

**JOINT MEETING OF THE CENTRAL AND NORTHEAST WATERFRONT
ADVISORY GROUPS**

JULY 17, 2019 MEETING MINUTES

ADOPTED SEPTEMBER 18, 2019

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

Central Waterfront Advisory Group Member Attendees:

Katy Liddell, South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay Neighborhood Association (SBRMBNA)

Jamie Whitaker, SBRMBNA

Chris Wasney, Preservation Architect

Jasper Rubin, SFSU Geography Department

Ted Choi, City Kayak Pier 40

Howard Wong, SF Heritage & SPUR

CWAG Members Absent:

Toby Levine Mission Bay Resident

Katherine Doumani, Dogpatch Neighborhood Association

Marc Dragan, The Brannan HOA

Ritita Puri, The Watermark HOA

Ralph Wilson, Potrero Boosters

Northeast Waterfront Advisory Group Member Attendees

Jane Connors, The Ferry Building

Jon Golinger, Telegraph Hill Dwellers

Stewart Morton, San Francisco Heritage

Carol Parlette, Golden Gateway Commons

Bruno Kantor, North Beach Neighbors

Ficka McGurrin, Pier 23 Café

Bob Harrer, Barbary Coast Neighbors

NEWAG Members Absent

Alec Bash, City At-Large

Kim Bernet, Exploratorium

Roy Chan, CCDC

Arthur Chang, San Francisco Tomorrow

Michael Franklin, Levi's Plaza Property Mgmt

Michael Gougherty, WETA

Stephanie Greenburg, SoTel

Bob Iwersen, Golden Gate Tenants Association

Cathy Merrill, SPUR
Marina Secchitano, Inland Boatman's Union of the Pacific
Pam Perez, Metro Events

Port Staff

Ryan Wassum, Design Review Planner
Phoenix Alfaro, Planning Intern
Peter Albert, Real Estate
Rebecca Benassini, Assistant Deputy Director of Development
Mark Paez, CWAG Coordinator
Ming Yeung, NEWAG Coordinator
Patrick Foster, Planner
Diane Oshima, Deputy Director Planning & Environment

Audience

Alice Rogers, South Beach Rincon Mission Bay Neighborhood Association
Simon Snellgrove, Pacific Waterfront Partners
Reiman Reynolds, Pacific Waterfront Partners
Elliott Schimmer, Environmental Science Associates

1. Announcements and Introductions

After introductions, Mark Paez announces that the next regular meeting of the CWAG is scheduled for August 21st 2019 and reviews items of interest to both CWAG and NEWAG on the upcoming Port Commission calendars. Ming Yeung states that the next NEWAG will be in August or September and a notice will be mailed prior to the meeting date.

2. Approval of Draft Minutes

After discussion, CWAG approves the May 15th and June 14th meeting minutes and NEWAG approves the draft March 20th meeting minutes. Mark announces that he is working on revisions to respond to CWAG comments on the draft June 5th Special meeting minutes.

3. Opportunities for All

Sheryl Davis, representative of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission, provided an overview of Mayor Breed's initiative to create paid internships for high school youth and young adults up to the age of 24. The intent of this program is to be inclusive and aims to fill in the gaps of accessing paid internships and is summarized as follows:

- The program started with 1000 slots that aimed to support existing city programming and ended now has 2300 people registered.

