

# Designing for Resilience Workshop

March 1, 2017

## Summary of Table Reports and Wall Notes

This matrix provides a Draft Summary of public comments received at the March 1, 2017 Designing for Resilience Public Workshop. Many of these comments relate to topics and policy discussions by the Waterfront Plan Working Group's Resilience, Land Use, and Transportation Subcommittees. The matrix includes color-coded text to indicate the Subcommittee which most closely relates to the public comments. This Draft Summary was presented at the 4.19.17 Resilience Subcommittee Meeting. The color-coded key in the upper right hand corner provides further detail.

- **Blue Text** – Comments considered in development of Draft Resilience Policy Ideas
- **Orange Text** – Best addressed in Transportation Subcommittee
- **Green Text** -- Best addressed in Land Use Subcommittee
- **Black Text** – Not specifically addressed (e.g., too detailed, pre-mature, inconsistent with Guiding Principles or preponderance of opinion, should be addressed by full Working Group. etc.)

	Historic Preservation	Views and Access	Urban Form	Resilience	Transportation	Land Use	Ecology	What Else?
<b>Table 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Persevere in preservation; consider creative, flexible options.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance public access into the Bay where possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider “graceful retreat” where piers or land might not be savable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop multi-pronged solutions (e.g., that benefit maritime, recreation, transportation and/or the economy.)</li> <li>• Educate the public about SLR and other resilience challenges; consider “interpretative” signage along the waterfront.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance waterborne transit wherever possible.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide opportunities for habitat enhancement, particularly for in-Bay solutions to sea level rise adaptation and/or seismic risk.</li> </ul>	
<b>Table 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The historic district, the seawall, the finger piers and bulkhead buildings, are all valuable and important resources that the City should protect and retain, as much as possible.</li> <li>• Do a better job educating the public about the importance of these resources through photos, displays, and information campaigns.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect open access and connections to the Bay.</li> <li>• Access should be equitable/democratic, not just for those who can “afford” to pay for it.</li> <li>• Resilience projects should look to improve such access, if possible, e.g., levees, marshes, walkways, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SLR maps indicate that the waterfront experience in 2100 will be very different than it is today. So, in 2100, what would we like to have retained from the present; what new opportunities will resilience projects provide?</li> <li>• Consider SLR interventions that include Bay fill, perhaps at a large enough scale that new real estate could be leased or sold to help finance resilience infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some values may be applicable across entire waterfront, but others may have a more specific geographic location (e.g. public views may be very important in some but not all areas; preventing inundation into Muni tunnel is important only in the Ferry Building area)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although some existing uses may be lost due to SLR or major public works projects, resilience projects also should incorporate new maritime berths and recreational uses.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid seawall and sea level rise solutions that create “financial barriers” to public enjoyment of the Bay in order to raise revenue for needed improvements.</li> </ul>
<b>Table 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This table was not that enthused about traditional Port issues-maritime and historic resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide more access to the water; a more “intimate” shoreline.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard shorelines can be desirable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare for disasters and protect the City – not just the Port.</li> <li>• Consider critical linkages with the City for transit, utilities, disaster preparedness, stormwater and watershed flooding.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider adjacent upland land uses.</li> <li>• Need more space overall, especially for biking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foster oyster and other habitat.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider prioritizing areas where investments already have been made.</li> </ul>
<b>Table 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve all resources for as long as possible; then prioritize Ferry Building to Fisherman’s Wharf.</li> <li>• Avoid harming northern waterfront buildings.</li> <li>• An “all Embarcadero” seawall solution could improve transportation &amp; reduce impacts on historic resources, but doesn’t address SLR.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It’s critical to see the water from the street.</li> <li>• Improve public access and views to the water; be flexible as they evolve over time.</li> <li>• Solutions should further connect people to the Bay (not lessen connections)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider how the City meets the water.</li> <li>• Consider making structures float.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seismic improvements should accommodate future SLR adaptations.</li> <li>• Take a flexible, agile approach to resilience planning.</li> <li>• Consider different solutions for different parts of the waterfront; take advantage of greater flexibility for shoreline solutions in the Southern Waterfront.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid disruption to landside transportation.</li> <li>• Expand and upgrade water transportation, both to ease construction impacts and to provide a long term solution/alternative to landside congestion.</li> <li>• Consider putting transportation in an underground tunnel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve maritime operations, consistent with the Public Trust; maritime functions are intimately connected to historic preservation.</li> <li>• Provide opportunities for new recreation and easier access to the water.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase habitat and ecological function.</li> <li>• Consider living shorelines in the Southern Waterfront.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs matter; its hard to prioritize until there is financial information.</li> <li>• Consider region-wide or Bay-wide solutions (e.g. locks, hydraulic systems or a “super-levee at the Golden Gate”)</li> <li>• Look to the Netherlands and places where technology already is in use for ideas.</li> </ul>

