



Waterfront Plan Working Group

Meeting: September 15, 2016

Meeting Notes

Present: Grant Ballard, Kirk Bennett, Troy Campbell, Kevin Carroll, Chris Christensen, Jane Connors, Linda Fadeke Richardson, Jon Golinger, Pia Hinckle, Carolyn Horgan, Aaron Hyland, Earl James, Ellen Johnck, Janice Li, Ron Miguel, Stewart Morton, Rudy Nothenberg, Jacquelyn Omotalade, Karen Pierce, Alice Rogers, Jasper Rubin, Cristina Rubke, Peter Summerville, Dilip Trivedi, Anne Turner, Corinne Woods, Dee Dee Workman

Absent: Reid Boggiano, Mike Buhler, Jeffrey Congdon, Ken Kelton, Tom Radulovich, John Tobias

1. Welcome and Acceptance of July 6, 2016 Working Group Meeting Notes
 - Co-Chair Rudy Nothenberg welcomed attendees
 - Working Group accepted June 1, 2016 Meeting Notes
 - Links to [Working Group documents](#) and [SFGovTV meeting video](#)
2. Relationship between the Waterfront Land Use Plan, Port Strategic Plan and Port Capital Plan

Interim Port Director Elaine Forbes provided information on how the Port's other Planning Documents relate to the Waterfront Land Use Plan:

- Port's 10-Year Capital Plan describes and quantifies in dollars the capital needs required to address deferred maintenance of Port facilities to bring them to a state of good repair and maintain them at that level. It looks out ten years and is updated bi-annually. Port capital needs are estimated at \$2 billion and vastly exceed available Port resources. More details are available in Part 1 meeting documents on the 10 Year Capital Plan.
- The Port Strategic Plan provides a framework of strategic goals and objectives that expresses the Port Commission's guidance on operations and projects to carry out the Port's mission. The Strategic Plan has a 5 year time horizon and will be updated annually. Some of the projects and initiatives included focus on Port operational and business needs and priorities; others reflect Waterfront Plan objectives and goals.

Responses to Questions:

- Is there anything the Working Group does that may conflict with the Strategic Plan? No. If there were a change in the direction of the Waterfront Plan, that would drive changes in the

Strategic Plan. The Capital Plan similarly may be amended as needed in response to changes that come from the Waterfront Plan Update.

- Does the Strategic Plan address resilience? Yes, the Strategic Plan reflects the Port's focus on seismic reinforcement of the Seawall, a key priority for a more resilient waterfront. The Port Commission is well aware of the importance of the waterfront to support City emergency response needs after an earthquake.

3. Part 2 Subcommittee Public Planning Process

Diane Oshima, Assistant Deputy Director, Waterfront Planning:

- Expressed gratitude for the Working Group and Advisory Team participation in the Part 1 Orientation process. A summary of all the Part 1 topics and Working Group public discussions has been published in a Waterfront Plan Update Part 1 [Overview of the Port of San Francisco](#). This report is intended to encourage further public participation in the Waterfront Plan Update, and -inform members of the public who are new to the process.
- In the [Part 2 process](#) of the Waterfront Plan Update, the Working Group will be divided into three subcommittees to address policy issues: Land Use, Resilience and Transportation. Each subcommittee has been assigned specific Port staff. Sub-Committee Chairs are Alice Rogers (Land Use), Dilip Trivedi (Resilience) and Linda Fadeke Richardson (Transportation). The topical names of the subcommittees do not limit the scope of their discussions; it is anticipated that each subcommittee will address interrelated historic preservation, open space, land use, financial and other issues, as needed. All subcommittee meetings are public meetings; Working Group and Advisory Team members are encouraged to attend any meetings in addition to the subcommittee on which they serve. In addition to meeting notes for each sub-committee meeting, subcommittee chairs will periodically report on the progress of their sub-committees to the Working Group.
- The Part 2 meeting schedule is under development and the estimated time range is from October 2016 to March 2017.