- The program managed to place 1,500 youths with paid internships, with the largest placement occurring at SFO with 200 interns.
- Over 100 employers have taken on interns, including small business and large organizations such as Bank of America and Black Rock.
- A special pilot program was recently launched with Airbnb that is hosting 30 interns who will work 20 hours a week on a special project focused on community engagement.
- LinkedIn and Code Tenderloin are offering coding tutorials.
- The University of San Francisco has been collecting data and conducting focus groups to understand the impact of this program. The Bayview, Sunnysdale and Visitation Valley neighborhoods are being studied.
- The program seeks to develop a diverse pool of interns and to connect with people who have no work experience.
- About 1300 people participated in the first survey, and results show that 40% have no work experience and 70% worked a job that lasted less than six weeks.
- The program offers participants the opportunity to develop skills and experiences that can lead to economic mobility.
- The program also helps build social capital and networking abilities so that participants can ask employers for letters of reference helping them with development of long-term careers.
- The Mayor is committed to continuing the program and leveraging city dollars and private donors for support.
- The SF Giants recently signed on and launched a kickoff event. The Port will also be hiring participants.
- It is difficult for the program to accommodate the demand for internships due to the limited placement capacity.
- SFO and DPW have both agreed to enroll 200 participants at each department. The first DPW group was dispatched at the Port, many of whom do not frequent the Embarcadero.

Sheryl concluded the presentation by passing out handouts and stating that it is the Mayor's intention for every high school youth to get have access to paid internships.

NEWAG/CWAG Questions and Comments:

Question: There are many small businesses around the city that have help wanted signs outside their windows. Are they included in this program?

Response: Yes. We are working with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and subsidizing small business to hire participants.

Question: Is this program just focused on youth in San Francisco?

Response: It is a combination of students who live or attend school in San Francisco, as well as children of people who work in the city.

Question: Was there press coverage of the program?

Response: There was some media coverage in the SF Chronicle. The recent kickoff was on a couple of news channels. Next year, we will be more intentional with coverage.

Question: Is there contact information on the handout?

Response: Yes.

4. Draft Waterfront Plan

Diane Oshima, Deputy Director of Planning and Environment provided an overview of the June 2019 Draft Waterfront Plan and thanked the Working Group and Advisory Group Members for their participation in the lengthy process. Diane's presentation is summarized below and her slides can be viewed [HERE](#):

The update was a three-year process that focused on amendments to the 1997 Waterfront Land Use Plan to update Port planning policies. Because of new goals and policies that focus on topics beyond land use, the Port has revised the name of the document to Draft Waterfront Plan, which was released in June 2019 for public review and comment. The comment period extends to September 30th and the Draft Plan is available on the Port's website along with online public comment survey. Diane provided an overview of the following nine goals of the Draft Plan:

1. **A Maritime Port:** Maritime industries extend across the waterfront, each with different requirements and capital needs. An overarching objective is to maintain maritime industries on the waterfront.
2. **Diversity of Activities:** The Plan continues to support additional uses that are not in conflict with maritime and support a vibrant urban waterfront. These include recreational, commercial and business activities, and a connected of open space and public access system. Public-oriented uses are a major priority promoted in the Draft Plan, particularly for including in Embarcadero Historic District pier rehabilitation projects. The Draft Plan includes new Embarcadero Historic District public trust objectives and policies for Port leases, which the Port seeks to test in the historic pier RFP process.
3. **Public Access and Open Space:** The Port has a 7.5-mile network of parks and open spaces. The Embarcadero Promenade and open space network has been a major change for the waterfront since the Embarcadero Freeway was demolished. We now have the Blue Greenway open space and water recreation network defined between China Basin

Channel and India Basin, through the Mission Bay and Southern Waterfront. New Draft Plan policies support enhancements and activation of existing waterfront parks and open spaces, many of which are under-utilized. The major new open space opportunity identified in the Plan is to create a plaza behind the Ferry Building which is civic gathering place and site of the Saturday Farmer's Market.

