -- I'm sorry. I can't read the last name. Matt?

Matt Juanes: Hello. My name is Matt Juanes. I am a local commercial fisherman right there at Pier 47. I have storage there at Pier 45 and the sheds there. I've been selling the majority of my catch off my boat there at Pier 47 and trying to bring the pier and Fisherman's Wharf back.

Without that storage shed there, I have nowhere to put my gear. There is no incentives for me to be here unfortunately at Fisherman's Wharf. I'd be looking at Half Moon Bay, Bodega Bay, Fort Bragg because I really don't -- actually, I don't live here. I live in the Central Valley.

So I come here because the storage and everything has been around us. So I ask not to lose our storage. And it's part of the fishing community. Without fishermen, Fisherman's Wharf would just be more t-shirts. Thank you.

President Brandon: Thank you. [Sean Flanning]?

Sean Flanning: Hi there. Thank you for the Port commission for hearing this public comment. The essence and heart of San Francisco's Fisherman's Wharf since its beginning in the mid-1800s is the fishermen and San Francisco's fishing fleet.

Despite the redevelopment from tourist attraction in the '70s and '80s, Fisherman's Wharf is still currently home to many active commercial fishermen. And the heart of the fisherman's business is centered in San Francisco's iconic Fisherman's Wharf.

Pier 45 Sheds A and C is the epicenter of our local commercial fisherman's business. It is perfectly located across from all the fish buyer and wholesalers. It is critical to both fishermen and wholesalers for the fishermen to have easy access to their tools and gear which are stored in Sheds A and C.

With the help of the wholesaler supplying cranes and forklifts, the fisherman is able to easily move their fishing gear from Sheds A and C to their vessels and off their vessels and back into the shed. Each year before the commercial Dungeness crab season, which brings in tens of millions of dollars to San Francisco, Pier 45 becomes an extremely crucial and vital staging area where tens of thousands of crab traps await to be loaded onto fishing vessels.

By taking away the space of Pier 45 and Sheds A and C, it will have a catastrophic negative impact on the ability for the fishermen to stage, load and offload their crab gear let alone selling their catch.

By taking away the space of Pier 45, Sheds A and C, it will be taking away my fishing and crabbing business. My entire business equity is contained in Sheds A and C. And without it, I will be forced to relocate to a more fisherman-friendly harbor such as Half Moon Bay.

By taking away Pier 45, Shed A and Shed C, you will be taking away the very important word "fisherman" from Fisherman's Wharf. That's all. Thank you.

President Brandon: Thank you. Michael Rescino?

Michael Rescino: Good afternoon. My name is Michael Rescino. Thanks for letting me speak today. I'm a fourth-generation fisherman out of Fisherman's Wharf. My family's been down there since 1908 operating out of Fisherman's Wharf.

I have the Lovely Martha. I own and operate the charter boat Lovely Martha. And I also operate a commercial fishing vessel, the Natalie Nicole. I'm against this proposal of eliminating or actually using -- or utilizing our shed space.

If you guys do anything down there, you're taking away the small sliver that we have -- that the fishermen have of the waterfront. By relocating us somewhere else to keep our gear, it is going to be catastrophic to the fleet.

And as my fellow fishermen have already said, it will basically force fishermen out of this harbor. And you will lose the fishing fleet. Another too that I'm against the proposal is for my charter business. Okay.

Right now, I don't think we need to be making new things. I think we need to be utilizing the buildings that are empty right now because this was the worst Fourth of July I've ever seen in my life of being down here at Fisherman's Wharf.

The business down there, the tourism is just at an all-time low. And I think we have to put our efforts into: filling those vacant buildings; cleaning out the homeless, honestly, okay, because there's a bad reputation right now that I've been hearing from people coming from out of state; and also to the illegal vendors that are down there on the street.

It's basically shooing away the tourism from Fisherman's Wharf. Also too with that proposal of them utilizing Shed A and C -- if they do take away that storage space and do anything down there, it's going to basically bottleneck all the traffic down to a dead end and not have people coming down to my business, which is between Jefferson and Jones -- Jones and Taylor.

It's all going to bottleneck to the end of 45. And that's going to virtually hurt my business. And I'm not going to see that. Thank you for letting me speak.

