



Waterfront Plan Working Group Land Use Subcommittee Meeting Meeting Notes: December 14, 2016

Land Use Subcommittee Members Present:

Alice Rogers (Chair), Kirk Bennet, Jane Connors, Ellen Johnck, Ken Kelton, Stewart Morten, Karen Pierce, Jasper Rubin, Corinne Woods, Dee Workman

Carolyn Horgan, Working Group
Amy Patrick, Land Use Advisory Team
Cristina Rubke, Working Group
Veronica Sanchez, Maritime Advisory Team
John Tobias, Working Group
Howard Wong, Urban Design Advisory Team

Absent: Ron Miguel

Other Working Group and Advisory Team Members Present:

Bo Barnes, Open Space Advisory Team
Chris Christensen, Working Group
Jeffrey Congdon, Working Group
Stan Hayes, Land Use Advisory Team

Port Staff: Diane Oshima, Kari Kilstrom, Aaron Golbus, Carol Bach, Anne Cook, Norma Guzman, James Hurley, Michael Nerney, Shannon Alford, Byron Rhett

Agency Staff: Ben Botkin (ABAG) Andrea Gaffney (BCDC), Brad McCrea (BCDC)

1. Introductions and Announcements

- Port staff has proposed changes to some meeting dates in 2017. The January 11th Land Use Subcommittee meeting has been proposed to be held on January 18th. All present Land Use Subcommittee members, except Corinne Woods, indicated they could attend on January 18th. Staff will confirm this meeting date later in December, after determining that other meeting date changes are acceptable for the Working Group and other subcommittees. Please stay tuned for [schedule change](#) announcements
- Tonight's agenda will cover [Water Recreation](#) and [Maritime Berthing and Public Access](#)
- The group accepted the [November 16, 2016 Meeting Notes](#) and requested to add Stewart Morton to the list of attendees present
- Link to tonight's [PowerPoint presentation with notes](#) and background materials:
 - [Part 1 Maritime Industries Report](#)
 - [Part 1 Bay Water Trail Information](#)
 - [Port Commission Maritime Preservation Policy](#)
 - [BCDC Waterfront Special Area Plan](#)

2. [Water Recreation](#)

Kari Kilstrom presented an overview of the Port's work in creating a Port-wide open space network and, as part of the Blue Greenway open spaces south of China Basin, a Bay Water Trail system for

San Francisco's waterfront. The Port partnered with City agencies, as well as BCDC and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and public stakeholders to create the [Blue Greenway Planning and Design Guidelines](#). The Blue Greenway sets a plan for open spaces and recreational Bay access that is compatible with industrial and maritime terminal facilities. Since adoption of the original Waterfront Plan, ABAG, BCDC, California Coastal Conservancy and community developed the Bay Water Trail plan for water recreation. Kilstrom described Port objectives to incorporate new policies and guidance regarding water recreation in the Waterfront Plan Update.

Questions/Comments

Safe access and public health

- The Port has worked with human-powered water recreation community for over 10 years to establish the Bay Water Trail. Measures to build awareness and safety between deep water vessels and small water recreational craft have been improved.
- There are more water recreation support needs, including public restrooms. This process should explain timelines for water recreation improvements.
- To improve public health and safety of public fishing, the Port should distribute public health information about Bay fish consumption, and notices prohibiting public fishing during sewage overflows following storms.

Water Access Locations

- Port should broaden the definition of "water recreation" to include small motorized recreation boats and wind-powered vessels, not just human-powered vessels.
- Water recreation provides a unique form of public access, to allow water-to-shore public access to restaurants and waterfront attractions, served by transient berthing docks. The Waterfront Plan promotes this.
- Expand the water access network to include regional access points.
- Pier 52 public boat launch in Mission Bay provides the only access for power boats in San Francisco. Pier 40 provides transient berthing for small boats; the Ramp is a good location for additional transient berths.
- Regarding "Objective 2 for Discussion" in the Water Recreation handout, the Port should amend the phrase, "coordinate meetings as appropriate with *all (rather than "new")* maritime operators", to best ensure safe travel in the Bay.
- Will the language in the "Objectives for Discussion" be the actual language used in the Waterfront Plan Update? Response: The "Objectives" were developed from discussions with ABAG and water recreation stakeholders to indicate substantive points to include in the Waterfront Plan, for feedback and public comments. Staff has not started drafting any specific amendments to the Waterfront Plan, and thus the Objectives do not necessarily reflect how these points would appear in the updated Waterfront Plan.

