

**JOINT MEETING OF THE CENTRAL WATERFRONT ADVISORY GROUP  
AND NORTHEAST WATERFRONT ADVISORY GROUP  
MEETING MINUTES**

**March 20, 2019**

**Pier 1 - The Embarcadero at Washington Street, San Francisco**

**5:30 – 7:30 p.m.**

**Attendees:**

**Central Waterfront Advisory Group**

**Members:**

Toby Levine, Mission Bay Resident  
Chris Wasney, Preservation Architect  
Marc Dragun, The Brannan HOA  
Katy Liddell, South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay  
Neighborhood Association  
Howard Wong, Heritage/SPUR  
Katherine Doumani, Dogpatch Neighborhood  
Association  
Ted Choy, City Kayak Pier 40

Michael Franklin, Levi's Plaza  
Michael Gougherty, WETA  
Stephanie Greenburg, SoTel Top of Broadway  
CBD  
Bob Harrer, Barbary Coast Neighborhood  
Association  
Bob Iwersen, Golden Gate Tenants Association  
Flicka McGurrin, Pier 23 Café  
Cathy Merrill, SPUR  
Marina Secchitano, Inland Boatman's Union  
Diana Taylor, Barbary Coast Neighborhood  
Association

**CWAG Members Absent:**

Jasper Rubin, SFSU Geography Department  
Ritika Puri, The Watermark HOA  
Jaime Whitaker, South Beach/Rincon/Mission  
Bay Neighborhood Association  
Ralph Wilson, Potrero Boosters  
Corinne Woods, Mission Creek Resident,  
Mission Bay Citizens Advisory Committee

**Port Staff:**

Mark Paez, CWAG Coordinator  
Ming Yeung, NEWAG Coordinator  
Byron Rhett, Chief Operating Officer  
Lindy Lowe, Resiliency Director  
Kari Kilstrom, Planning Staff  
Randy Quezada, Government Relations  
Colette Borsodi, Planning Intern

**Northeast Waterfront Advisory Group**

**Members:**

Jane Connors, Hudson Properties  
Stewart Morton, San Francisco Heritage  
Jon Golinger, Telegraph Hill Dwellers  
Carol Parlette, Golden Gateway Commons  
Bruno Kanter, North Beach Neighbors  
Kelsey Bauer, Pier 29 Metro Events  
Pam Perez, Pier 29 Metro Events

**City Staff**

Bessie Tam, SF PUC  
Beatriz Florez Huertas, SF PUC  
Emily Cohen, Mayor's Office  
Kaki Marshall, Department of Homelessness  
and Supportive Housing (HSH)  
Rachel Alonzo, SF Public Works  
Sam Dodge, SF Public Works

**NEWAG Members Absent:**

Alec Bash, Interested Citizen  
Kim Bernet, Exploratorium  
Roy Chan, Chinatown CDC  
Arthur Chang, SF Tomorrow

**Audience:**

John Friedrich, Bridgeview Resident  
Earl Gee, Portside Resident  
Linda Moriarty  
TJ Hsiang  
Chris Curtis, Resident  
D. Drue, Resident  
Roe Gallo Zocchi, Resident  
Linda We, Resident  
Jo Anne, Resident  
Jeanne Lyons, Resident  
Judy Dundas, Resident  
Alan Dundas, Resident  
Christy Scrivano, Resident  
Paul Scrivano, Resident  
Teal Taylor, Resident

Michael Taylor, Resident  
John Cornwell, Resident  
Garret Law, Brannan Street Resident  
Kirk Byers, Resident  
Barbara Burlington, Resident  
Michael Wen, Resident  
Wallace Lee, Resident  
Garrick Mitchler, Work/East Cut CBD  
Bill Hannan, Resident  
Robert Scripp, Resident  
Alice Rogers, South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay  
Neighborhood Association  
Marcus Da Cunha, Resident  
Mahesh Khatwani, Resident  
Jean Roebuck, Resident  
Shelley Carroll, Brannan Resident  
Peggy Fahnestock, The Radiance