4. **Urban Design and Historic Preservation:** The Draft Plan includes a new goal and policies that incorporate many of the urban design and historic preservation policies and design guidelines from the Waterfront Design & Access Element of the 1997 Plan. The Draft Plan recognizes the Port's National Register Historic Districts, and includes new policies on creating or enhancing the public realm.
5. **A Financially Strong Port with Economic Access for All:** This goal and policies describe the Port's financial responsibilities. As an enterprise agency, the Port must generate revenues from Port leases to support Port operations, repairs and capital improvements, and seeks development partner investment opportunities to repair and improve Port properties that the Port cannot accomplish with its limited resources. The economic policies also support creating opportunities for employment that benefit everyone. As a Public Trust agency, the Port is responsible for providing benefits and attractions for the people of San Francisco and California.
6. **Transportation and Mobility for People and Goods:** The Port does not have control over most transportation services operated along the Port waterfront by SFMTA, SF Public Works or other public transit agencies. The Draft Plan Transportation goal and policies thus promote agency partnerships and collaboration to secure transportation improvements. Water Emergency Transit Authority (WETA) is an exception, as the Port can influence the growth of water transportation. These projects include the expansion of the Downtown Ferry Terminal next to the Ferry Building, Mission Bay Ferry Terminal, and the temporary facility at Pier 48, to serve the Chase Arena.
7. **An Environmentally Sustainable Port:** The Port has rich and deep environmental stewardship practices that are guided by waterfront environmental regulations. This includes shoreside power and stormwater management. This section explains all facets of sustainable management and practices, which is imperative for the public to understand. This will also contribute to the Port's resiliency program.
8. **A Resilient Port:** The Port is spearheading the Seawall and Resiliency Program, conducting community outreach, and working with the Army Corps on a Flood Study that identifies flood issues where the federal government can assist local initiatives. The goals and policies in this section of the draft plan provide guidance to the seawall and sea level rise efforts. They express the public value of improving and creating a safe waterfront.
9. **Partnering for Success:** Communication is to be delivered in multiple ways. Advisory group meetings are the main form of outreach, but the Port is looking to hold meetings with other organizations who are wanting to learn about the Port. This will help them develop an understanding of the Port and support the agency. This goal includes the

community engagement process steps that are being followed for the historic pier RFP projects.

The Draft Plan's nine goals and Port-wide policies are applied to objectives for five geographic subareas identified in the Plan. NEWAG and CWAG should develop an understanding of these policies for their respective Northeast and South Beach sub-areas and let the Port know if they agree or have comments regarding the objectives for these subareas. Staff provided Draft Plan excerpts of the Plan goals and subarea objectives, maps and Acceptable Use Tables. The Waterfront Plan is a result of the 1990's voter approved initiative Proposition H, that requires an acceptable land use table for piers and properties within BCDC jurisdiction. This table goes beyond and includes all Port properties.

Public discussions during the planning process included accelerating efforts to rehabilitate Embarcadero Historic District pier structures, which led to recommendations for Embarcadero Historic District Public Trust Objectives, which are included in new policies in the Draft Plan. The Port Commission wants to open more piers to the public and provide a more standardized and predictable way for achieving objectives while taking sea level rise into account, and has initiated preparations for a development request for proposals (RFP) for Embarcadero pier rehabilitation projects. The RFP's aims to have a financially feasible development program that includes maritime and public access, public-oriented activities and high revenue-generating uses that are necessary to finance pier seismic upgrades and historic preservation construction that complies with Secretary of Interior Standards, and the inclusion of lower rent maritime and public-oriented uses in the project. Piers 30-32 and SWL 330 are not part of the Embarcadero Historic District and have different conditions.

The Plan goals and policies will guide Port improvements and waterfront adaptation for the next 10-20 years, while the Port continues efforts to plan for seismic and sea level rise adaptation for the Embarcadero Seawall and in the San Francisco Flood Study, in partnership with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Port is soliciting public comments on the Draft Plan through September 30th. The Port advisory groups are among the most knowledgeable to weigh in on gaps or questions about the Plan policies. Early public comments will allow the Port to determine whether course corrections and refinements to the Plan goals and policies are needed before starting the environmental review process. The Plan is dedicated to the late Corrine Woods who was a CWAG member and advocate for multiple waterfront issues. The Port recently named a Pier 52 public boat launch in her memory.

NEWAG/CWAG Questions and Comments:

Question: Can you provide additional resources that outline the difference between the new and old plans?

Response: We can do that. This updated Plan has a lot of new content and was re-organized for the design and access policies.