Public Access Benefits and Amenities

- What are “public access” benefits? Can they include access to land from the water? Response: The Port and BCDC work with applicants to look for ways in which “public access” improvements can be delivered with projects per the Waterfront Plan and to meet BCDC permit requirements. Generally, public access is provided from land to the shoreline, because it serves the most people. However, facilities for transient boats can provide public access from water to land, but are more costly. BCDC and ABAG have been leaders and support the Bay Water Trail, to create a regional network for water recreation.
- The Waterfront Plan policies seem to provide high-level guidance, rather than specific improvements. Can the policies be more specific? Discussion: The Waterfront Plan is like a general plan, to provide guidance and communicate public values and objectives without being prescriptive. While not defining details about specific improvements or timelines, Waterfront Plan policy language can be revised to provide more specific programmatic guidance, to describe big ideas, performance criteria and/or public review procedures to shape future improvements.
- We should assess the provision of amenities such as bathrooms, security, and utilities along the Bay Water Trail, especially with regards to transient berthing.
- Transient berths for overnight boaters need more security, such as provided at South Beach Harbor.
- In San Diego, transient access serves as a dual type of public access for boaters and non-boaters, which should be considered in San Francisco.
- We should compare the trade-offs of providing water recreation public benefits for human- or wind- powered versus small motorized vessels, including the associated costs.
- Not everyone can use kayaks; small motorized boats and sailboats serve water recreation public access needs too.
- Water recreation uses and facilities should be low-cost to maximize public benefit, and should serve people of all physical abilities.
- Consider partnerships with YMCA or other organizations that focus on youth recreation programs, and potential new funding sources for water recreation.

Capital Prioritization, Timelines and Funding

- The kayaking community would like to see a timeline or schedule of priorities for improvements. Efforts should focus on: improving personal safety in and around the Islais Creek area; meet with PASHA to discuss in-water safety; and address recurring car and storage area break-ins. Kayaks Unlimited recently turned down an ABAG grant to construct a new bathroom because of timing, even though the existing bathroom is not in good shape.
- Are timing and funding within the scope of the Working Group’s discussions? Response: The Working Group discussions should result in a sense of available resources and may identify some priorities, but not timing or funding for specific improvement projects.
- The Port requires outside funding regardless of what project it undertakes. We must search for outside funding sources and actively solicit partnerships, or else desired improvements will not come to fruition.

- How much does it cost to provide water access sites? Response: Pier 15 cost approximately \$640,000, not including permitting and engineering. The site does not have utilities and is only used to berth excursion and small boats. The Port hopes that berthing fees will cover maintenance costs. Pier 52 public boat launch had an original grant for \$300,000; the cost of the improvements cost about \$3 million.
- Sailboat berths should be close to amenities such as restaurants, fueling facilities and onsite security. Consider models such as The Ramp in the Southern Waterfront, with transient visiting guest docks.
- ABAG shares the kayak community's concerns about timelines and funding, and acknowledged that its grant program involves an intensive application and engagement process.
- Would also like to see non-human powered sites, but not marinas because they do not pay for themselves. We should plan for "complete sites" that have amenities, destinations and connections to attractions.
- Swimming is also a form of water recreation that is human powered. In the coming years as new projects develop in southeast San Francisco, swimming access should be considered as an option for providing water recreation. Environmental and water quality issues will need consideration.

Meeting Discussion Summary

- There is broad support for the draft Water Recreation Objectives provided by staff, which should be further refined to support:
 - 1) Broadening the definition of water-recreation access to include transient berthing for free or low-cost use by small motorized boats and swimming, as well as human- and wind-powered water recreation craft that serve people of all physical abilities
 - 2) Locating transient berths and facilities for water recreation in locations where people want to be along the waterfront.
 - 3) Waterfront Plan amendments that provide direction about desired water recreation improvements, amenities, financial requirements and process to determine priorities and implementation.
 - 4) Partnership and efforts to increase water recreation funding resources

3. Maritime Berthing and Public Access

Aaron Golbus and Kari Kilstrom presented a staff briefing and powerpoint presentation on the Port's maritime berthing facilities, needs and how they are managed with public access. Both the Waterfront Land Use Plan and the Maritime Preservation Policy advance the Port's commitment to the Port's 10 maritime industries and the wide array of associated berthing needs, siting, operational and financial requirements. In general, heavy industrial, deep water vessels are berthed south of China Basin and are not compatible with public access, which is provided separately along the Blue Greenway. North of AT&T Ballpark, a mix of harbor service, cruise ships, ferries, excursion boats and water-taxies generally co-exist well the urban mix of uses along The Embarcadero, and in the Embarcadero Historic District.