## **1. Announcement and Introductions**

- Toby Levine welcomed everybody and advisory group members introduced themselves.
- Mark Paez announced that the next Port Commission meeting is scheduled for March 12<sup>th</sup> and the next CWAG meeting is scheduled for April 17<sup>th</sup>. He highlighted some items of interest on the Port Commission calendar.
- Ming Yeung announced that there is no final date set for the next NEWAG meeting but the upcoming meeting will likely include an update on the Historic Piers RFP and/or the Waterfront Land Use Plan.
- Jon Golinger, NEWAG representative for Telegraph Hill Dwellers announced that his organization had met with Port staff on the proposed RFP and had been advised by Diane Oshima that the RFP and amendments to the Waterfront Land Use Plan would be issued in late May 2019 and that both items would return to the Port Commission prior to returning to the advisory committee meeting.
- Carol Parlette thanked Kelsey Bauer, the representative from Metro Events for providing the email update with upcoming Metro Events.

## **2. Approval of Draft Minutes - Mark Paez and Ming Yeung**

- The NEWAG October 17, 2018 draft minutes were approved
- The CWAG January 16, 2019 draft minutes were approved with the correction spelling errors.

## **3. SFPUC Force Main Rehabilitation at Embarcadero and Jackson Street – Update on the SFPUC Force Main rehabilitation work anticipated to begin Fall 2019.**

Bessie Tam, SFPUC Project Manager provided an update on the project. Bessie's presentation can be viewed [here](#). Bessie explained that the objective of the project is to repair corroded sewer infrastructure and to meet SFPUC's Level of Service to provide redundancy to critical sewer infrastructure. SFPUC staff recommends daytime work on The Embarcadero due to construction noise that cannot be mitigated and based on lessons learned from night work for emergency contracts. SFPUC is prepared to conduct extensive outreach throughout the project. The work is anticipated to take 16 months and require lane closures along the Embarcadero. The Port's approval is sought through an MOU and encroachment permit. The SFPUC also plans to execute an agreement with the Ferry Building to enter Seawall Lot 351. Bessie concluded by stating that PUC hopes to advertise for the contract in April with construction starting in Fall 2019 but work may not start until January 2020. The project is scheduled to be completed by Spring 2021 and will require daily closure of north and south bound lanes of traffic on the Embarcadero.

Mark Paez stated that because there are of the large number of members of the public in attendance wishing to speak on Item 5 he would be monitoring time on each agenda item. Toby

Levine explained that there were six minutes left for Q&A and that she would reserve three minutes for the advisory group and three minutes for the general public.

**Advisory Group Questions/Comments:**

**Question:** Is the slip liner a physical pipe? If so how does it bend?

**Response:** Yes it is a physical pipe, and we will cut and cover to access at the bends so the pipe will not be bent.

**Question:** Is there a need for rodent control?

**Response:** Yes, the SFPUC will coordinate with the rodent control experts.

**Question:** Will the work emit any smell?

**Response:** The work should not emit any smell since most of the work will be enclosed, however if it does, the SFPUC will use odor control masking agents.

**Question:** Will there be artwork on the electrical boxes on the sidewalk?

**Response:** We don't have any plans for that as of now, but we are open to it and can look into it.

**Public Questions/Comments:**

**Question:** Your presentation did not deal with bicycle traffic on the Embarcadero, how do you plan on addressing that?

**Response:** Typically bicyclists are re-routed to merge with traffic but we will look into this further with SFMTA, and we will present the traffic routing information to the bicycle coalition.

**Comment:** I think that should be further looked at.

**Comment:** Now I know that NEWAG and CWAG are not just connected by interests, but also by the sewer system.

- 4. Port of San Francisco Resiliency Planning** – Briefing on the Port's resiliency efforts, including the seawall earthquake safety program, the SF Planning-MTA-Port Islais Creek Caltrans Grant, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' General Investigation study.

Lindy Lowe, Port Resiliency Director, provided an update on what the Port has been doing to advance the resilience program and analyze the risks and hazards to San Francisco. Lindy's presentation can be viewed [here](#).