Question: From my initial read, there are two things that are different. I am concerned because Proposition H requires a plan, not a vision. It wasn't a micromanaged attempt, but something in between. Does use belong in the Waterfront Plan? There is a complete deletion of specific narratives of what belongs on each pier. The proposed objectives are good, but they are not precise and do not identify specific piers.

Response: The Draft Waterfront Plan continues to provide goals and policies to guide Port improvements. As required by Proposition H, the Plan continues to identify a menu of Acceptable Land Uses in tables for every Port property.

Question: Will the Embarcadero Historic District RFP's allow office uses to finance historic pier rehabilitation?

Response: Yes. With the establishment of the Embarcadero Historic District, it has been recognized that high revenue uses may be needed to help finance seismic and pier improvements and to achieve a full benefits package that includes public-oriented uses.

Question: Will the RFP involve microzoning, where public oriented uses are allowed in bulkhead buildings with offices and other high revenue uses in the pier sheds?

Response: The Draft Plan policies for Embarcadero Historic District Full Rehabilitation projects prioritize ground floor areas in bulkhead buildings for public-oriented uses, and encourage such activities in as much of a pier as is financially viable. Each project proposal should examine the setting of each pier and choose the best configuration.

Question: The Northeast Waterfront section of the plan starts with a photo of Rincon Park which is more a part of South Beach...was this intentional? **Response:** We are happy to change the photo.

Comment: If one were to envision a continuous ribbon from north to south and work out perfectly, where you can walk, run, bike and take water transit, the waterfront would be a magnet for the city with a dynamic mix of uses – an urban mixture of cafés next to shops. Maritime would also contribute to this dynamic mixture.

Comment: Lamenting the fact that the Chelsea Piers sports complex proposal was unsuccessful, including that concept is a very wise way to go to incorporate enthusiastic people who are athletic. There is a constant safety concern due to the shared use of the Embarcadero Promenade. We need to figure out how to protect people with carriages and strollers and allow bikes and scooters to have the right of way with conscious organization. The lack of safety makes the promenade dangerous for pedestrians.

Question: Are scooters and electric vehicles prohibited on the promenade and is that written into the plan?

Response: Motorized vehicles are not allowed on the promenade. This is an enforcement problem and capacity issue because the bike lane is narrow, causing cyclists and scooters use the promenade.

Question: What does the Embarcadero Enhancement Project entail?

Response: SFMTA is seeking funding for the Embarcadero Enhancement project to create a 2way protected cycle track along the east side of The Embarcadero While that funding effort is underway, SFMTA is focused on implementing short term improvements to improve cyclist safety. More green painted lanes were added a year ago, which was part of that effort.

The advisory group members thanked Diane and the Port staff for their collective efforts and agreed to review the Draft Plan and provide comment by September.

5. Embarcadero Historic District Request for Proposal

Rebecca Benassini, Assistant Deputy Director for Development, begins the presentation and states that she will focus on efforts to prepare an RFP for historic rehabilitation of Piers 38 and 40. The Port also will be preparing a separate RFP for Piers 30-32 and SWL 330, managed by Peter Albert, Special Projects staff; that RFP effort will be scheduled for a future CWAG meeting. Rebecca explained that the presentation is meant to overlap with the Waterfront Plan efforts. Consistent with Draft Plan policies that describe community engagement process for development RFPs, she is soliciting Port advisory group input about public values that should be included in the RFP offering. Rebecca’s slide presentation can be viewed [HERE](#).

The RFP is an opportunity for the Port to test the Draft Plan’s Embarcadero Historic District public trust objective policies. It is important to get private investment in the Historic District as soon as possible. Piers cost \$200 million to rehabilitate and the Port has a small capital budget. The Port must leverage private resources for pier rehabilitation and channel public resources to the seawall. Port staff wants to solicit input about public values and benefits the public would like to achieve in the historic rehabilitation of Piers 38 and 40.

