Approved October 19, 2016 CENTRAL WATERFRONT ADVISORY GROUP MINUTES

August 17, 2016 Port of San Francisco, Bayside Conference Room - 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
Jasper Rubin, SFSU Geography Department
Mahesh Khatwani, Watermark Homeowners
Association
Chris Wasney, SF Heritage
Katy Liddell, South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay
Neighborhood Association
Michael Gerbracht, BAE SF Ship Repair
Howard Wong, Heritage/SPUR
Jamie Whitaker, South Beach/Rincon/Mission
Bay Neighborhood Association
Ralph Wilson, Potrero Boosters
Katherine Doumani, Dogpatch Neighborhood

Port Staff:

Mark Paez, CWAG Coordinator
Byron Rhett, Deputy Director for Planning &
Development
Norma Guzman, Planner
Phil Williamson, Development Project Manager
Ricky Tijani, Development Project Manager
Diane Oshima, Assistant Deputy Planning &
Development
Jamie Hurley, Development Project Manager

CWAG Members absent:

Corinne Woods, Mission Creek Resident Kamala Subbarayan, UCSF Planning

Audience

Association

Roscoe Mapps, SF Giants Sharon Polledri, Russian Hill Resident Hannah Diaz, Planning Student Veronica Sanchez, Westar Marine Rebecca Crump, Craig communications

SFMTA:

Patrick Golier, Transportation Planner

1. Announcements and Introductions

Mark Paez notified the advisory group about future agendas from the Port Commission's Calendar:

September 13, 2016:

- 1. Update on the city's resilience planning by Patrick Otellini (SF Chief Resilience Officer)
- 2. Update on the northern seawall resiliency program
- 3. Informational presentation on the operations and performance of South Beach Harbor (likely to be continued to October)
- 4. Items under Planning & Development related to city and port strategy addressing homeless encampments on port property and the 25th Street Navigation Center

Katy Liddell reported that the South Beach Rincon Neighborhood Association (SBRMBNA) has been working with the Port and SFMTA on pedestrian safety and enjoyment issues on the Embarcadero promenade. She explained that Patrick Golier, SFMTA planner, and the Port were scheduled to come to the September SBRMBNA meeting to discuss some trial measures that the agencies were willing to test on the promenade to improve pedestrian safety. Katy also said that with increased utilization of the promenade pedestrians, bicyclists, skateboarders, Pedi cabs, are experiencing increasing conflicts.

Jasper Rubin announced that the second edition of his book on the San Francisco Waterfront was published and is available on Amazon. He explained that this edition includes more recent development proposals and analyzes the gentrification on the waterfront.

2. Approval of the July 20, 2016 Draft Minutes – Mark Paez

Mark alerted the advisory group members to revisions that staff made to the minutes in response to a concern raised by a member of the public regarding how his comments were recorded in the minutes. Mark explained that CWAG members wishing to do a comparison of the minutes should refer to Page 7, end of Item No. 4. Mark stated that staff did their best to clarify and capture the meaning of the comment by providing additional context. Mark also mentioned that advisory group minutes are a summary and not intended to be a verbatim transcript of the discussion.

Some advisory group members pointed out specific grammatical errors in the draft minutes, and ask that they be corrected. Staff agreed to make the corrections and the draft minutes were approved.

3. Pier 22 – ½ Fire Station No. 35 Expansion Project – Jamie Hurley, Port Development Project Manager and Gabriella Cirelli, DPW Project Manager

Presentation slides available <u>here</u>.