#### Commissioners' Discussion on Item 11B:

Commissioner Harrington: Thank you, Madam President. Thank you all for being here today. And I really do appreciate your comments. If I could reiterate what Michael said earlier, we are not talking about what this proposal might do today. We are talking about whether we want to move forward to have the proposal even be discussed.

So I completely get your frustration and this idea of pushing the fishermen out of Fisherman's Wharf. I don't think that's the intent of anybody sitting up here for sure or the Port. But the question is, while we're doing all these things that we agree with you are urgent -- and again, hopefully filling those restaurants, hopefully doing all those kind of things -- what's going to happen three, four, five, 10, 15, 20 years from now?

And this is the only proposal out there right now that talks about what is that future for Fisherman's Wharf. And again, I don't think the future Fisherman's Wharf is to get rid of the fishermen. But I do think that our choices are: we could do nothing; we could wait for who knows how many years till the economy gets better, till our staff can put together a vision for Fisherman's Wharf, have that all vetted with the community.

And maybe in several years, the economy would be good enough to go out and do a request for proposal and have competitors come in and see what they want to do. What this does instead is it starts us now being able to have those kind of conversations with a partner that has the wherewithal to make those things happen.

It also allows us to say yes or no. There's going to be so much -- you know, make-us-all-crazy process in the next several years. But there's going to be so much going on that will allow all of this discussion to take place.

And if, in fact, Pier 45 needs to be different from what the original proposal is, I'm betting that's going to happen. Or it's not going to go through if it's not going to be something that works for the people that are involved in this.

So I think, again, I'm happy to support the move to go forward to waive the competitive bid process to allow that conversation to happen because, absent that, really kind of nothing happens for several years. And I don't think that's healthy for the organization. It's not healthy for Fisherman's Wharf. It's not healthy for any of us.

So I'm hoping that people can see that we are not jumping on this proposal and adopting it. We are simply saying we want a discussion to happen. And this is the only tool we have right now to have that discussion happen for us.

I do think that, to do this, it will be good to have a couple changes to the item before us today. One of the items says that we received two letters of interest. There really was one letter of interest and one letter of opposition I think as much as anything else.

So I think that would be to clarify that. The other thing is that the Board of Supervisors will be trying to make a decision. And they're going to be relying on our resolution. I think it would be better if our resolution was clearer about why we think that this qualifies for that waiver of the competitive bidding process.

So adding some words to that I think would make this a stronger kind of thing. But I do want to assure the folks that are here today that nothing here is going forward without a whole lot of additional conversation and a whole lot of process that will allow all of these things to come out and all these things to be heard.

So I would hope that you could stick with us for the only real possibility I see on the -- out there for the next couple of years to start doing anything about the long-term health of Fisherman's Wharf. So thanks for being here.

President Brandon: Thank you. Commissioner Lee?

Commissioner Lee: So I think you guys know that I'm all about small business. I'm all in your court. You know, I'm the champion or try to be the champion of the people that don't get a paycheck every two weeks. The thing is, as long as I'm here, the fisher -- you know, it's all about education too.

You guys have been around 100 years. We built the railroads, you know. The next generation needs to know where to fish and how to catch crab. Fisherman's Wharf is not going to lose their fishermen. I tell you that right now.

This proposal gives us an opportunity to find something to do everything that you guys just said. But without cooperation from people on the outside, we're going to sit here for two more years in the same predicament.

And you guys are going to be complaining the same thing as what we all complain about because, you know, I checked with the experts. It's going to be 2025 before we recover from this. And we have a war going on. We've got a lot of things that affect our tourism.

And we've got to get our locals back in the game. Okay. So all this does is we have an opportunity here to hear from a set of -- a group of people that are interested in trying to help. And we're far from even approving anything. But even to hear their proposal, we've got to get over this.

So trust me. We're not losing the fishing industry and Fisherman's Wharf. This is - - you know, like you said, we are Fisherman's Wharf. So for me, I'm supporting to move to the negotiation phase. At that time, you guys have a lot to say to the developers.

Maybe they'll work it out. And maybe they'll just focus on one other area and maybe help with your sheds. Who knows? But we can't get there until we can take this part out and move to the negotiations stage. So just be patient. And I have your guys' back at least, you know, for small business. So that's all I have to say.

President Brandon: Thank you. Commissioner Gilman?