**Advisory Group Questions/Comments:**

**Question:** There was a slide that showed the online site where people can comment on the hazards. Can you explain why it is important for people do this and how the information collected will be used?

**Response:** We are going through all of the comments, from both the meetings and online, and we are addressing the seismic and flooding risks accordingly. For example if we hear nothing about preserving historic resources, it will be difficult to make their protection a priority. If we had a proposal to protect them, but had no evidence of public concern regarding the matter, some agencies would question why they should care. We are pulling from the comments provided to make changes to our goals, priorities and principles.

**Question:** You mentioned visiting Mission Bay and Islais Creek communities and facilitating meetings, but how are you addressing the Dogpatch neighborhood?

**Response:** Our flood studies include the entire 7.5 miles of waterfront, including the central waterfront, so those communities can choose which meeting to come to.

**Comment:** Islais Creek is on the southern border of Dogpatch, but we don't consider it part of that neighborhood. You should come and present to the Dogpatch Neighborhood Association.

**Response:** Yes, I will follow-up on that.

**Question:** Ocean Beach is its own resilience project. Are these two efforts coordinating with one another?

**Response:** Yes, we work closely with the Planning Department, the Office of Resiliency, SFMTA and SF Recreation and Parks, to share “lessons learned” and learn from one another's experiences. One thing that Ocean Beach did that we might try is a scenario planning approach.

**Public Questions/Comments:**

**Question:** What time are the community meetings at?

**Response:** The meetings are held in the evenings, and we always provide refreshments. We also go out and meet with groups, and in those cases we often meet during the day.

**Comment:** Thank you, I am glad to hear that.

- 5. SWL 330 Temporary Navigation Center** – Informational presentation on Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) proposal to build a new temporary Shelter Access for Everyone (SAFE) Navigation Center on Seawall Lot 330 at Bryant, Brannan and the Embarcadero.

Mark Paez introduced the agenda item by announcing first there would be a Port presentation by Randy Quezada and then an HSH presentation by Emily Cohen. These will be followed by advisory group member comments, and then public comment and that the public would be limited to two minutes each and would be timed so that as many speakers as possible can be heard. Mark also explained that the advisory groups do not make a decision or vote on matters but do provide

comment that helps to inform Port staff, the Port Commission and HSH. Mark asked all meeting participants to read the posted ground rules of conduct and stated that in order to participate in the meeting parties are required to conduct themselves accordingly. He also stated that it may be possible for advisory group members and the public to stay in the lobby and discuss issues further with City staff and that copies of the written comments received to date are available while the supply lasts.

Toby Levine, the CWAG Co-chair added that the advisory group will hear from Randy first, Emily second and then the committee will ask its questions followed by the public and that all comments received will be shared with the Port Commission and posted on the Port's website.

Mark followed up by stating that Port staff will try to have these comments posted within a week, with the help of the interns, and that the committee will consider the comments and may decide to write a letter to the Port Commission to provide them with a summary of the advisory group meeting.

Randy Quezada, Port Communications Director began by offering to post the Dogpatch Navigation Center Interagency Agreement on the Port's website, as model for SWL 330. Randy stated that lease terms have not been settled, and could include provisions for termination if the site is needed for long-term development.

Emily Cohen, Mayor's Office Policy Advisory on Homelessness presented the proposed Navigation Center at Seawall Lot 330 and can be viewed [here](#). Emily's presentation pointed out additional mitigation measures that are proposed as result of the public input received to date that address cleanliness and safety. Emily introduced the project team:

**Project Team**

Emily Cohen, Mayor's Office

Kaki Marshall, HSH

Rachel Alonzo, DPW

Sam Dodge, DPW

Emily stated that she and her colleagues were taking note of the public comment and ideas presented as they conduct their community outreach including the concept of a "safety zone" around the Navigation Center. She explained the concept of a safety zone as a geographic area that would be monitored by San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) to reduce crime through the use of patrols and security cameras, where litter and graffiti would be abated but that the size and specific blocks that would be included had yet to be determined. She stated that the 175 to 225 bed facility Navigation Center would be run the by a non-profit under contract with the City and that the primary candidates for placement in the facility would be unsheltered people along the Embarcadero. She continued by explaining that the facility would be fenced and landscaped in order to fit well with the surrounding residences and neighborhood.