Gabriella Cirelli, DPW Project Manager gave an informational presentation on the expansion of Pier 22 ½ Fire Station. Her comments are summarized as follows:

- This project would be funded by the Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond (ESER) bond which is a General Obligation (GO) bond and that there would be no General Fund money in this project.
- o The project started in 2011, back when this project was part of the ESER 2010 bond. The project was originally envisioned to be developed on Pier 22 ½ and 24, then was considered as a part of the Golden State Warriors project at Piers 30 & 32. Because of these changes the planning has taken several years to progress to the current proposal.
- O The existing Pier 22-1/2 historic fire house was built in 1913 and is a city landmark and a contributing resource within the Embarcadero Historic District.
- O The existing historic structure is very small and contains approximately 4,000 sq. ft. The non-historic shed located on the actual Pier 22-1/2 wharf structure that extends out into the Bay is about 2,000 sq. ft.
- The non-historic structurally unstable Pier 22 ½ and remnants of Pier 24 would be demolished in order to construct a single new facility to meet the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) needs for maritime fire and emergency response operations.
- One of the key considerations in designing a new over water facility is the amount of fill or shadow the project cast on the Bay. Sea level rise is also an important consideration that led the SFFD to design the proposed facility to be a floating rather than fixed structure.

- o SFFD wants to centralize all the water rescue operations and equipment at the Pier 22-1/2 site and to create adequate storage for oil spill response and jet ski equipment, as well as provide co-ed facilities for SFFD staff.
- o SFFD and DPW retained Mary McGrath who is an expert architect in the area of marine facilities for fire stations and has worked with SFFD to figure out what they need and translate that into the basic programming for the facility.
- The proposed project would be a floating platform that will allow the firefighters to move safely from boats onto a level platform in order to more easily fulfill operational requirements. The project would also include a vehicular and pedestrian ramp that would connect to the Embarcadero and the promenade allowing emergency vehicles direct access to the proposed floating fire house facility.
- The majority of the first-floor is would support boat operations where the small boats would be stored to facilitate quicker emergency response. The second-floor would contain living quarters including shower and dining facilities.
- o The floating structure design would limit pile driving significantly because only three guide piles on each side would be needed. The design process will start in April of 2017 and the project is scheduled to finish the by 2020 and be operational early 2021. DPW will be issuing and RFQ for a design build team.

CWAG members expressed the following comments and questions which are followed by SFFD and DPW responses:

• To what degree is the size and capacity of the proposed project to berth three fire boats driven by the fact this facility serves the greater Bay Area and how are you communicating this to the public so that they understand how different this project is from a private development proposal?

Response: Ken Lombardi, Assistant Deputy Chief SFFD stated that the Department needs a new waterfront fire station. We make do with what we have, but the existing facility is inadequate to meet our operational needs. There are 45 fire stations in the city, and this is the only one without separate bathrooms. The facility also lacks ADA access. SFFD receives federal grants since 9/11, 2001 to assist with the cost of operations on the Bay. Much of our equipment is stored in warehouses all over the city. To respond to emergencies SFFD staff to go to multiple locations to get the required equipment which reduces our response time.

Fire Station 35 is becoming a regional facility and asset as Oakland closed its fireboat station. With the growth on the eastern side of this city more people are using the Bay and its shoreline increasing the need for emergency response and rescue services.

• If San Francisco supports other Bay Area cities do they reimburse us for this service?

Response: Ken stated that there is not an established cost recovery system and that reimbursement depends on the location and type of disaster SFFD responds to. In some instances SFFD is part of a mutual aid situation in the state. Further, new fireboat is technically a regional asset because the purchase of the \$12 million received \$10 million in federal funds. The cost recovery issue is a high level policy matter to be addressed by City Hall but currently there's no clear mechanism to collect fees for service from other jurisdictions.

Gabriella stated that the need for a new facility was supported by voter's approving the GO Bond and that the regional serving nature of the facility has not required the need for funding from other jurisdictions.

Where's your third boat?

Response: ken stated that this project was conceived for two fireboats but that SFFD just purchased its third vessel to be commissioned in the near future. So there's a need to berth three boats and the project includes berth space for a three vessels. SFFD will lease the north apron of Pier 26 and repair it to serve as a berth for its three boats in the interim because of the structural deficiencies of the non-historic Pier 22-1/2 wharf structure. The Pier 26 berthing is a separate project between the Port and SFFD that will allow SFFD operations to continue on the waterfront until the new facility is completed and ready for occupancy.