Commissioner Gilman: Well, thank you, everyone, for your public comment. I think you're just going to hear me pile on to the love for the fishermen at Fisherman's Wharf. As someone who lives a stone's throw away, I hear the sea lions at night.

[Sean], I think you were selling off the boat. And I think you helped me because I bought my first fresh fish from you. And you gutted it for me, put it all in a bag. I posted on Facebook. So we know -- first of all, it's public land in the public trust under the Burton Act.

And maritime fishermen is a use that we need to maintain. And again, everyone has said it. And I'll say it again. I don't think we need to throw back up the slide that's in the packet. But it's available to all of you. This is a two-year negotiation with these sponsors.

This motion and what we're sending to the board is so we can start the conversation. And I would hope that out of that would be renewed space for all of you for -- it's Sarah, right, in the back? I think I met you when we had the fire at Shed C.

Maybe you'll have a brand new ice machine. I don't know enough about this to know what you guys need. But maybe, out of this, we modernize your facility. No one is evicting you. No one is asking [you just] to leave.

What we want to do is open up the conversation. And it's going to be a two-year process. And I do want to commend the project sponsor for starting the very baby step of community outreach with the three meetings that he did. And they'll need to do a million more before this process is over.

And you guys are partners with us on this. So I really hope you hear this from the commission because we know how important Fisherman's Wharf is. But as someone who lives also -- you know, who is a local, lots of my friends make their living on the Port, whether it's the San Francisco Sailing Company or other businesses.

We need to do something about the triangle parking lot. We need to do something -- I would hope, in this redesign too, we can mitigate and maybe design to decrease illegal vending. There is actual built physical things we can do to help mitigate that.

Project sponsors are sitting here right over to my left. And I think they're hearing all this input. I think there's a way collaboratively. In two years, we can have a plan that then, in five years or 10 years, makes the wharf a more attractive place both for you to do business, whatever that means -- because I don't know what that means -- for the fishing industry and so that we bring more locals back and more tourism back to a thriving wharf both for the Fisherman's Wharf community but also for North Beach, for Barbary Coast and for Chinatown that are all feeders into that community, so we can all be holistic.

So I hope you hear us that we got you guys. I'm supportive of us moving forward. We learned during the pandemic that sometimes, if we can reshape process a little bit, we can achieve pretty incredible things.



And if we were to layer on a full competitive-bid process, that would be at least another year to the process. So this way, we can start the conversations now. So I'm supportive of this item.

President Brandon: Thank you. Thank you. And I do -- I appreciate my fellow commissioners' comments. And they made great comments. But I do want to give the project sponsors an opportunity to speak if they would like to.

Lou Giraudo: My name is Lou Giraudo. And I just simply want to say that I would echo the comments of all the commission.

President Brandon: Can you speak into the mic, Lou?

Lou Giraudo: I'm sorry. We know that this is a process. We didn't come to you with a picture that said this is the way it's going to be but a picture that we envision. And we hope that we can work with other people to come to a finalized picture that makes life better for everybody at Fisherman's Wharf, North Beach and Chinatown, which all presently are suffering.

And at the end of the day, I personally, as I said the last time I was here, said, I'm 77 years old. I was born, raised and still live in San Francisco, North Beach, Fisherman's Wharf, on a fishing boat, my Uncle Gus, my Uncle Pasquale and then again Boudin Bakery that is now owned by my son. But it was founded by my father and founded by the Fisherman's Wharf bakery myself and my partner, Sharon Duval.

We love Fisherman's Wharf. We love San Francisco. It's our intention to give back. And I welcome Larry. I welcome S -- I welcome them all to give us whatever input it is. And we have walked with them. And we've seen. And we've heard what they had to say.

And we said to them then and we're saying to them now, there is no final plan until they bless it. And that's what we're looking forward to doing. And if we can do it and achieve it, it's a wonderful, wonderful thing for San Francisco. And if we don't, we don't. But I think we will. Thank you very much.

President Brandon: Thank you, Mr. Giraudo. So again, my fellow commissioners made great comments. I think that we've all said from the very beginning that the fishing industry is a priority in this area, in this project. And we stand by that. We do know that there is an urgent need to do something in Fisherman's Wharf.

We can do all the short-term investment we want. But if we don't do long-term planning now, it's only going to get worse. So we want the opportunity to be able to look at this proposal and decide if it is something that should go in this area. Or should it change?



