



**Mission Rock- Pier 70
Design Advisory Committee
Draft Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2018**

This was a joint meeting with the Bay Conservation and Development Commission's Design Review Board (DRB). The meeting was held at 375 Beale Street, Yerba Buena Room, 1st Floor, in San Francisco.

Approved on May 6, 2018

Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (Committee)

Members in Attendance:

Laura Crescimano (recused)
Jimmy Chan
Marsha Maytum
Kathrin Moore
Chris Wasney

The meeting commenced at 5:30p.m.

- 1. Pier 70 Waterfront Site 28 acre Special Use District**, located at Pier 70, generally between 20th and 22nd Street east of Illinois and bounded on the east by the Bay. David Beaupre from the Port and Ethan Levine from BCDC provided planning and site context.

Jack Sylvan, Vice President of Development at Forest City, the project developer, stated the Pier 70 site has amazing potential and asks for something remarkable. He stated the new schematic designs respect the historic character of the site, elevate it in the appropriate ways but do not freeze it in time, and introduce exciting elements that are opportunities for individuals to interact with the waterfront. Jack went on to report that this would be the second review of the parks and open space by the DRB and to list the items that had changes since the first DRB review in 2016:

- Viewing pavilions refined
- Cobbled bench added
- Central lawn enlarged with the Bay Trail behind (inland)
- Large scale furnishings for slip ends

Jack continued by explaining that the activity area would include a multi-purpose lawn, The Hull, Market Square and the 22nd Street Pavilion and that these spaces would be activated with

arts and cultural events, including 100 small events and a yet to be determined number of large events per year with an attendance of approximately 5,000 people.

Richard Kennedy, Senior Principal at James Corner Field Operations, the landscape architect for the proposed project, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the site context and history, phasing, site plan, shoreline open spaces, and programming and event spaces.

Mr. Kennedy stated the open space and master plan were developed with the concept that the Pier 70 project should build in the character of its industrial history and legacy as a major shipbuilding operation for the country and maintain that as an important quality within the project, but is also an extension of the Dogpatch. The presentation followed the format of the staff report published prior to the meetingⁱ

Board and Committee Questions:

- What is the phasing of the project?
The phasing of the parks includes Slipway Commons and Market square as the first phase of open space, additionally 22nd Street , Maryland Street and 20th Streets; parcels a,d,e2 and historic buildings 2 and 12.
- What is the status of the ship repair operations,
The last operator left in June 2017 and the Port is actively seeking a new operator.
- How is Forest City coordinating with Orton and the Historic Core project and what is the schedule for the Historic Core?
The Port coordinates planning and design issues amongst its various partners, Forest City, Orton and the Port meet regularly to make certain a seamless integration of Pier 70 is implemented. The buildings within the historic core are being occupied now and the public access atrium through Building 113 is open and connects 20th Street to the Piazza on the south side of the building.
- How are Forest City and the Port coordinating with the plans for the former Potrero Power Plant site?
The Port and Forest City are coordinating with the developers of the former Portrero Power Plant site to ensure that Pier 70 and the power plant site are coordinated and integrated together.
- How has the design evolved around Irish Hill?
The development parcels around the Hoe Down Yard have been revised to include a passage way (physical and visual)at the NE corner of Illinois and 22nd Street to Irish Hill is preserved.
- Has Forest City and the Port considered site security once the parks are constructed?
The Port and Forest City have developed preliminary concepts and budgets for security. Security costs are included in the Community Benefits District assessment.

- *How will access into the bay be restricted?*

The design includes a series of railings, barriers and grade separations to preclude access to the Bay. The Port and Forest City continue to discuss the appropriateness and design of the "rubble beach" just south of building 6. The rubble beach is not within Phase 1 of the project.

- What would become of the actual Pier 70 Wharf structure, would there be opportunities for the public to interact with the Bay and how would the parks be secured at night?

Pier 70 wharf will be demolished and that the public would not have access to the Bay at this location due to pollution and conflicts between small human powered boats and the ship repair operations. Tidal action makes this a hazardous area for small boats. Safer access will be provided in the protected waters off of Crane Cove Park. The Port has serious questions about the feasibility of Forest City's proposed "rubble beach" because of the proximity to Building 6 and the ship repair operations to the immediate north.