• The Pier 22-1/2 historic firehouse is one of the most attractive sites along the Embarcadero waterfront and the fireboats are a huge part of this attraction. Given this aesthetic sensitivity the design of the new facility requires extra attention in the planning to ensure that its architecture is understood as a composition in conjunction with the Bay Bridge. Some thought should be given to preserving the old waterfront charm that comes from the remaining old wooden piles and piers remnants and if possible the project should incorporate some of that character into the new design.

Gabriella addressed the question by stating that the project will require a special design team and that DPW envisions a three step design build selection process where respondents will be judged by two different panels. One of the key points is when the four short listed firms responding to the RFQ will move forward into a creative interpretation exercise or design competition. The design completion will determine which firms advance to the next phase. She went on to say that DPW was aware of the design sensitivity given the prominent location of the existing historic fireboat house on the Embarcadero. She also explained that DPW is looking at the existing vehicle parking on the south side of the fireboat house that would be removed and how best to maintain public and visual access of the fireboats access in this area between the fireboat house and the Pier 24 Annex Building to the south.

• What phase of the design process is the project in now and have you settled on the steel barge approach for the facility?

Response: Gabriella reported that DPW went through a pretty intense concept phase to look at different ways to approach this design. We have been in this concept phase since the end of 2015. After evaluating four design approaches the floating barge responded favorably to important criteria including environmental impact, sea level rise adaptability for the future, support of the fire operations, and budgetary reasons and is the preferred alternative.

• CWAG has had briefings that indicate that floating structures need breakwaters to deal with tide and current so how will you address this issue at Pier 22-1/2?

Response: Gabriella explained that based on tidal studies the proposed facility would be buffeted by waves over time but when evaluated against the project criteria and is the preferred alternative.

• Could you explain what you mean when you refer to shadowing on the Bay?

Response: Gabriella explained that the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) regulates Bay fill and shadows being cast on the water surface so DPW is trying to meet the space requirements of SFFD most efficiently and in the minimum footprint possible.

• Are any of the structures or the pier historic?

Response: Gabriella said that Fire Station No. 35 is a city landmark and a contributing resource within the Embarcadero Historic District, but that the Pier 22-1/2 wharf structure that extends out into the Bay is not historic. She continued by stating that the fireboat house is going to remain exactly as it is and that the structure has already received some repair work from the ESER bond, the 2010 bond including repairs to the concrete substructure underneath the fire engine bay.

• Does the fireboat house need to be seismically retrofit?

Response: Gabriella said that no seismic retrofit would be needed because the substructure of the fireboat house was previously upgraded and because all fireboat functions would in the new facility which would be designed in accordance with the more stringent Building Code requirements for "essential structures."

• Will the project go through a historic review process?

Response: Mark Paez responded by stating that because the fireboat house is a local landmark the Historic Preservation Commission would review the project for consistency with the requirements of City's historic preservation regulations, Article 10 of the City Planning Code and for the environmental review process under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and.

• Design build procurement raises concerns about the selection process especially and whether it would be set up to be privileged design instead of low cost, what controls will be included, will there be a stipend for phase one of the process and what will part three of the process be like?

Response: Gabriella stated that DPW has thought long and hard about the RFQ process that will include:

Step 1 self-formed teams will be submitting a Minimum Qualifications Assessment, where they state their company's solvencies and years of experience. Then there is a technical submittal where they have to respond to. That's where they review all the work that's gone on before. From that process, a panel is going to shortlist four teams. Those 4 teams are going to move forward onto Step 2.

Step 2 will be a solely creative interpretation exercise. It's going to be a blind design competition where a separate panel of design experts is going evaluate submissions. The three firms that are not selected will be paid a stipend of \$40,000 for having participated in Step 2. Two teams move onto Step 3.

