

**CENTRAL WATERFRONT ADVISORY GROUP  
DRAFT MINUTES**

**July 20, 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:**

Corinne Woods, Mission Creek Resident  
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  
Ted Choi, City Kayak  
Kamala Subbarayan, UCSF Planning  
Katherine Doumani, Dogpatch Neighborhood  
Association  
Mahesh Khatwani, Watermark Homeowners  
Association

**Port Staff:**

Mark Paez, CWAG Coordinator  
Byron Rhett, Deputy Director for Planning &  
Development  
David Beaupre, Senior Planner  
Dan Hodapp, Senior Planner  
Allan Kapoor, Planning Intern  
Phil Williamson, Development Project Manager  
Ricky Tijani, Development Project Manager

**CWAG Members absent:**

Jasper Rubin, SFSU Geography Department  
Toby Levine, Mission Bay Resident

**Audience**

Dale Riehart, South Beach Resident  
Janice Stokes, South Beach Resident  
Larry Stokes, South Beach Resident  
Stewart Morton, WLUP Working Group and NEWAG member  
Susana Razo, PG&E  
Roscoe Mapps, SF Giants  
Sharon Polledri, Russian Hill Resident  
Alice Rogers, South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay Neighborhood Association  
Jennifer Cooper-Sabo, Perkins and Will  
Kelly Pretzer, Forest City

## **1. Announcements and Introductions**

Corinne Woods gave a quick update from the Waterfront Land Use Update Working Group. She reported that over the last six months, the group has been receiving informational presentations from Port staff in Part 1 of the planning process. These presentations are all available on [sfgovtv.org](http://sfgovtv.org). She also reported that Part 2 will be focused on policy recommendations and will begin in the fall.

Mark Paez notified the group about future Port Commission's agenda items of interest:

### **August 9, 2016**

1. Approval of modifications to the AECOM contract for Crane Cove Park,
2. Approval of an MOU between the Port and the Fire Department for berthing at Pier 26
3. An update on the Board of Supervisor's adoption of the Port's operating capital budget
4. A staff presentation on Phase II of the Waterfront Land Use Plan Update

### **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
4. Downtown Ferry Terminal expansion
5. Informational presentation on the Port's proposed state and federal legislation agenda
6. Authorization for the Executive Director to enter into an MOU with WETA for the Mission Bay Ferry Landing
7. Authorization to award the contract for Crane Cove Park surcharge and sight preparation.

### **September 27, 2016**

1. approval of an MOU with the Department of Human Services for a Navigation Center at 25<sup>th</sup> Street

Mark also passed around the CWAG forward calendar and announced that the agenda for the August 17<sup>th</sup> CWAG meeting would include the proposed expansion of the existing fire station at Pier 22 ½ and possibly Pier 70 project updates from Forest City and Orton Development. Mark asked CWAG members to let him know if there are items that they would like added to the agenda and if they had planned absences between now and the end of the year to ensure that a majority of the members are present. Corrinne Woods added that there is an interesting presentation Port Commission presentation on the fire station at Pier 22 ½ available on [sfgovtv.org](http://sfgovtv.org).

Roscoe Mapps, SF Giant's Campaign Manager, gave a short update on the proposed Mission Rock Development on Sa Wall Lot 337. He reported that since the election the Giants have been focusing on entitlements and CEQA. A draft EIR is expected to be published late summer or early fall 2016. The Giants anticipate more public workshops in late summer or early fall but the dates have yet to be determined. The CWAG asked if traffic studies would be included in the EIR. Roscoe said he thought they would be included but

would check. Mark invited him to present to return at a future CWAG meeting to address this topic further.

Brad Benson, Special Projects Manager, gave an update on the 25<sup>th</sup> St Navigation Center. Brad explained that at the last CWAG meeting the site location had not been determined and the Dogpatch community was strongly in favor of locating the Center on 25<sup>th</sup> St. The August 9th Port Commission meeting included approval of an MOU between the Port and the Department of Human Services regarding the Navigation Center. Brad reported that during community outreach the neighborhood expressed concern about the homeless encampments at Warm Water Cove and Islais Creek. Brad also reported that Tom Carter, Port Maintenance Director has been working with the Homeless Outreach Team, SFPD, and DPW to clean up and keep eyes on the park and that the situation is still bad along Islais Creek, but the City is currently working on a plan on how best to relocate such a large homeless population.

