



**Public Meeting of the Port's Northern Advisory Committee (NAC)
March 20, 2024 (5:30 to 7:30 pm)
In-person at Pier 1 and remote via MS Teams**

Meeting Notes

NAC Members Present

Katy Liddell, (Co-Chair), South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay Neighborhood Association
Jane Connors (Co-Chair), Ferry Building, Hudson Pacific Partners
Ted Choi, City Kayak, Pier 40
Shani Krevsky, Exploratorium
Bruno Kanter, North Beach Neighbors
Stewart Morton, San Francisco Heritage
Carol Parlette, Golden Gateway Commons Resident
Vivian Perez, Metro Events
Bob Iwersen, Gateway Apartments
Alec Bash, Alternate for Bob Iwersen
Stan Hayes, Telegraph Hill Dwellers

NAC Members Absent

Marc Dragun, Brannan Homeowners Association
Flicka McGurrin, Pier 23 Café
Bob Harrer, Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association
Diana Taylor, Alternate for Bob Harrer
Ritika Puri, Watermark Homeowners Association
Mahesh Katwani, Alternate for Ritika Puri
Al Fontes, Alternate for Stan Hayes

Port Staff

Patrick Foster, Planning and Environment, NAC Coordinator
David Beaupre, Planning and Environment, NAC Coordinator
Sandi Oberle, Real Estate, NAC Coordinator
Diane Oshima, Planning and Environment

Presenters

Luiz Barata, Port Waterfront Resilience Program
Cathy Hickey, Port Park Services and Open Space

Audience

Bob Hanley
Penny Wells
Alice Rogers

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

- Katy Liddell acknowledged the recent passing of Jerry Levine and his many contributions to the San Francisco waterfront over the years.
- Jane Connors announced new restaurants coming to the Ferry Building.
- Next NAC meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 15, 2024.
- Roll call for committee members.

2. Approval of Draft Meeting Notes: NAC January 17, 2023 meeting (5:45 - 5:50pm)

Meeting notes not yet reviewed, Patrick Foster to follow up with co-chairs for approval.

3. Waterfront Resilience Program: Presentation and Q&A on the Draft Plan for the San Francisco Waterfront Flood Study, which was released for public comment at the end of January. The Draft Plan addresses coastal flood risk and effects of sea level rise for the 7.5 miles of waterfront within the Port of San Francisco's jurisdiction. – Luiz Barata, SF Port (5:50 - 6:40pm)

Q&A

- Jane Connors – If there is an interest from NAC to provide written comments, what is the best way to provide them?
 - Luiz Barata – Best to submit online directly to the Army Corps, the link provided in the presentation is also on the Port's website.
- Bob Iwersen – How are new projects being considered as part of these plans?
 - Luiz Barata – New projects take into account the latest sea level rise projections at the time of design.
- Stan Hayes – The Ferry Building and other structures will be moved and it is unclear how many pilings will be required. When the pile driving starts along the waterfront it will likely be very disruptive due to noise, so this is a concern. What is going to happen to traffic that normally uses the Embarcadero? Major disruptions in this portion of the waterfront will continue for a long time and will disproportionately affect this area near the piers. If you look to see where sea level rise is greatest it is not in this area. There is a model developed by NOAA that calculates where sea level rise would be for different parts of the City. The effect along the northern waterfront is less pronounced than the flooding that occurs in the financial district and south. We do understand that something must be done here, but we want to be sure to understand alternatives and what the magnitude of impacts will be. Are the methods available for traffic diversion and construction adequate to address potential issues?
 - Luiz Barata – We recognize there will be impacts. This is a plan to get federal interest, therefore it is a high level plan and it is still unclear exactly how much of the Embarcadero will be involved. In some areas it will only affect northbound lanes up to the light rail, in front of the Ferry Building we may have to extend out to the southbound lanes. The technology and methods of construction employed will consider noise impacts. We also know there is concern about construction at nighttime. This will all need to be defined/addressed through further community engagement.
 - David Beaupre – The northern waterfront is actually lower than most parts of the waterfront, for example in south beach the elevation of piers and wharves are higher so less work is proposed there. In the northeast the first move is more dramatic and the economic interest is higher.
- Alec Bash – Excellent presentation, I understand that details will need to be resolved as time goes on. Appreciate Stan's comments and concerns about ongoing disruption. When the freeway came

down the city had to re-do the entire roadway, and there was a lot of thought on how the traffic could be handled. The goal was something beautiful as well as providing an efficient route for traffic. If walls are built around the piers and water comes up underneath, will there be a bathtub effect that impacts the piers?