Responses to Working Group Questions:

- Is Port staff using online tools to maximize meeting attendance? Staff had asked Working Group members to reserve Wednesday evenings for subcommittee meetings; staff needs to work with each subcommittee to define specific dates. It is not pre-determined how many meetings each subcommittee may need; staff is prepared to manage schedule changes as needed.
- What is the role of the Advisory Teams in Part 2? Have they been meeting? Part 1 did not involve heavy Advisory Team participation, although staff has met with the majority of Advisory

Teams to provide information on the process. Part 2 Subcommittee meetings will be structured so as to engage more active participation from Advisory Team members.

- What role will maritime have in the Subcommittees structure? Maritime issues have an elevated presence in the Proposed Guiding Principles to reflect its importance. The nature of the Port Commission prioritizes maritime issues, and there is a general understanding that maritime issues remain a key value.
- Is the Part 2 timeframe sufficient? The schedule is not set in stone and Port staff is open and will manage time in response to Working Group/subcommittee needs.

What are the Subcommittee deliverables from the subgroups? Will we receive list of issues to resolve? Port staff reported to the Port Commission the various policy issues and questions for Part 2. The Sub-Committees will be provided with specific issues/questions in the subject areas they are intended to cover. The subcommittee meeting discussions should produce recommendations and/or policy language to the Working Group as a whole.

4. Discussion of the [Proposed Guiding Principles](#)

Co-chairs Janice Li and Rudy Nothenberg led the review and discussion of each:

- The proposed Guiding Principles are intended to provide a frame of reference for the Part 2 subcommittee meetings. They are not set in stone nor intended to constrain subcommittee discussions. The proposed Guiding Principles are intended to express points of agreement from the Part 1 Working Group meetings; each will be reviewed at this meeting to determine if the Working Group wants to accept them as provided or propose amendments. Since the Working Group is not a voting group, any decision will be consensus based.

[Please view the videotape of this Working Group meeting to track details of the discussion and exchange on the Guiding Principles:

http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=183&clip_id=26164]

- Proposed Guiding Principle 1 regarding the Seawall and Sea Level Rise was approved by consensus.
- Proposed Guiding Principle 2 regarding Finance was deemed accepted.

[Guiding Principles 3 and 4, which were deferred to later in the meeting.]

- Proposed Guiding Principle 5, regarding maritime commitment was deemed accepted
- Proposed Guiding Principle 6, regarding discussion of Port historic resources and aspirational goals included comments about the desire for the Waterfront Plan to continue to express aspirational goals even while recognizing financial and other challenges or constraints. Staff was directed to work on revisions to reflect the spirit of the Working Group discussion, for review at a future meeting.

- Proposed Guiding Principle 7, regarding Transportation was deemed accepted, with changes to address regional and State interrelationships.
- Proposed Guiding Principles 3 and 4, regarding historic rehabilitation in the Embarcadero Historic District involved extensive Working Group discussion, which include the below points, but no conclusions were reached. Further review of these Guiding Principles was continued to the next Working Group meeting.
 - The proposed language “the Waterfront Plan should provide greater flexibility” in order to raise funding to protect historic facilities opens the door to extending flexibility to other areas of the waterfront beyond the Embarcadero historic district. Wording should be tighter to express the reasons or purpose for which flexibility could be considered.
 - Guiding Principles 3, 4 and the 4th bullet of Guiding Principle 6 regarding seawall lots seems to be based on a premise of promoting more development, and should be posed as questions rather than statements.
 - Does the Waterfront Plan Update process require the Working Group to approve all 7 Guiding Principles? If we don’t have support for Guiding Principles 3 and 4, can they be delegated to the subcommittees instead?
 - At direction of co-chairs, staff is requested to revise Guiding Principles 3 and 4, and remove reference to seawall lots in Guiding Principle 6, and return at the October 5th Working Group meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:05pm.