## **2. Approval of the May 18, 2016 Draft Minutes – Mark Paez**

The draft minutes were unanimously approved pending minor revisions to a statement made by an audience member.

## **3. Proposed Landscaping of Lawn Area at the northwest corner of Bryant Street and the Embarcadero - Jennifer Cooper-Sabo, Perkins & Will**

Presentation slides available [here](#).

Jennifer Cooper-Sabo of Perkins & Will gave an informational presentation on a drought resistant grass test pilot project on half of the lawn outside their offices at the northeast corner of Bryant St and the Embarcadero. Perkins + Will's San Francisco landscape architecture practice was just started last year. Jennifer gave a brief history of the spot. It was originally part of the bay, but was then filled in and then covered by railroad tracks. Now the lawn is used primarily by dog walkers. Perkins & Will is proposing to replace half of the lawn with different drought-resistant species in six foot-wide strips to see how well each type of grass does. There will also be signage explaining the purpose of the pilot and the different types of grasses. The project is designed to be simple and easily approval, but is also designed to begin a conversation about what this space could become. Dan Hodapp added that Perkins & Will is offering to do this test pilot on Port property free of charge even though they are not Port tenants and that it will provide valuable information about how to treat other Port properties. Katy added that she has forwarded this presentation to several neighborhood groups and received no negative comments.

CWAG members expressed the following comments and questions which are followed by Jennifer's responses:

- We learned from Mission Bay that dogs and their owners don't really read signs. You should place boulders near the planting areas so that dogs are attracted to do their business on them instead of trampling the grass and ruining the experiment.
- Mission Bay is also testing drought tolerant lawn alternatives so you should talk to them about what they are testing.

- How long will the pilot run?

**Response:** Up to a year, but could lead to a permanent installation.

- Any open lawn in San Francisco becomes a de facto dog toilet, which discourages other uses. These grasses are great, but unless something is done to re-designate the use of the lawn, it will only be used by dog walkers.

**Response:** The goal is to create a space that is not just for dogs, but also for people. Many of these grasses, especially the bunch grasses, grow to be fairly tall so it will discourage dogs from walking through them.

- If there is a Phase II, maybe there would be an opportunity for the community to raise funds for some benches to activate neighborhood resident's use of the space for socializing.

**Response:** We are exploring the opportunity for benches, but also want to ensure that it doesn't end up as a place for homeless people to sleep.

- If you are installing signs, depending on how you want to get feedback on the pilot, you could incorporate QR codes

**Response:** We're not sure that people really use QR codes that much anymore, but we do have a hashtag, #whenindrought

- The lawn looks like it is privately owned and not a public space. In the future it would be nice to include some symbol in the park that communicates the Port's public ownership of the space.

**Response:** The signage should explain the purpose of the pilot to encourage people to keep their dogs off the grass

- We are planning to have two explanatory signs, one south and one north of the project.

#### **4. Informational Presentation of Site Conditions and Assessment of Trust Use Options for Piers 30-32 – Dan Hodapp, Senior Planner**

Presentation slides available [here](#).

Dan Hodapp gave an informational presentation on the Port's assessment of trust use options for Piers 30/32, which was also given to the Port Commission on June 14. The Port Commission asked Port staff to look at site conditions and the financial feasibility of various trust consistent uses. The purpose of this study was to inform the Waterfront Land Use Plan Update. He reported that the key takeaways are 1) the Piers are 100 years old and are in terrible condition, 2) the trust limits what types of uses are allowed, and 3) any non-trust consistent uses would require federal and state legislation.

Dan started with a brief history and overview of the piers. The piers were built between 1910 and 1912, extended in 1925, and the lower middle section was added in 1950 to make

it one large pier. Today it is used as a parking facility and sections of the pier have weight limits or are yellow tagged due to its deteriorating condition, which will continue unless repairs are made. It is the site of one of the Port's only naturally deep-water berths, meaning that the Port does not have to dredge to allow large cruise ships to dock here. Dan reported that several development projects have been attempted on the pier. Lend Lease was selected in 2000 to develop a cruise terminal, but even with state legislation to remove trust requirements so the development could include office and retail, it was still not financially feasible. America's Cup originally had grand plans for the pier, but changed their minds and the Port had to do \$1.8 million in upgrades to make the pier safe as a staging area. Most recently, the Golden State Warriors had a plan to renovate the existing pier and construct an arena and events center on it, but they realized that it would require \$165 million dollars to build an entirely new structure within the existing footprint.

