

**CENTRAL WATERFRONT ADVISORY GROUP
DRAFT MINUTES**

May 1, 2017

**Port of San Francisco, Pier 1 The Embarcadero– Bayside Conference Room
Embarcadero at Washington Street, San Francisco
5:30 – 7:30 p.m.**

Attendees:

Central Waterfront Advisory Group

Members:

Corinne Woods, Mission Creek Resident
Chris Wasney, Preservation Architect
Mahesh Khatwani, Watermark Homeowners
Association
Katy Liddell, South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay
Neighborhood Association
Katherine Doumani, Dogpatch Neighborhood
Association
Jamie Whitaker, South Beach/Rincon/Mission
Bay Neighborhood Association
Howard Wong, Heritage/SPUR
Ted Choi, City Kayak
Jasper Rubin, SFSU Geography Department

Port Staff:

Norma Guzman, Planning Staff
Ming Yeung, Planning Staff
Diane Oshima, Planning Manager
Phil Williamson, Development Project Manager
Byron Rhett, Port Chief Operating Officer

**Office of Economic and Workforce
Development**

Ken Rich, Director of Development

SF Municipal Transportation Authority

Carli Paine, Land Use Development &
Transportation Integration Manager

CWAG Members absent:

Michael Gerbracht, Puglia Marine
Ralph Wilson, Potrero Boosters
Toby Levine, Mission Bay Resident

Audience

Fran Weld, SF Giants
Roscoe Mapps, SF Giants
Alice Rogers, SBRMB Neighborhood Association
Nick Crammer, Forest City
Elizabeth Canela, Forest City
Bill Harvey, Writer

1. Announcements and Introductions

- Status of the Waterfront Land Use Plan Update – Corinne Woods stated that the Land Use Subcommittee was focused on policy recommendations to address the complex financial issues that challenge badly needed pier rehabilitation and that the State Lands Commission has recognized the national significance of the Embarcadero Historic District and is willing to work with the Port to address these issues.
- Diane Oshima stated that Port staff would provide the advisory group with email reminders of upcoming Port Commission items of interest for May 9th, May 23rd and June 13th.
- Port Maritime staff was not present to provide an update on the Port/Puglia Marine Interim Operating agreement for the Pier 70 Shipyard.

2. Approval of the April 3, 2017 Draft Minutes – Mark Paez

The CWAG postponed adoption of the minutes to the June meeting.

3. Southern Bayfront Framework

Ken Rich, Director of Development, from the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), and Carli Paine, Land Use and Transportation Integration Manager with SF MTA presented the Southern Bayfront's Coordinated Negotiation Framework.

Ken and Carli explained that for the Southern Bayfront OEWD and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency are using a “coordinated negotiation framework” to leverage investment to provide significant value to communities. Their presentation can be viewed at:

<http://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Southern%20Bayfront%20Update%20Presentation%20-%20CWAG.pdf> and is summarized as follows:

- Funding for benefits will come from development fees including Community Facilities District (Mello-Roos) bonds which may be renewed.
- One of the key benefits that the framework is focused on include affordable housing is and that the City is on track to meet its 2020 goals.
- The Sea Wall Lot 337 Mission Rock Development will assist the City to meet its affordability goals.

- The other key benefit category is open space and OEWD is looking to achieve as diverse a palette as possible.
- Transportation improvements through 2030 will include: rapid bus service on Geneva/Harney Street, Central Subway, and the Blue Greenway.
- The SFMTA is looking at ways to complement the existing transportation network in the Southern Bayfront.
- All projects will go through many years of outreach and the community benefits will go through similar process
- Individual projects are covering their individual transportation impacts but the City acknowledges that financing broader City needs is challenged. Since so much city growth is in the South Bayshore area there's a healthy debate at City Hall about whether to spend more MTA funding there.

CWAG members expressed the following comments and questions which may be followed by a response from Ken or Carli:

- Who will manage all of the open space?

Response: Management will depend on ownership, OEWD is working to see if San Francisco Recreation and Parks will oversee “store front” activities such as space rentals.

- Will there be enough funding available to maintain the new infrastructure?

Response: We estimate that the onsite development fees and property taxes will be able to cover for the needs that they create onsite. The rest of the City's needs are largely because of tax base growth because of Proposition 13. There is a healthy debate in the City about property tax growth and distribution because needs are different.

- How are transportation mitigation fees and funding accounted for?

Response: The environmental review documents will cover specific project needs from new growth. There are base taxes that will generally go to the General Fund, although some of the Port's taxes will be captured onsite. Mello-Roos taxes will be used onsite.