But as you heard Mr. Giraud say, he's going to look to you for support and what your opinion is, what you need. He needs to hear from you. So I think we all agree that we want to take advantage of an investment into making Fisherman's Wharf even better. But still, the fishing industry is our top priority because that is Fisherman's Wharf. Did you want to say something?

Commissioner Gilman: I'm going to let you finish -- [crosstalk] [laughter] I had a suggestion. [crosstalk] I guess I just wanted to direct staff. I know the northern advisory working group is a place that is in the waterfront plan that this would come to.

I guess I'd like us to -- if possible and if this is not too staff intensive, I'd like us to form an advisory group of the folks that have space at Pier 45 maybe through the -- I apologize --

Director Forbes: [Fish WAG].

Commissioner Gilman: -- through the -- my gawd -- the collaborative that the gentleman over there is representing. [crosstalk] Yeah. I would just like to make sure we have a specialized group where it's just not part of a larger group like the northern advisory council, that we have a fishers group that advises and gets community outreach on this project.

Mike Martin: Commissioner, that's a really good point. We used to have a Fisherman's Wharf advisory committee that sort of splintered during the pandemic because there are different sets of user groups there. Some are more active than others.

So we're going to try to put that back together. And this project would be a perfect reason to do that because of all those interest groups. And we definitely want to specifically talk to the fishers along the lines that we talked about today as well.

Commissioner Gilman: I'm sorry. The co-op was the word I was searching for. It was on the tip of my tongue. So maybe we can have a subgroup just of the co-op and crabbers.

Mike Martin: Yeah. Our maritime division is very interested in doing just that.

Commissioner Gilman: Thank you.

President Brandon: Thank you. Any other comments or questions? Director Forbes?

Director Forbes: Thank you so much. This was such a rich conversation. And I think all of us really appreciated hearing from the fishers and hearing from our commission on this unsolicited proposal. I would like to respond to some

recommendations that Commissioner Harrington made related to findings that we would have in our resolution to advise the Board of Supervisors.

We had a preview and worked together with the city attorney and with our Chief Operating Officer, Assistant Port Director Michael Martin. And I'd like Michelle Sexton, our attorney, to read into the record two new whereas clauses and a strike of two words in the whereas clause number 10. Michelle, could you do that, please?

Michelle Sexton: Thank you. Commissioners, so if you turn to page nine of the staff report where it incorporates the resolution, we recommend changing the first whereas clause on that page so that it would read, "Whereas the Port issued the RFI on May 20, 2023 and received two letters, which were summarized by Port staff at the July 11, 2023 Port Commission meeting; and --"

-- the next change would be in the fourth whereas on that page so four paragraphs down. It would just be the deletion of "now therefore be it" because we have added two new whereases that will be paragraphs five and six reading, "Whereas, in accordance with Chapter 23 of the administrative code, the Board of Supervisors can waive competitive solicitation upon finding that the competitive process is impractical, impossible or not in the public interest; --

"-- and whereas the lack of development interest and any response to the RFI indicates that the time and expense in pursuing a competitive process would be impractical and not in either the Port's or public interest; and now therefore be it." And then, it continues with the legislation.

Commissioner Harrington: Thank you very much.

Michelle Sexton: Thank you.

ACTION: Commissioner Harrington moved approval of the amendments to the resolution. Commissioner Gilman seconded the motion.

Resolution 23-37 passes unanimously as amended.

## 12. PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT

### **A. Informational presentation on three (3) artists selected as finalists by the San Francisco Arts Commission (SFAC) Artist Selection Panel to develop artwork proposals for installation at the site of the Pier 27 Cruise Terminal Plaza, located at the Embarcadero between Chestnut and Lombard streets.**

Ryan Wassum: Good afternoon, commissioners and Executive Director Elaine Forbes. My name is Ryan Wassum. I'm a planner with the Port's planning and environment division. And I am here with my colleague Dan Hodapp as well

as the San Francisco Arts Commission project manager for the project, Marcus Davies.

And we have an exciting project update for you all. On the Pier 27 cruise terminal plaza public art as well as the top three selected artists. And with that, I'm going to hand it over to Marcus Davies to begin the presentation for you all.