# Designing for Resilience Workshop

March 1, 2017

## Summary of Table Reports and Wall Notes

Draft for Discussion at 4.19.17 Resilience Subcommittee Meeting

This matrix provides a Draft Summary of public comments received at the March 1, 2017 Designing for Resilience Public Workshop. Many of these comments relate to topics and policy discussions by the Waterfront Plan Working Group's Resilience, Land Use, and Transportation Subcommittees. The matrix includes color-coded text to indicate the Subcommittee which most closely relates to the public comment. This Draft Summary was presented at the 4.19.17 Resilience Subcommittee Meeting. The color-coded key in the upper right hand corner provides further detail.

- **Blue Text** – Comments considered in development of Draft Resilience Policy Ideas
- **Orange Text** – Best addressed in Transportation Subcommittee
- **Green Text** -- Best addressed in Land Use Subcommittee
- **Black Text** – Not specifically addressed (e.g., too detailed, pre-mature, inconsistent with Guiding Principles or preponderance of opinion, should be addressed by full Working Group. etc.)

	Historic Preservation	Views and Access	Urban Form	Resilience	Transportation	Land Use	Ecology	What Else?
<b>Table 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve San Francisco's history as represented in the Embarcadero Historic District finger piers and bulkheads.</li> <li>• Stay committed to reconstructing historic buildings impacted by seawall repair.</li> <li>• Consult SHPO/NPS regarding the notion of reconstructing pier sheds/bulkheads at higher elevations – to determine how best to meet historic preservation standards.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aim for a balanced solution that may vary along the seawall; overall interventions may 'zig-zag' along the shore.</li> <li>• Integrate resilience design with the "character" of the adjacent neighborhood</li> <li>• Recognize that The Embarcadero is generally a barrier to the public experience of the waterfront; resilience solutions could change the "form" of The Embarcadero (e.g., underground portions of the roadway &amp; transit system, and also change the shoreline edge through Bay-fill solutions along seawall between and underlying the piers.</li> <li>• Might be very awkward to rebuild one portion of a historic building at a higher elevation than another for sea level rise protection.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan for intentional flexibility &amp; adaptability to respond to changes in science over time</li> <li>• Take the opportunity to improve/enhance old utility infrastructure within The Embarcadero</li> <li>• In other locations, a stronger-fix may be to construct new "edge" outboard of the seawall</li> <li>• Consider projects where the first floor can be inundated with water from time-to-time (Charleston is a model).</li> <li>• Coordinate and problem-solve with other cities around the Bay; leverage common ground</li> <li>• Mimic the design of a living shoreline, with something that has higher public utility and performance, e.g. flatter slope than vertical wall (maybe terraces), that wouldn't need to extend as far into the Bay, with more usable upland area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be fewer vehicles on The Embarcadero in the future (if the trend is that fewer people use cars). The Embarcadero might be narrowed in certain places, to reduce the "barrier" between the City and waterfront.</li> <li>• Focus on people's personal experience of the Embarcadero; resilience project design could improve the pedestrian experience of The Embarcadero.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maritime uses and water access should remain highly valued.</li> <li>• Diversify the experiences available to people that visit the waterfront: try something like the Asian Night Markets - for a colorful, egalitarian way to extend a visit to the waterfront without dining in an expensive restaurant.</li> <li>• The "recreational value" of the Historic District is HIGH: people from all over the state, the world, come to enjoy the historic waterfront. And experience SF culture.</li> </ul>		