Step 3 will be an interview worth 35% of their score, and 65% will be the cost proposal. The team that is not selected will get a second stipend of \$80,000.

• Will the Port get credit from BCDC for the removal of Bay fill within the project site?

Response: Gabriella explained that the fill to be removed would be subtracted from the amount of fill to be added by the new floating facility.

• Do helicopters play any role in the SFFD emergency rescue operations?

Response: Ken said that helicopters do play a role in their operations but that no helicopter would land at the project site.

• The tidal staircase near Pier 14 is closed off with fencing. As a part of the BCDC public access improvements required for this new facility it would be good to explore whether some improvements could be made to this feature of Rincon Park?

Response: Gabriella said that DPW is open to the possibility and is in early discussions with BCDC about the project and its public access requirements, but understood that BCDC preferred project public access improvements be made onsite whenever possible.

Members of the audience were provided the opportunity to comment on the project:

• Will there be dock space as part of the new floating facility to support the operation of water taxis that could provide another means of emergency transportation to and from the facility?

Response: Gabriella stated that this issue had not come up but that it appears that space would be available to support this additional function and that DPW would consider this function during the project design phase.

4. Embarcadero Roadway Transportation Enhancements – Diane Oshima, Port Planning Manager and Patrick Golier, SFMTA

Patrick Golier and Diane Oshima talked about the Embarcadero Enhancement Project. The Port and SFMTA have partnered on this project because the Port owns the right-of-

way and SFMTA is responsible for the maintenance and operation of transportation improvements. SFMTA is planning for a number of enhancement projects along The Embarcadero as a part of the City's Vision Zero Strategy which seeks to eliminate pedestrian fatalities from conflicts with autos and bicycles. The Embarcadero Enhancement project seeks to improve safety by establishing dedicated areas for autos, pededstrians and bicyclists along The Embarcadero by developing a concept design for a protected bikeway. This would allow the Embarcadero Promenade to be dedicated to pedestrian use only rather than current mixed bike and pedestrian use. Because there currently is no funding to implement the project, Port and SFMTA would like to pilot low-cost interim improvements to test out their effectiveness. One of the interim projects being considered is the use of stencils to convey information that the Promenade is a shared path. The stencils would supplement pole signs that also communicate the shared path status of the Promenade. SFMTA noted the need to determinehow to measure progress, and is working with the Port to take before and after videos of the flow behaviors of the pedestrians, bicyclists, pedi cabs, and people with various vehicles on the promenade or along the bikeway. This would be one way to get an anecdotal understanding about the flow of traffic now and compare that to video of traffic flows afterwards to see if there are notable changes after the improvements are made.

Patrick explained further that SFMTA wants to make the bike lanes in the Embarcadero Roadway more attractive to cyclists to get them off the promenade. However, short-term SFMTA is looking to fill in gaps in the bike lanes, formalization of the bicycle infrastructure network that is on the ground, and painting the rest of the bike lanes green. Patrick continued by reporting that he has outreached to neighborhood associations and got input on the conditions that make pedestrians feel uncomfortable on the Embarcadero Promenade. Not only did pedestrians feel unsafe and uncomfortable on the promenade, but also when crossing the Embarcadero. Vehicles were not yielding to the pedestrians in the crosswalks and cyclists feel unsafe in the bike lanes. As a result SFMTA is considering changes to signal timing to provide a leading interval for pedestrians where they get a couple more seconds of green time, and painted stop bars (solid white lines) that are about 12 inches wide in advance of the crosswalk along the Embarcadero (to help guide motorists to stop before the crosswalk). Patrick concluded by stating that data collection will help identify if the improvements are making a difference.

CWAG members expressed the following comments and questions which are followed by Port and SFMTA responses:

• For a cyclist it's really hard to get through the Third Street Bridge by AT&T Park because it's very unclear where to go and who has the right-of-way?