Dan reported that the regulatory context is challenging due to the pier's proximity to the Embarcadero Historic District, location within BCDC jurisdiction, FEMA flood risk, and public trust requirements. In public outreach, four major concerns were expressed: 1) the value of the site as a deep water berth, 2) views from and through the piers, 3) the seismic strength of the seawall, and 4) the future impacts of sea level rise. Options for addressing sea level rise include raising the seawall, raising the pier, or building a floating pier.

The Port's study looked at the financial feasibility of various trust consistent uses over a 30-year period. The options included continuing existing uses, removing the piers completely, building a new floating pier for open space, building a marina, and various combinations of these options. The only option that will not result in a massive budget deficit is continuing the piers' existing uses, with most revenue coming from parking fees, until the pier reaches the end of its useful life in 20-30 years. Dan concluded that some of these options would be more financially feasible at other locations on the waterfront and that it will take a "big idea" that hinges on the pier's unique location for a development project to be financially feasible.

CWAG members expressed the following comments and questions which are followed by Dan's responses:

- If you build a floating pier, do you need to completely remove the underwater structure of the existing pier? Would this reduce the \$40 million necessary to remove the entire pier?

**Response:** No, we would still need to remove the entire pier.

- I heard something about NOA research vessel being docked here?

**Response:** No idea. The pier is used for ceremonial berthing and as an overflow berth for cruise ships, but this is a very small percentage of the piers' revenue. However, it is the responsibility of the Port to continue to encourage maritime uses.

- Were there ever sheds on the pier?

**Response:** Yes, but they burned down in 1982.

- Does continuing the existing uses involve investments every year?

**Response:** Yes, we factored in a few million every five years into the analysis for repair.

- What happens at the end of 30 years? Will it need to be demolished? Was that cost factored into the analysis?

**Response:** Yes, it would need to be demolished. No, we did not factor that into the analysis.

- CWAG's feedback about what you think about various ideas, costs aside because they are all enormously expensive will be valuable during the Waterfront Land Use Plan update process so that the Port knows what the public would like to do.

**Response:** Yes, we would like to hear CWAG's feedback on what they would like to see done and we hope to do this type of analysis on other piers as well. The WLUP Working Group is structuring itself so that it can do some of this analysis to test different uses.

- There's been mention of a second BART tunnel or subway line. Would this area be a good location for that?

**Response:** We aren't looking at that.

- Why were the existing floating piers around the world financially feasible but one at this location is not?

**Response:** There are actually very few successful examples and they are all in calm water. San Francisco Bay can experience five-foot waves.

- If no other uses are possible the pier could be kept to use as a disaster staging area/public safety facility.

**Response:** The condition of the pier is too poor. When the Port studied use as a park, the seismic upgrades necessary to enable public assembly uses was \$100 million.

- If none of these proposed uses are feasible, what kind of feedback do you want from us?

**Response:** We just want you to have a better understanding of the constraints. Brad Benson added that the purpose of this presentation is to inform the WLUP Working Group, which might result in more detailed proposals.

- If you remove the pier, is there a benefit to "banking" fill credit with BCDC?

**Response:** Brad Benson responded that although it would have a regulatory benefit, the Port is not proposing that much new fill anytime in the near future. David Beaupre added that the cost of removing the pier might actually exceed the value of the fill credit.

- How deep is the water off the end of the pier?

**Response:** It is around 35 feet deep at the end of the pier and decreases in depth nearer to the seawall. Underneath the pier it is likely to be much shallower because of siltation over time.

- If you built a marina was built in place of the pier, could you built a wall around it to seal it off?

**Response:** It would be extremely expensive, very difficult from a regulatory standpoint, and would likely interfere with the natural scouring that maintains the deep water berthing.

- It is seems that the Port has a choice between infeasible trust consistent uses and non-trust consistent uses. Either we need to find outside sources of funding for trust uses or go to the state to authorize non-trust uses. This decision should be a focus of the WLUP Update.

**Response:** That is a good summary. During the WLUP Update we will be taking a macro view rather than just looking at individual facilities.