Two sets of piers are the focus for rehabilitation, which will be offered in two separate RFP solicitations: South Beach Piers 38 and 40, and the Northern Waterfront Piers 19-23, 29 and an optional Pier 31 shed. The Port Commission considered several factors – location, condition, financial considerations, and how much seawall information could be given to developers. There will be a staggered release: the South Beach Piers RFP will be released first, followed by the Northern Waterfront Piers RFP. This staggered RFP release will allow the Port to select a developer for the South Beach RFP and provide the opportunity for those respondents not selected to respond to the Northern Waterfront Piers RFP.

The South Beach piers are older and were built with short caisson piles. These piers have not aged as well as the “younger piers” in the northern waterfront. Because of the poor condition of piers in the south the Port needs to provide a more flexible approach.

The South Beach Piers RFP should recognize and complement the Pier 40 Marina and its water recreation. Brannan Street Wharf can be activated in a concerted way. It is a good location and Pier 38 received high interest from the Public-oriented Use Request for Interest (RFI), but rehabilitation is challenging. The bulkhead is long with several hundred feet located atop the seawall which could potentially add more costs. Pier 40 has a surface parking lot, which could allow a new building, as consistent with the Embarcadero Historic District. This could be important for subsidizing and adding more to the Pier 40 shed that is underutilized. There can be strong enhancements of berthing and water recreation use by utilizing the basin in between Pier 38 and 40. Pier 38 is a wonderful location, but the necessary repairs are costly. About 20% of respondents mentioned this was their preferred location. Existing uses that support the marina and key harbor services should be maintained in the future.

During the solicitation process, there will be community outreach with advisory groups. An RFP review panel, potentially including the advisory group members, will be formed. The developer will likely go to the Port Commission and present its concept. With regards to the RFI for public-oriented uses last year, Chelsea Piers declined to submit a statement of interest, but the Port will continue to outreach to them regarding the potential for recreational use development. The RFP will require public-oriented uses to be included in the development program to activate piers along the Embarcadero and have a diversity of uses and activities. The Port is seeking developers who have experience with marine construction and executing waterfront development projects.

Rebecca concluded by stating that the goals and objectives from the Waterfront Plan will apply to the RFP. Hopefully the advisory group agrees that the community's interests are represented. The Port wants to hear more on public oriented uses, whether they are specific or broad.

NEWAG/CWAG Questions and Comments:

Comment: The list of public oriented uses is great, but there isn't a clear distinction and not all public uses are equally desirable. There needs to be a signal to potential bidders, or ways to get a diversity of users. Make sure to get greater diversity, using a narrative or other approach.

Comment: Will balancing the financial concerns and public-oriented uses result in uses that are truly public? The Ferry Building is wonderful, but it may not appeal to people with less money or youth. Repeating the Ferry Building use program up and down the waterfront would not be desirable.

Comment: At Pier 40, where recreational opportunities are available, there are things that can be made available. Ten years ago, Brannan Street Wharf included a proposed public dock but because of wave surge it was infeasible. If the new floating firehouse can be built for boats, there should be a way to build a dock at the wharf with more pilings or barriers that break waves and have public access docks. There are ways to improve the wharf and Pier 38. Kayak access tunnels should be allowed under Pier 38. When winds are strong, you can't get around the pier. If you provide tunnel access under the pier one could travel to the wharf from the south and give

access to paddlers. Winds and currents are a challenge for kayaks. There is a lot of interest in sailing and training at the wharf. If there was a public access dock, there would be a higher interest in spending time here and this would help activate the wharf.

Question: I am struggling with the point about not being too broad or too specific. When you released the RFI, what did you learn about people’s interest in the two piers?