<b>Table 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve San Francisco's history as represented in the Embarcadero Historic District finger piers and bulkheads</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain and improve access along the entire waterfront, and connections/access between the City and the Bay.</li> <li>• Increase access, porosity, connections between the land and Bay</li> <li>• Create expansive public views</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow new changes in the Southern Waterfront</li> <li>• Recognize and accept that the waterfront will evolve and transition; take a long-term look at the opportunity for a new shoreline form that offers maximum public benefits, broader than currently available.</li> <li>• Plan for intentional flexibility and adaptability to respond to changes as they arise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximize co-benefits that can be delivered by resilience projects (e.g. more sustainable transportation)</li> <li>• Identify and close places along the shoreline to avert flood entry points, buying time for longer-term adaptation and flood protection.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because of long, disruptive construction periods, plan for transportation services (alternative modes to autos) that move large numbers of people efficiently.</li> <li>• Improve and expand pedestrian and bicycle access as transportation modes to and along the waterfront.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain the diversity of Port businesses to support a variety of jobs and a mix of modern and historical industries, preserving the waterfront's interesting and colorful culture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the ecological benefits of a retreated shoreline.</li> <li>• Provide more focus on ecological values and increased bio-diversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leverage Seawall project to realize planned/desired improvements (e.g. Blue Greenway, transportation )</li> <li>• Economic sustainability – flexible and multiple revenue sources</li> <li>• Consider "triple bottom line" long-term cost-benefit analysis of projects ( e.g. economic, ecology &amp; environment, equity &amp; diversity populations)</li> </ul>
<b>Wall Notes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore acceptable changes to historic district</li> <li>• Be flexible with approaches</li> <li>• Retain bulkheads &amp; piers</li> <li>• Better public information about the resources</li> <li>• Ferry Building to Fisherman's Wharf top priority</li> <li>• The Embarcadero option for seawall improvements did not appear to preserve historic structures.</li> <li>• Explore different options for how or what parts of the historic district should be preserved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important</li> <li>• Be flexible with evolving views</li> <li>• Good access to the City</li> <li>• Solutions should connect people to the Bay</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Values will be unique to the Port's geography</li> <li>• "Graceful Retreat" in some places</li> <li>• Integrate design with the local neighborhood</li> <li>• Acknowledge that the waterfront will be changing – a "graceful retreat" or managed change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieve multiple benefits</li> <li>• Always multi-prong approach (Resilience, Transportation, &amp; Land Use)</li> <li>• Fix the easiest first</li> <li>• Plan for the long term</li> <li>• Port's role in protecting City</li> <li>• Critical linkages for disaster preparedness</li> <li>• Explain future to the public</li> <li>• Explore multiple options and different solutions for different locations</li> <li>• Be flexible &amp; adaptable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should Embarcadero continue in current capacity?</li> <li>• Maintain ease of north/south movement</li> <li>• Support all modes of travel</li> <li>• Better bike access</li> <li>• Integrate water transit into the Bay</li> <li>• Support for The Embarcadero's many travel modes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activate the historic district</li> <li>• Diverse uses</li> <li>• Diversity of Port businesses</li> <li>• New opportunities for recreation &amp; maritime</li> <li>• Focus on the experience of The Embarcadero</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance through best practices</li> <li>• Living shorelines may be best in Southern Waterfront.</li> <li>• Hard edge can be diverse &amp; desirable</li> <li>• Always look for habitat enhancement (e.g. oysters)</li> <li>• Evaluate watershed impacts/benefits</li> <li>• How could living shoreline be adapted to the North?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$ Matters</li> <li>• Consider Bay fill as an economic resource for the City</li> <li>• Explore large scale/regional /global approaches to SLR.</li> </ul>