- An audience member asked if the 1950 infill between the two original piers in better condition.

**Response:** Yes, but because it is 44 inches lower it will face problems from sea level rise much sooner.

- An audience member commented that because the city originally planned the eastern waterfront as an industrial area and therefore is deficient in park space. When will it be time for the Port to go to the city, state, or private sources for funding to support open space or other trust consistent uses?

**Response:** The original WLUP contains a detailed plan for public open space that the Port has been implementing for 19 years. It has been one of the most successful components of the WLUP and is continuing to be built out in the southern waterfront. Brad Benson added that the Port has gone to the city for funding. The last two general obligation bonds included \$35 million for Port parks. There is another planned GO bond on the city's bond schedule and the Port is also seeking money from the city to retrofit the seawall.

## **5. PG&E Hoe Down Yard (Northeast Corner of 22nd and Illinois Streets), Relocation and Resolution of Ownership of Former Hunters Point Power Plant Lands – Brad Benson, Manager Special Projects (6:40 – 7:25)**

Please note this presentation was revised after the CWAG meeting to address the technical issues in the version of the slides that were presented to the CWAG on July 20<sup>th</sup> and new summary slides are included at the end.

Presentation slides available [here](#).

Brad Benson reported on the proposed relocation of PG&E's Hoe Down Yard to enable the parcel to become part of the Pier 70 development. He reported that the parcel is currently used by PG&E to store soils excavated during various projects while work is being done and then returned to their source. This industrial use right at the gateway to Pier 70 creates a

deterrent from major investment in the neighborhood. The city is ready to rezone the parcel but the challenge is finding another suitable location for the parcel's current use. There are two other legacy utility issues that need to be resolved at Pier 70 to allow private investment to move forward—the open-air substation across the street, which needs to be enclosed in a building, and the fuel tanks on the edge of the Pier 70 property.

There are also some other land ownership issues at Hunter's Point that need to be resolved between PG&E and the Port and the intention is to address them all at once. Historically the Hunter's Point power plant was partially built on Port paper streets, planned streets that were never constructed. The Port is working with PG&E to resolve this issue through a settlement agreement and the Port has the opportunity to sell these paper streets in the shoreline band for approximately \$2.5 million. This would also benefit PG&E because they would like to redevelop the upland portions of the site. Susana Razo of PG&E stated that there's no development plan at this time but that PG&E would like to clear the title for these lands and that the substation was proposed for relocation. Brad also stated that the proposed settlement agreement would create public access along the bay shoreline.

CWAG members expressed the following comments and questions which are followed by Brad's responses:

- Why not have SF Recreation and Parks Department manage the shoreline open space that would become publically accessible?
- What's the connection between the Hoe Down Yard and the former site of the Hunter's Point Power Plant?
- The Dogpatch community wants to improve the appearance of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Street PG&E substation but has not expressed a preference for an enclosure.

Response: There's no direct connection between the two sites but both are the subject of negotiations with PG&E and could be a combined transaction that would need the approval of the Board of Supervisors and the State Lands Commission as well as a CEQA review.

## **6. Public Comment**

Susan Razo of PG&E commented that PG&E is testing gas lines, including work on Illinois St. They are doing their best to mitigate effects on parking. This will be taking place in August and September.

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

David Beaupre gave a quick update on the closing of the Lefty O'Doul Bridge for repairs in 2018. Public outreach has not begun because the engineering consultant is still doing analysis. DPW estimates that construction/repair will take about a year. When they know more about the timing of closures they will begin public outreach. He also encouraged CWAG members and the audience to go check out the miniature golf course and pop-up rebar opened by Pier 70 Partners at Building 12. Each hole on the course was created by a different local artist.



Katy Liddell gave an update on the Embarcadero Promenade safety improvements. The Port is proposing some short-term immediate fixes, including pavement stencils, which they will present during CWAG's September meeting. The long-term enhancements, with a public workshop process, will begin again in September.

Jamie Whitaker noted that because of the popularity of Pokémon Go, Port property on the Embarcadero is receiving much more use, especially at late hours.

Corrine announced that the Mission Bay children's park is now open and that Mariposa Park will open August 15, 2016. There will be a party to celebrate the opening of the children's park on August 13, 2016 and a party for Mariposa Park is planned in conjunction with UCSF for September.

## **7. Adjourn**