Response: [Note: Staff did not have all the details in the meeting and indicated that full information will be provided, shown in the below table summarizes RFI respondents by type and their preferred pier locations, ranked top to bottom.] See full public-oriented use responses to the RFI, [here](#),

All Responses	Active Recreation	Art, Makers, and Assoc. Retail	Knowledge Transfer: Education, Training, Incubator, Innovation hub	Food and Beverage	Live Performance, Entertainment, Attractions	Maritime excursion, charter, and transportation	Mixed use w/Hotel concept (understanding Prop H limitation)
Pier 29½ & 29	Pier 29½ & 29	Pier 29½ & 29	Ag Building	Pier 38	Pier 29½ & 29	Pier 28	Pier 26
Pier 19½ & 19	Pier 38	Pier 19½ & 19	Pier 26	Ag Building	Pier 23	Pier 19½ & 19	Ag Building
Pier 38	Pier 28	Pier 48	Pier 28	Pier 19½ & 19	Pier 19½ & 19	Pier 26	Pier 28
Pier 28	Pier 26	Pier 23	Pier 38	Pier 40	Pier 28	Pier 38	Pier 38
Ag Building	Pier 19½ & 19	Pier 28	Pier 19½ & 19	Pier 29½ & 29	Pier 31	Pier 33	Pier 29½ & 29
Pier 26	Pier 40	Pier 35	Pier 35	Pier 23	Pier 48	Pier 29½ & 29	Pier 19½ & 19
Pier 23	Pier 48	Pier 33	Pier 23	Pier 26	Pier 26	Pier 31	Pier 35
Pier 31	Ag Building	Pier 31	Pier 48	Pier 31	Pier 38	Pier 23	Pier 33
Pier 48	Pier 33	Ag Building	Pier 29½ & 29	Pier 28	Pier 33	Pier 48	Pier 31
Pier 33	Pier 31	Pier 38	Pier 33	Pier 48	Pier 35	Pier 40	Pier 23
Pier 40	Pier 35	Pier 40	Pier 31	Pier 35	Pier 40	Pier 35	Pier 40
Pier 35	Pier 23	Pier 26	Pier 40	Pier 33	Ag Building	Ag Building	Pier 48

Comment: I am sure you’ve learned a lot about Pier 1 and other developments. You’ve probably seen some ventures that require large capital. The proposed cruise terminal and Warrior’s Arena were challenged by infrastructure costs. Developers need to have substantial upfront ability and

revenue generation is the foundation. Perhaps, look at a larger RFP with flexibility. Open it up and ask how many piers are allowed in the proposal and have one development team.

Response: The Port Commission asked us to look at this “master development” option and after performing an analysis, it recommended against it. Because we have limited time the Port does not want to take a risk on one entity that could ultimately fail, so we decided to go with multiple pier offerings. The Port also wants to keep its interim tenants in place as long as possible. It will be a more competitive process by focusing on subareas.

Question: How long are the lease terms being offered?

Response: We are starting at 66 years. The RFP’s will require proposals to include flood and sea level rise adaptation measures and provide information about storm surge and what flood protections to deploy. Early lease termination options will be negotiated protect public health and safety.

Comment: For Pier 38, the front end seems oriented for restaurant uses, but it shouldn’t just sell fancy food. It should be accessible to low-income people and allow for culinary educational opportunities. A toddler playground like the one near the Pier 40 Harbor Masters Building could be included at Pier 38 to attract a wide range of users to the area.

Comment: Pier policies are well-intentioned but concerned that high cost of pier rehab will leave little room for public-oriented uses, especially affordable ones. Does not want pier projects to yield only “Google offices and expensive restaurants” or another expensive market hall use, in piers. Diverse uses, economically accessible uses are desired.

Response: The policies in the draft Waterfront Plan provide more details for desired land uses on historic piers. There is a priority for public oriented uses that attract people to the waterfront. The provision to allow high revenue uses is a means for getting many types of public-oriented uses and lower cost offerings included in a project that also is financially feasible. There will always be tension between affordability and project rehabilitation cost. The lease terms try to address this with different lease durations.