- How will the site history be interpreted within the parks and public realm?
The Port along with Forest City began to develop an interpretive program for all of Pier 70 initially with the planning for Crane Cove Park. Forest City has leveraged that work done for Crane Cove Park and has worked with local historians and experts to evolve the Interpretive Program and Plan. More details about the interpretive plan will be presented at the next DAC meeting.
- How are the parks designed in the context of the future architecture? The approved *Design for Development* has detailed design parameters for the building developed recognizing the historic site features and waterfront setting.
- Will the craneway piers be rebuilt or repurposed as is?
The craneway runways will be maintained as is, however they likely will need to be patched and resurfaced.
- Why isn't access to the bay for recreational boating included in the design and program?
Access to the bay in this location is discouraged because of the strong tidal action, exposure to the wave action and because of the proximity to the ship repair use. Tidal and wave action have a tendency to push boaters into and under the ship repair operations, which is a security issue for ship repair and a life safety issue for water recreation. Port staff has spent considerable time with the recreational boating community and advocates on selecting safe and appropriate locations for water recreation and is investing significantly on facilities at Crane Cove Park.
- What's the timing of the review of schematic design and will the committee have the opportunity to review the project again?

DAC members will review the schematic design for consistency with the D4D.

- How much open space will be lost as a result of sea level rise and how far west would the 15 foot increase in the overall site elevation extend? The eight foot wide lower path along the shoreline is at the same elevation as the slipway pier ends and the use of these areas would be lost to sea level rise?

Yes, the worst case estimate would result in the loss of use during storm events and king tides and that the parks would be designed to allow more use today verses in 2100. He also stated that the elevation would decrease from east to west so that at Building 12 the increase in elevation would be reduced to nine feet.

Public Comment:

Bo Barnes, Board Member, Bay Access, stated Bay Access wrote the legislation for the San Francisco Bay Water Trail. He stated the currents along the lower area are substantial. It is not a place for swimming or kayaking; however, Crane Cove Park is perfect for water activities.

Committee and Board Recommendation:

General comments of consensus:

- The design works with the historic features of the site, making them the primary focus, and designing new features to complement the old is exemplary.
- The design is masterfully done, is appropriate in scale, and makes coming to the waterfront a transformation from the past as an industrial area where the public could not go to where the public is now invited to be at the water's edge.
- The slightly denser configuration on the inside of the site and then pulling individuals to the waterfront through the open space is also masterfully done.
- The balance and the proximity between Crane Cove Park and this project fulfills the mission of what open space on the waterfront should do.
- The treatment of landscaping feels right. Individuals will now be living, working, and recreating in this space, not building ships. The amount of planting is respectful of the historic nature of the site, does not disproportionately block views, and is well done
- The view corridors along the street were well done.
- This will be a spectacular space that feels right and is respectful of the historical aspects of it.
- The sequences of spaces along the waterfront are magnificent and that it is not just one blank lawn.
- The variety of the Bay edge is interesting in this area with many nooks and crannies and the project design is a great interpretation of that with the series of outdoor spaces and rooms with different characteristics, rhythm, and cadence going down the waterfront.
- All of the pavilions add an element of interest and the 22nd Street pavilion area would be the public punctuation for that zone depending on how it is detailed.

- There is concern that the wonderful public amenities might be at risk for value engineering, it is important to make sure they remain part of the public benefits.
- There was support for the project and better understanding of the intersection of the new and the old, the history and design details; there is a need for more information on the proposed materials to be used.
- There is an incredible opportunity for the integration of historic interpretation. There will also be a public art program that has yet to be detailed. The potential of the intersection of all these things is tremendous
- Concerns were expressed about the treatment of the craneway piers – whether they will be rebuilt and if they have scars. One way to express the history of a site is in interpretation when the artifacts are gone. Due to the nature of this project, much of the historical artifacts are gone or buried. It is great that the three buildings will be kept. Given that the craneway piers are the last visible vestige of this industrial heritage, it was suggested that leaving these features in a state of arrested decay will reveal their age showing the rough life they have had. It could be celebrated in a way that might be more visceral than a picture of one next to one with new pavement
- The site furnishings on the craneway piers feel a little precious; like the amphitheater seats and the chase lounges. There is a place for those along the waterfront in general. It was suggested making these vestigial piers tougher and not so programmed. If there are historic pieces that can be saved efforts should be made to do that. It was suggested the fishing bars would contribute to the roughness.

Applicant's Response

Applicant thanked the Board and Committee for the comments and stated they will be taken into consideration. Port staff will offer a tour of the site and the project sponsors will return to present more information on materials, interpretation and the Phase 1 parks.

1) Public Comment (for items not on the agenda)

There was no additional public comment.

The DAC meeting was adjourned at about 7:30 p.m.

I:\00-PortwideMR_P70 DACMinutes\2018\2018\Feb 26-2018 Meeting Minutes_Draft.docx

ⁱ http://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Pier70%20MRP70%20DRB-WDAC%20WFSshoreline_2-26-18F.pdf