Marcus Davies: Hi. Good afternoon, commissioners. As Ryan said, I'm going to walk us through the process to date, the results of the process and then next steps. So just to recap, on September 22, 2022, the Port entered into an MOU with the San Francisco Arts Commission to administer the commissioning of an artist or arts team to develop and execute an artwork for the Pier 27 cruise terminal plaza.

The singular sculpture or series of smaller sculptures will be located adjacent to the Embarcadero pedestrian entrance and will contribute to the activation of future Beltline building uses and the transit experience for the cruise terminal passengers.

The core art project goals developed with the Port project management and in keeping with BCDC, their policies state that the artwork should be positioned to invite visitors. The artwork should be visible from points north and south along the Embarcadero.

The artwork should embrace and highlight its visual connection to the bay and consider geographic, cultural and historic relationships to the site and its surrounding areas. It should be universally accessible and accommodating and appropriately scaled to the site.

And it should be fabricated with consideration of sustainable materials and constructed as permanent and maintainable within an urban and marine environment. I think we lost the -- there we go. All right.

So the goals of the Pier 27 art enrichment project also align with the larger intent of the Arts Commission civic art collection -- the Art Commission and the city's civic art collection to promote a rich, diverse and stimulating cultural environment in order to enrich the lives of the city's residents, visitors and employees and to enhance the city's image both nationally and internationally.

The total project art enrichment amount for this project is \$330,000, as generated by the city's 2012 general obligation bond for parks and open space. The artwork budget is \$136,000 inclusive of all artist fees and associated expenses for artwork design, fabrication, insurance and transportation. I should clarify that that is the artist contract.

Additional site work and installation allocation will be managed by the San Francisco Arts Commission and is budgeted at \$83,700. The remainder is project

management cost and conservation -- a conservation reserve are typical, 20 percent project management set aside and 10 percent conservation set aside.

The RFQ was issued on October 20, 2022 and extended to January 13, 2023 to accommodate the holidays and allow for additional outreach through the distribution channels shown here.

At the close of the RFQ, we received a total of 144 applications with 91 California-based applications, 58 Bay Area-based applications, 34 San Francisco-based applications and, overall, 57 applicants who identified as BIPOC, which is a voluntary demographic field in our application materials.

So just to walk us through the process to date, the applications were reviewed by an artist qualification panel on January 31, 2023 consisting of a representative from the Arts Commission staff and two arts professionals.

The panel identified a list of 28 applicants to be considered for the project opportunity. And the scoring criteria included the following: artistic merit, relevant skills and experience and appropriateness of the artist's work to the goals of the project and the civic art collection.

The short list was then presented to a panel consisting of a representative of the client agency, BCDC and the Pier 27 design team, three arts professionals, an arts commissioner and a community representative.

The artist review panel recommended three finalists for the Port Commission's review. The finalists are: Ana Teresa Fernandez, James Shen and David Brooks. And we'll be reviewing their work in just a minute.

The finalists will be asked to develop conceptual proposals after attending an orientation session with the project team and key stakeholders. Each finalist will be paid an honorarium of \$2,000 for the development of a conceptual design proposal.

The proposals will then be displayed near the project site and posted on the Arts Commission website for written public comment prior to the final review panel meeting. The review panel will reconvene to consider the finalist concepts in an interview format along with public comment and input from the Port Commission and advisory committee.

And at the end of the process, one project artist will be recommended for the Arts Commission's final approval. The schedule is to be determined with the goal of having an artist under contract by end of fourth quarter this year, moving into fabrication next year.

So just a few notes on our -- some biographical notes on our three artist finalists starting with Ana Teresa. Ana Teresa Fernandez's work creates moments

of activation and changes in communities. And her practice creates experiences and ways for individuals to feel an awareness of what has been left unnoticed or silenced.

She engages the public through the power of somatic learning to evoke curiosity and motivate change. She recently exhibited at the Armory Show in New York City and was spotlighted as a guest of honor at the Paris Photo fair.

Fernandez has developed two large-scale public art pieces in San Francisco and is currently engaged with the city of Napa in creating a permanent art piece to be installed in the fall of this year. She has also created permanent public projects in Brazil, South Africa, Haiti and Mexico.

Her work is in the permanent collections of the Fine Art Museums of San Francisco, the Indianapolis Museum of Art, the Blanton Museum of Art, University of Texas, Denver Art Museum, the Nevada Art Museum, the National Museum of Mexican Art in Chicago and the Kadist Art Foundation in San Francisco and Paris.