Comment: We all wish the piers could support a high percentage of public oriented uses and be egalitarian. Underutilization of the piers is the result of needed seismic safety upgrades and rehabilitation. We can’t rely on another Exploratorium project to come along and solve the problem. If we take this as a given and allow higher revenue generating uses, as was the case at Pier 70, let it be a cautionary or success tale. There is a perception that there was a bait and switch done by a skilled developer who sold us on public oriented uses. Now the Pier 70 buildings rehabilitated by Orton feel like an office park. Maybe it will become more public oriented in the future. PDR seems like a fancy term for offices. Public spaces have become private spaces. This is a public relations problem but can easily happen again without safeguards

that should be included in the RFP to protect against it. You can micro-zone for public oriented uses. The master leases need flexibility to pencil out. We do not want another bait and switch.

Comment: You have captured what we are thinking about and nobody wants a repeat of the messaging issue that happened with Pier 70 leasing. We will take care to be on alert when project concept renderings or site plans are presented to the public to be clear what are required public benefits versus those that are desired to be provided. The RFP process should consider setting a minimum threshold of public benefits required to accept a development proposal and evaluate the feasibility of a project to deliver this public benefit and remain economically feasible.

Comment: Waterfront Plan policy sets expectations for piers; each project should demonstrate that it is suitable for the SF waterfront by meeting objectives based on public values, such as 1) a use mix that contributes to the overall diversity of uses on the waterfront (i.e. not generic, and not more of the same), 2) provides equitable access for all (for example, affordable, appeals to children and adults), 3) has authenticity and relevance to enhancing the waterfront, and 4) creates a sense of place, such as interpretive opportunities relevant to waterfront.

Question: If there are four projects, three could be allowed to be non-public oriented and receive revenue, as long as there is one that really pops with 100 percent public oriented uses. Can the Port implement an impact fee, or is there a different way of approaching the problem?

Response: Establishing a desired mix or weighting publicly accessible space versus revenue generating space through RFP criteria may be a good route to accomplish the achieve more public-oriented uses.

Comment: Please pay attention not the public realm which sometimes gives the appearance of public use when it really may be more privatized.

Question: Are there restrictions to not build on water? Can we build a room or building on the water?

Response: This is a historic district. The more you change the character, you trigger reviews and restrictions. You can build on water, but we are trying to rehabilitate these nationally significant pier facilities.

Comment: Pier 40 was partially rehabilitated 10 years ago, and millions of dollars.

Comment: That was just cosmetic improvements, not rehabilitation.

Question: If you look at all foundations, the least expensive option would be to do all required work at once. The Port should consider reinforcing or replacing infrastructure in the water all at the same time. Is it possible to float the piers? How would you do that – treat it as a single project and fund it with loans, bonds, or pool money with developers and combine it with the seawall?

Response: Substructure repairs are very expensive and separate projects from the Seawall repair program. The Port has bundled substructure repair projects and realized savings through a single mobilization for more than one project. This achievement of cost savings occurred by bundling more than one pier repair, it is not necessary to bundle all pier substructure repair for cost savings. The Port has a consultant team evaluating various ways to improve pier resilience to sea level rise, including floating historic piers.

Comment: Relative to a developer proposal, a developer must make a strong case for being on the waterfront. The RFP criteria and selection process should apply to all respondents. Diversity and equity really drove the Waterfront Plan, but authenticity did as well. We are recognizing the sense of place and trying to reinterpret the waterfront to avoid it becoming generic.

Comment: The approach should deliver public benefits first, or some mixed use, instead of frontloading high generating uses. The Watermark condominiums came first from the Bryant Street Pier Project. Front-loading the public benefits that a development must deliver makes it more challenging. The current Waterfront Plan allows offices and although not specific it contains good language. Other unacceptable uses should be called out such as high end private recreational uses.

Diane concluded by stating that she hopes everyone becomes more acquainted with the plan and stated that advisory group can provide feedback through different avenues. It might be a bit cumbersome, but the Port is trying to offer different formats for the public to engage. The advisory groups are on the front end and the Port is looking forward to feedback.

6. Adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:26pm