- What is the process to identify the existing and future demand for community facilities and is there a timeline for the delivery of benefits such as childcare and libraries?

Response: The City acknowledges that it has limited knowledge about how to project the future needs for community facilities and is working on analyses to help identify delivery dates.

- Will the team examine design so that there is a diversity of design in new development?

Response: There will be a community process to bring up design ideas.

- It was suggested that the transportation slides reference the City's Vision Zero.

Response: Agreed.

4. **Sea Wall Lot 337 Planning Process and Mission Rock/Pier 48 Development Project Review Process**

Fran Weld, Mission Rock Development, provided a summary of the project's history including an update on the status of the environmental review. Fran stated 10 years ago, the Giants responded to Request for Qualifications and were selected. She also stated that the San Francisco electorate passed Proposition D in support of the Project, the development team made various presentations and project updates at 16 CWAG meetings, and that more information about the process is available on the Port's website. Fran credited the CWAG with helping to encourage a fourth project pillar – community-serving retail and childcare. She went on to say that in the past 10 years, the Giants have been working on a variety of transaction documents such as a development agreement, financial structure, design package and a sustainability strategy which includes the delivery of affordable housing units. Further the Giants have also been working on environmental documents and that the Port Commission will hear presentations on the various documents starting in the Fall 2017. Fran stated that if CWAG and members of the public are interested, the Port Commission information is available on the Port website and that Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is now available and covers 17 different categories of impacts. Fran continued by stating that a CD of the DEIR was mailed to each CWAG member. She concluded by citing the example of an impact analyzed in the EIR regarding noise generated from pile-driving and reported that the team is researching mitigation alternatives such as using an auger drill, which is a quieter type of drill.

CWAG members expressed the following comments and questions which may be followed by a response from Fran or Ken Rich:

- The Port should be clear about whether it wants the CWAG to review the EIR. EIR analysis is limited but is relied upon by the public to challenge projects.

Response: Ken Rich stated that the City has a good track record of development project EIR's being upheld and uses the DEIR to identify fixes that can be included in the project to resolve concerns.

- EIR's analyze projects element by element but does not address how to deal with impacts that are not predicted and analyzed in the EIR after the EIR is certified? The rules governing the EIR process preclude discussions so how can the community be involved in an iterative way?

Response: The EIR addresses specific questions. Some of the overall transportation issues, for example, are citywide networks that are not a part of the EIR scope for this project. Perhaps a broad team of development and community members may monitor Mission Bay lessons. After the EIR process, the Planning Department will prepare responses to comments and the EIR may be recirculated at that point. The Development Agreement will have impact related components as well. CEQA environmental review is a legal process and not an integrated planning system.

- Waste water treatment capacity is an issue in the area and it would be good to address it in the project.

Response: The Project will have a sustainability strategy that will include a recycled water system onsite. However, the EIR looks at maximum impact scenarios, so this was not considered.

The discussion concluded by Fran stating that CEQA litigation can delay projects for years, EIR challenges tend to result in favor of the lead agencies and that when an EIR is in draft form, it may accommodate recommended changes. She also reminded the CWAG that the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the DEIR for the purposes of accepting public comment on June 1st and that the comment period closes on June 12th. Fran also stated that the Giants would reach out to CWAG regarding content of upcoming Port Commission actions and that Port Commission staff reports are found on the Port's website.

Co-Chair Katy Liddell reminded CWAG members that wish to comment on the DEIR that they will need to submit their comments as individuals rather than on behalf of the CWAG. Katy also requested a flowchart to illustrate the timeline and identify when the

community and public have opportunities to provide input on the proposed development projects.

5. Resilient by Design (RBD) a Bay Area Challenge

Keven Brough, Mayor's Office Executive Fellow presented the RBD project: <http://sfport.com/sites/default/files/RBD%20presentation%20for%20CWAG.pdf> He stated that San Francisco will host a design competition to encourage ideas for sea level rise adaptability design. Keven explained that the Port will help with the site selection process. In early spring 2017, RBD received funding and was able to launch a new website and hire project staff. In spring 2018, the selected teams will present designs. Keven continued by stating that the Central Waterfront is one of several Port sites under consideration and that the project scope has yet to be defined. In conclusion Keven mentioned that the project goal is to find a design that can be implemented.

CWAG members expressed the following comments and questions which may be followed by a response from Keven:

- What relationship does the Port have with the effort?