- (CAC suggestion: Get public input on that before finalizing)

**Advisory group comments and questions/comments followed by responses from City staff**

Katherine Doumani, Dogpatch resident and neighborhood association representative stated that Dogpatch Neighborhood Association (DNA) was skeptical of the Central Waterfront Navigation Center when it was first proposed but that DNA worked with the HSH and the City and are now strongly in support of the facility. Katherine said that the system is far from perfect but that over time it has proven to be positive for the neighborhood and that they are now supporting an extension of the facility's lease with the Port. She asked members of the audience to please keep an open mind on the proposal, to work constructively with the City to address their concerns and to arrange for a tour of the Central Waterfront Navigation Center.

**Question:** where are the other Navigation Centers and how do they compare in size with the proposed facility on Seawall Lot 330?

**Response:** Emily stated that there are Navigation Center facilities at:

- 1) 12<sup>th</sup> Street (Civic Center)
- 2) Central Waterfront (25<sup>th</sup> Street)
- 3) SF General Hospital
- 4) Division Circle
- 5) 5<sup>th</sup>/Bryant Streets
- 6) 125 Bayshore Avenue

She also stated that the Central Waterfront Facility contained 64 beds and that the Seawall Lot 330 facility would contain up to 200 beds.

**Question:** What is intended service area or outreach for the Facility?

**Response:** Emily said that the service area had yet to determine and that the City was listening to community for their input on this – to determine the “sweet spot” to invite folks nearest the site first, and best serve this neighborhood.

**Question:** How can the community be assured of the quality/service level for “safety” and “cleanliness?”

**Response:** Emily said that the City was open to discussing expectations and that this discussion would include the SFPD about expected response times and that she would like to discuss neighborhood clean-up further.

**Question:** The quality of the service provider is key to the success of a social service facility and should be chosen carefully.

**Response:** Emily agreed and stated that all service providers are excellent non-profits (St. Vincent de Paul; Five Keys and Episocopal Community Services operate the existing navigation centers).

Before moving on to public comment the advisory group members discussed the process of communication to the Port Commission and City officials the outcome of the meeting. The CWAG members agreed that the proposed Navigation Center would be included on their April agenda so that they could decide how best to formulate their comments and to effectively transmit.

**Public questions/comments and responses from City staff if it was determined that the comment warranted an immediate response**

A total of 15 persons from the South Beach neighborhood commented on the proposed Navigation Center.

**Members of the Public that commented:**

John Friedrich, Bridgeview Resident

Earl Gee, Portside Resident

Linda Moriarty

TJ Hsiang

Chris Curtis, Resident

D. Drue, Resident

Roe Gallo Zocchi, Resident

Linda We, Resident

Jo Anne, Resident

Jeanne Lyons, Resident

Judy Dundas, Resident

Alan Dundas, Resident

Christy Scrivano, Resident

Paul Scrivano, Resident

Teal Taylor, Resident

Michael Taylor, Resident

John Cornwell, Resident

Garret Law, Brannan Street Resident

Kirk Byers, Resident

Barbara Burlington, Resident

Michael Wen, Resident

Wallace Lee, Resident

Garrick Mitchler, Work/East Cut CBD

Bill Hannan, Resident

Robert Scripp, Resident

Alice Rogers, South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay Neighborhood Association

Marcus Da Cunha, Resident



Mahesh Khatwani, Resident  
Jean Roebuck, Resident  
Shelley Carroll, Brannan Resident  
Peggy Fahnstock, The Radiance

All but one speaker spoke against the project and their comments are summarized as follows:

**Question:** What are the proposed planning and environmental safeguards?

**Response:** Rachel Alonso stated that recent legislation will expedite Building Permits and now allow shelter facilities in the subject Zoning Districts, but that otherwise no planning or environmental waivers were authorized. For instance CEQA environmental review will not be waived.