- Luiz Barata – My understanding is that once the water starts to get to the bottom of the piers, the pier will need to be elevated or removed at some point. The walls primarily help with wave runup rather than sea level rise.
- Carol Parlette – If the piers are going to be raised, how will one get from the Embarcadero to the piers?
 - Luiz – We are aiming for a solution that creates a gradual terraced change of grade so nobody experiences a wall. The physical connection should still be accessible. Detailed plans are not available yet, the design will depend on the layout of the Embarcadero, transit lanes, loading/unloading, etc.
- Shani Krevsky – The early projects, such as the MTA improvements to the bike lane should be interwoven with this work. Staging/sequencing may need to be revisited to avoid work being torn out and causing extra delays, and diverting traffic through neighborhoods and addressing the business continuity will be critical. For stormwater management, thinking about the walls/upturned dikes along the finger piers, right now there is natural drainage, bathtubs at finger piers would need to be conveyed in a different manner.
- Ted Choi – Would also like to see the benefit of storm preparedness highlighted as we talk about sea level rise preparedness. One of the benefits would be in the design, as we raise the walls we could incorporate how to mitigate storm/wave actions more effectively. Last year a large storm took out barge at Pier 40 and I've seen firsthand a lot of damage to the docks here, including to a Coast Guard facility. A few years ago we had up to 80mph wind action which is not too unusual.
- Stewart Morton – I'm concerned how the long term plan affects our short term plans, including the potential loss of eleven palm trees in the southern embarcadero due to the MTA bike trail.
 - David Beaupre – For current projects/investments, we are considering that some may end up needing some reconstruction as part of this work. The work MTA is doing now is light touch, and Port finds that the benefits it will provide now are worth it even if it may need to be redone in 10-15 years. The palm trees may be impacted but we are looking at ways to minimize this. For Strada's project at Piers 30-32 it will be built at the necessary elevation to serve as a permanent investment in resilience along the waterfront.

4. Brannan St. Wharf Park: Update and discussion on the Port's proposed effort to activate Brannan St. Wharf Park, including outdoor volleyball. – Cathy Hickey, SF Port (6:40 - 7:15pm)

Q&A

- Bob Iwersen – At Sue Bierman park people started using it for games but would get kicked off from using the park this way.
 - Cathy Hickey – That park is operated by SF Rec and Park. For this park we would get the standard volleyball poles with standard net that would be left up throughout the day and then we can mark out the court on the lawn. There is a fencing option if there are issues with the balls going into the street.
- Katy Liddell – Are park restrooms being considered?
 - Cathy Hickey – There are currently no restroom plans, we want to start with activating the court only.
- Jane Connors – Great idea to activate the park, this will add to surrounding uses. The bocce courts we put in across from the Ferry Building have transformed that area and brings all sorts of people to participate. Otherwise the area was very underused.

- Alec Bash – Very enthusiastically supporting this proposal. Would like Port to consider going beyond this park, consider the lawn at the Cruise terminal. This was explored in the past as a possible site for volleyball tournaments 2-3x per year. There were previous restrictions on driving stakes into the lawn there. Please look again at this location.
 - David Beaupre – We can definitely look again at this.
- Alice Rogers – Over the years our neighborhood association SBRMBNA has received comments that they would like to see activation at Brannan Street. This is a great idea for providing a diversification of uses. Please also make sure the existing dog walking community still has space to use, should be able to co-exist well. Also at Piers 38-40 we are hoping to help activate that area in the long run. This could feed into their overall vision.
- Katy Liddell – In big favor of this, a great use for the park.