She lives and surfs in the Outer Sunset and has a studio in the Bayview. And her connection to the project site is her love for the ocean.

Our next artist is James Shen. James Shen heads the Long Beach Studio of People's Architecture office, a multidisciplinary practice focusing on social impact through art and design. His award-winning work has received international recognition.

With a background in architecture, art and product design, he has 20 years of professional experience creating places that inspire social interaction and connection and has completed projects spanning North America, Europe and Asia.

As a child of Chinese refugees that immigrated to the U.S. through San Francisco, ports are significant in his personal history. His family worked at the ports of Guangzhou and Hong Kong and, like many Cantonese from these places, came to the U.S. through the Port of San Francisco and resided in nearby Chinatown.

He understands the important role of ports and has watched their revitalization through his experience living in Long Beach and Boston and visiting San Francisco.

And our third artist is David Brooks. David Brooks's work investigates how cultural concerns cannot be divorced from the natural world while questioning the terms under which nature is perceived and utilized.

Embracing a research-based practice, their work considers the ecological crisis between the individual and the built and natural environments. Brooks has

participated in talks at the Exploratorium, residencies at Headlands Center for the Arts and has conducted aquatic research at the Farallon Islands.

Additionally, they have permanent commissions in the Miami-Dade Art in Public Places collection, the City of Changwon in South Korea and the Storm King Art Center. Brooks has exhibited at the Aldrich Contemporary Art Museum in Connecticut, the Dallas Contemporary, Teaching Museum and Art Gallery in New York, Sculpture Center in New York City, the Visual Arts Center in Austin and the Nevada Museum of Art.

And with that, I thank you all again for your time. And I am happy to welcome any questions that you may have and looking forward to next steps on this exciting project.

No Public Comment on Item 12A.

Commissioners' Discussion on Item 12A:

Commissioner Gilman: Marcus, I just wanted to thank you. And I also wanted to thank the selection committee. As someone who had an optional opportunity to participate in the selection committee and had to bow out because of the tremendous workload that those individuals and [humans] signed up for, I just really want to commend the RFQ/RFP panel that came together to get to these three, as someone who was on that email traffic.

It was a lot of work. So I just really want to thank you, Port staff and the citizens of San Francisco who made up that panel. We have really exciting folks here. It's a shame we're going to have to whittle it down to one.

I wish we could accommodate them all. And then, even though most of the public has left from the previous item, I just wanted to point out that from conception to bringing this back to us will be a year in the process.

This is sometimes the length and time that a competitive process takes to solicit these kinds of opportunities. So I just also wanted to illustrate that and just really thank you. All of these are exciting opportunities. I have no substantive questions.

Marcus Davies: Great. Thank you.

President Brandon: Thank you. Commissioner Lee?

Commissioner Lee: No comment. I come from an art background -- my family. So I like the story about the one immigrant artist who came through the Port because, yeah, a lot of the Chinese immigrants did come through the Port. So that's kind of interesting.

Did the selection go based on -- I mean, how was it really based? Was it based on just the design? Did they come up with a proposal? Or did they -- were more interested in their background, their history?

Marcus Davies: The latter. We're reviewing application materials that essentially contain the artist -- past experience, examples, visual examples of past projects, an artist letter of interest and CV if the panelists are willing to dig down to that level.

But yeah. It's based on past work. Then, the intention of the artist orientation, which is our next step, is to meet with the artist and the project team to give them all of the -- the kind of more intimate knowledge and familiarity of the project site as well as all the technical information that they'll need to develop strong and successful proposals that are absolutely site specific. [crosstalk]

Commissioner Lee: Great. Look forward to see who's the winner.

President Brandon: Thank you. Commissioner Harrington?

Commissioner Harrington: Yes. Thank you for bringing this to us.

Marcus Davies: Of course.

Commissioner Harrington: Looking at some of these proposals -- these aren't proposals -- some of this work that they've done before --

Marcus Davies: That's right.

Commissioner Harrington: -- I'm curious to see what we're going to get for \$136,000. I realize only 40 percent of the total budget here goes to the artist. But for example, Ms. Fernandez's dream thing -- very reminiscent of Ned Kahn. And I think he charges a million dollars for these things.