Response: The effort is a regional nonprofit, and there is no actual Port staff on board although Byron Rhett serves on the RBD Committee. RBD is an outgrowth of the mayor's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee. Because many of the sites affected by sea level rise are on Port property, the Port is involved in some of the project's discussions.

- Will there be a match-making process between the sites and the designers?

Response: We understand that there may be a variety of site and matched design teams, perhaps 10 teams. The design teams will engage with communities before they develop designs.

- Where will implementation funding come from and how much will each team be compensated?

Response: There's no funding for implementation at this time but the Rockefeller Foundation is one potential source of funding. The design teams will receive \$400 to 600,000 in compensation.

- Will the team use Mission Creek Study?

Response: Yes, not sure at what point, but the process taught project team lessons that will be taken into consideration. If CWAG and the Central Waterfront community have feedback, they can transmit comments to RBD through Mark Paez.

6. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Projects

- Proposed Improvements to the Mariposa Dry Weather Renewal Project

Bessie Tam, SF PUC Project Manager summarized the project as follows and the presentation can be viewed here:

<http://sfport.com/sites/default/files/PUC%20Sewer%20Presentation-to-CWAG.pdf>

- The project is located on the south east corner of Terry Francois Boulevard and Illinois Street and the purpose is to increase pump station capacity and is not being driven by Mission Bay or Pier 70 projects. The station is old and has been upgraded in the past but does not have the capacity to service existing demand
- SFPUC is the Project sponsor and Department of Public Works will coordinate traffic issues with SFMTA.
- The scope of the project includes two parts; the pump station at Illinois and Mariposa and a pipeline that extends from Mariposa Street to 18th and then on to Third Street.
- The goal of the project is to increase the capacity of the existing station. The station is used for water and sewage treatment. SFPUC has been coordinating with the Port. The SFPUC will be expanding the perimeter of the station.
- The architectural concept is respectful of adjacent parks and open space and has benefitted from David Beaupre's input.
- The project is expected to begin in the Fall of 2017 and will be completed in 2018.

CWAG members expressed the following comments and questions which may be followed by a response from Bessie:

- Can the fence component of the pump station include an art installation?

Response: We can take feedback and see if there is something possible.

- Are you working with OEWD to coordinate traffic plans?

Response: Illinois Street Corridor is complex. All of the department heads meet with Mayor and others to discuss these issues.

- How does this Project fit into regional vulnerabilities?

Response: SFPUC has completed seismic evaluations and used a soil structure interaction models. Sea level rise is being addressed and soil studies demonstrate that the pile supported facility will have the capability to withstand sea level rise and be back in operation within 72 hours after a major earthquake.

- Will you demolish the existing station?

Response: Yes, we will demolish and rebuild the existing station. The facility was not designed to handle dry weather flow and this will be part of the improvements.

- Is PUC working with Adam Vandewater from OEWD to coordinate traffic closures and construction vehicle congestion mitigation?

Response: Department heads are all trying to coordinate heavy construction.

- **Embarcadero/Drumm Street Sewer Improvement Projects**

Maureen Chan, SF PUC Project Manager, summarized the project as follows:

- The Project will take 16 months for substantial completion. The purpose is to rehabilitate two existing force mains that are aging.
- The construction project will be from 9:30 to 4:30 daily for 12 consecutive weeks resulting in the closure of two northbound lanes of the Embarcadero during this period each day.
- Much of the work will take place underground, but there will be ground-level impacts to the transportation network.
- The Agency does not have a contractor on board, and when the contractor joins the Project, the Agency will have a more specific sense of the project specifics.

- The contractor will not be allowed to work during special events and certain holidays. The SFPUC is working to determine the dates of cruise calls as well. The work duration will be 60 cumulative work days. There will be moments in which there will be a single lane of traffic.

CWAG members expressed the following comments and questions which may be followed by a response from Maureen:

- It is easy for the contractor to start and stop work and will construction occur at night.

Response: It is challenging for the contractor to mobilize and de-mobilize, No nighttime construction is proposed because of the anticipated sound impacts to surrounding residences. However, if there is construction that generates less noise the contractor will have the authorization to work from 9 pm to 4 am.

- Have you finished a study model?

Response: The SFMTA has performed traffic models and has advised SFPUC on closure strategies.

- Will you have electronic signs?

Response: Yes, and the public can find more information about the project at: Sfwater.org/edjs sewers

- The SFMTA weekly email should include traffic information on hours of construction and lane closures.

7. Public Comment

There was no general public comment offered.

8. Adjourn