Response: Patrick stated that he was looking forward to the data collection piece as a means to measure whether the painted signage on the pavement will help. Diane added that the city is working on the Third Street Bridge, and SFMTA has been working on bringing the Blue Greenway along Terry Francois Boulevard to provide a two way bikeway on the east side of the street. The bridge is proposed to be signed and striped so that confusion is reduced if not eliminated.

• Have you considered skateboards? Skateboarders do stunts, have you looked at that as part of this process?

Response: Patrick replied no we have not but the video collection will identify what kind of volumes of skaters are on the promenade and how much of an issue it is. Diane added I don't know if there's regulation of skateboards out there on the promenade and that when the promenade was created 25 feet seemed wide enough for everything. We don't want to push the bikes off the promenade because we aren't ready for them on the roadway and the same condition holds true for the skateboarders to a certain extent. The fast skateboarders, maybe they should be in the new bikeway, and recreational skateboarders can be on the promenade. Enforcing behaviors and speed limits is an operational thing that the city doesn't have the resources to enforce on a routine basis. We're open to good ideas.

• Most of the bicyclists do not use the bike lane in the morning because vehicles use it as a loading zone.

Response: Patrick the bike lane is not a place for vehicles to stop although we know it happens and struggle with what to do. Right now the bike lanes are at our minimum width on the Embarcadero. We've been looking at the possibility of adding width buffers. We hope that the green paint will eliminate some of that behavior.

• The signage on the pavement is a really good idea for bicyclists and skateboarders, and I think watching how people will respond is a really good thing to do. In the end you're going to have to change people's behaviors and that may mean you might have to say no to certain behaviors, or you're going to have to redirect the behavior. Maybe certain high traffic areas like the Ferry Building can have signs that say when it's the most active walk your bike or walk your skateboard. Also the west side of the Embarcadero could be improved in order to attract people to use that side of the roadway as a travel alternative.

Response: Patrick stated that the project gave us the opportunity to look at both sides of the Embarcadero specifically for the bicycle lane. What SFMTA heard from cyclists is that the south bound is much scarier for them than the north bound side primarily because of the turning vehicles. We have made notes in areas that we need to address such as strange merge points where vehicles merge on crosswalks. Ideally all of these strange conditions could be addressed in order to improve safety.

 Have you done an assessment to see how dangerous the Embarcadero is for pedestrians and what about installing signs that say "Walk Your Bike"?

Response: Patrick said Vision Zero is an opportunity to reduce fatalities so what SFMTA has done is look city wide at streets that have the highest rates of fatalities and serious injuries. Diane added that there are a lot of signs on the Embarcadero and it's important that this effort not add to the clutter. A walk your bike sign seeks to change behaviors and is dependent on a strong enforcement system so unless we really know we have the resources to support it we really need to question if that is a viable solution.

Patrick also reported that SFMTA does annual bike counts at many points across the city and that there are three or four points on the Embarcadero. The information is compared to the number of vehicles and the number of bicyclists at particular points every year. On the Embarcadero promenade we counts cyclists on the promenade and the bike lane and have found that the percentage of bikes in the bike lane in front of the Ferry Building is much higher. Patrick reasoned that because the pedestrian volume is much higher at this location so there is some self-regulating going on.

- It's the freedom on the promenade that makes it so appealing and separating it into dedicated lanes focuses on speed. The crosswalks could be improved solid zebra striping all the way across and LED lights along the perimeter.
- It would be wonderful to ride in the green stripe bicycle lane from Pier 39 all the way to Islais Creek.

5. Public Comment

After general public comment CWAG used the public comment period to cover additional announcements

Mark announced that the next meeting is scheduled for September 21st. Pier 40 is an item that they identified, talking about operations and maintenance, and maybe the Pier 40 Water Taxi.

6. Adjourn