**Question:** the Central Waterfront site is not comparable to Seawall Lot 330 as the 25th Street location is two blocks away from the nearest residential use. Can the City provide South Beach residents with information on all of the other Navigation Centers?

**Comment:** Sex-offender risk is 30 times higher among Homeless (statistics cited). Will sex-offenders be registered within 30-days per California law? Children in neighborhood will be at a higher risk.

**Question:** The size of the proposed facility far exceeds the homeless population in South Beach and should be aligned to reflect the actual need rather and should not import homeless from other neighborhoods. Does the City have data on the homeless population in the neighborhood in order to justify the size of the facility? Neighborhood residents do not see 200 homeless living in the neighborhood.

**Response:** Emily said that the City would research the needs data and provide a public response. She also stated that the City receives requests for greater homeless support along The Embarcadero and that the City goal is to maximize services, wherever possible.

**Comment:** The proposed facility should only serve this neighborhood, and possibly further 'west' in a rectangle and not draw homeless from all along the Waterfront (i.e. to Fisherman's Wharf).

**Question:** Do Navigation Centers have a "magnet effect" drawing more homeless and what happens to those parties that fail the program or get kicked-out for bad behavior, how does the City guarantee these parties do not stay in neighborhood when they are released? Does SFPD have the right to ask people to move on?

**Response:** Kaki Marshall from the Department of Homeless Services stated that not all participants are successful in the program and that the City works hard to not create a "magnet effect". Concerted SFPD/HOT outreach is devoted to addressing the potential negative

consequences of Navigation Centers. She explained that most people that participate in a Navigation Center are committed to turning their life around.

**Comment:** The reality is that City is failing on safety – shattered car windows, etc. Why should neighborhood believe that the largest Navigation Center will be fine? The reality at 5<sup>th</sup>/Bryant is that there are homeless in tents, landscaping is ruined and there is drug dealing nearby.

**Response:** Emily stated that the Navigation Center at 5th and Bryant Streets is across the street from a homeless shelter with 24 hour drop-in services and not at all similar to the program envisioned for Seawall Lot 330.

**Comment:** The beauty of the South Beach neighborhood is the active, festive waterfront with the Embarcadero promenade and not like downtown and other ‘smelly’ areas. The City has not provided a neighborhood impact analysis (including impacts on business, visitors and residents); this is not just a residential area –it is massively residential, i.e. very high-density in a small zone (10K residents). It's disturbing that City isn't discussing the potential impact on the neighborhood. This proposed facility will result in risks to women and children in neighborhood and the City is neglecting its hardworking contributors. More police is not the solution and will not create a suitable place to raise children. The Navigation Center will ruin/destroy the beauty of this area for visitors and residents.

**Question:** Why not consider bussing homeless to a more remote site?

**Response:** Kaki stated that the City has shelters (MSC South) with bus service to them at night, and return to City-center in morning but that the Navigation Centers are different: services/health clinic are provided inside and the social service model is based on research and best practices and the experience here and in other cities across the country.

**Comment:** The advisory groups are responsible to provide guidance to Port and Mayor, serving as watch dogs of the community. The advisory knows that Seawall Lot 330 was tied to Pier 30-32 and that on February 26, 2019 the Port Commission unbundled the two sites for purposes of future development and talked about initiating an RFP process for Seawall Lot 330. Coincidentally eight days later the Mayor announces the Navigation Center proposal. The site is worth \$35 million; Pier 30-32 provides maritime access; parking is currently worth \$400K (1/2 would be fair market value); SWL 330 is approved for housing/affordable housing. The advisory groups should be looking out for the future of the Port and advocating for a higher and better use of the site.

**Comment:** Community outreach is not reaching business owners, and not all residents.

At the conclusion of the item members of the South Beach community provided a list of questions to the City and asked that they be prepared to address the questions at the next public meeting.

Emily provided her contact information (emily.cohen@sfgov.org) and announced that the next public meeting would be at Delancey Street on April 3rd followed by an April 8th presentation at the South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay Neighborhood Association meeting.

**6. Adjourn (7:30 p.m.)**