So I'm hoping we can get some of this because, again, it's -- it seems like a lot of money unless you're trying to do something like that, I realize. So hopefully, it'll work out.

Marcus Davies: You bring up good points and a conversation that we've already started with all of the finalists. And even in the application process, all artists were aware of the budget before even applying.

So it's our job -- the Arts Commission and mine in particular as the project manager -- to work with the artists to ensure that there are successful and impressive proposals that are well within budget and meet all of the goals and the constraints of the project site and we end up with a successful artwork that is durable over a long period of time.



Commissioner Harrington: Good luck.

Marcus Davies: Yeah. Thanks. We've done it before.

President Brandon: Marcus, thank you again. What is my question here? My question here -- what are we looking for at Pier 27? What's the concept for what they're designing?

Marcus Davies: Well, we're looking for an artwork that really speaks to the goals that I've kind of outlined in -- working with -- in partnership with the Port and BCDC. We want an artwork that is responsive to these core -- sorry it's not back up on the screen -- but the core project goals, the invitation to visitors, visibility along the Embarcadero, highlighting the connection to the bay and the plaza space itself for the cruise ship visitors as well as the casual visitors to the plaza space.

We want to make sure that the artwork is accessible in all possible ways, that it's accommodating and appropriately scaled to the site and that the artwork should be fabricated with sustainable and durable materials that are suitable to -- to be honest, a tough marine environment that will demand a lot of the artwork and the artists' choice in their material palette. So it all kind of folds back to these project goals that we've outlined at the outset of the project.

President Brandon: Thank you. Thank you.

Marcus Davies: Mm-hmm.

President Brandon: And I'm sorry I missed that.

Marcus Davies: No. That's fine.

President Brandon: So it's just really open to what they conceive. And at this point, these three will be giving you renderings of their vision.

Marcus Davies: While working closely with Arts Commission staff and, in particular, our conservation team, again to make sure that there are no missteps during the conceptual phase and that they are ultimately delivering an artwork proposal that, you know, speaks to and addresses the project goals as appropriate to the site, is within budget, to Commissioner Harrington's point.

And that really is a process that we, the Arts Commission, pride ourselves on. And it is generally a three-month process where we are working intimately and very regularly with all three artists in their proposal development phase.

So we start to get a sense of what their proposals look like early on and then work with them within reason to shape them into something that is wholly



appropriate to the site and presentable to the final selection panel and our commissioning bodies.

President Brandon: Thank you. I really want to commend you on the great outreach that you've done and to the artists that you have submitting proposals because this is great work. I think any of these three could give us a great product. And hopefully, it fits within budget.

Marcus Davies: It has to be.

President Brandon: Right. Right. So next time we see you, we're going to see the selected proposal?

Marcus Davies: That's right. That's right.

President Brandon: Okay.

Marcus Davies: And potentially even --

President Brandon: Looking forward to it.

Marcus Davies: -- hear from our selected artist, which would be a great addition to the process.

President Brandon: That'd be great.

Marcus Davies: That's what we do for our commissioners and our committees. So if you'd entertain it, I think that would be --

President Brandon: Definitely.

Marcus Davies: Fantastic.

President Brandon: We'd definitely like to see the winner.

Marcus Davies: And we're excited to just continue a very successful kind of long-term partnership with the Port that has produced some really great public art in the past.

President Brandon: Yes. Yes.

Marcus Davies: So just continuing in that tradition and those footsteps.

President Brandon: Yeah. I was on the selection committee for the Bayview Gateway, which came out really nice. Love that project also.

Marcus Davies: That's wonderful work down there. Yeah.

President Brandon: Mm-hmm.

Marcus Davies: Yeah.

President Brandon: Thank you. We look forward to seeing you again.

Marcus Davies: All right. We'll see you soon. Thank you, everyone.

Commissioner Gilman: Thank you.

### **13. NEW BUSINESS**

Director Forbes: I have not recorded new business from the discussion. Is there any other new business?

Commissioner Gilman: I have one. I just have a request for a briefing from staff and from Hudson Pacific on the plans to revamp and modernize and refresh aspects of the Ferry Building.

President Brandon: Any other new business? If not, can I have a motion to adjourn?

### **14. ADJOURNMENT**

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

President Brandon: The meeting is adjourned at 5:02 p.m.