Public access and maritime berthing also can share pier aprons, but certain types of maritime operations and security requirements may preclude or require occasional closures of public access. The Port is experiencing growing demand for ferry and excursion boat berths, for passenger embarkation and overnight layover berthing. The Waterfront Plan Update seeks to provide more direction about how to support maritime berthing balanced with the need to preserve and improve the waterfront public access system. Port capital limitations do not support all pier apron and fendering needs. Staff provided questions to solicit insights about the relative public access value of maritime berthing, the acceptability of limiting public access to accommodate maritime berthing that is not compatible, and comments about how maritime berth facilities and public access can share space.

Kari and Aaron presented Piers 19-23 as a case study:

- Pier 23 north is dedicated for public access only, providing views of the Bay and cruise ships that call at Pier 27
- Pier 19 south is dedicated for public access but can support transient berthing for larger vessels that maintain public access along the apron
- The aprons along Pier 19 north and Pier 23 south require repair or replacement; portions of these aprons could support layover berthing without blocking views from The Embarcadero

Questions/comments

Public Access and Security

- Public access alongside shoreside power at the Pier 27 cruise terminal does not seem logical and may present safety problems. Discussion: Port and BCDC worked to provide shared maritime and public access along Pier 27 apron, and public access around the rest of Pier 27-29 perimeter. Shoreside power equipment includes tamper-resistant measures and warning signs. Few members of the public use that area because there are few attractions, with the exception of walkers and joggers.
- Shared maritime and public access is great when it works. Red & White Ferry passenger dock at Pier 43, adjacent to Pier 43 Promenade open space is a good example.
- Harbor services (bar pilots, tug & tow) and maritime maintenance facilities used for layover berthing, support and repairs are not safe for public access, creating anxiety for maritime operators. The Subcommittee should provide guidance regarding the co-location of maintenance facilities and public access, and conditions when public access is not compatible.
- In addition to views of the Bay, public views of the maritime vessels are desirable and reflect the working waterfront. Where physical public access is not feasible on-site, off-site views of maritime vessels and operations are desirable.
- The southern waterfront is a working industrial area with construction activities, a power plant, and other activities that may not be safe for general public access. Employees must be able to carry out their jobs safely without fearing that members of the public will trespass. As part of the Working Group's tour of the southern waterfront, we visited sites in industrial zones with

heavy equipment, trucks and materials that would not be safe for members of the public to enter.

- Fisherman's Wharf area has been historically accessible even though the public cannot board fishing boats. Perhaps the Port can use access signage or other tools to continue to allow some access in a safe way.

Additional berthing needs and capital requirements

- The Pier 43 Promenade project is a public access success that also enhances views and use of Pier 41 and 43 ferry operations.
 - Would like to prioritize which piers to reserve for maintenance and also acknowledge the value of shared public access.
 - Port has done a good job of serving maritime berthing and public access and balancing numerous regulatory requirements.
 - There are few berths available throughout the Bay Area and the Port is fortunate to have rare facilities that may be saved and brought back to life as working berths. There is an especially strong demand for excursion berthing.
 - The Maritime Preservation Policy should be incorporated into the Waterfront Plan Update.
 - The Maritime Preservation Policy focuses on berthing while this discussion considers twin public trust purposes – expanding public access and berthing sites.
 - For maritime tenants, providing public access comes with capital and permitting costs as well as operational costs associated with janitorial and security services. If maritime is a high priority then we need to address these high costs to private operators. Perhaps the Port can research funding opportunities or a general obligation bond to pay for improvements.
 - The staff case study of Piers 19-23 is good and is relevant to the ferry industry because certain fendering doesn't work for Blue and Gold's 19 vessels. The facilities at the Downtown Ferry Terminal suit our vessel needs and the location is a well-known destination.
 - If the Port can't repair the aprons, it loses opportunities for maritime berthing, public access, and required fire exit capability to support pier leases. Response: Staff will support Subcommittee discussions with a consultant economic model to study financial feasibility of various land uses and ability to finance capital improvements and pier repairs.
4. The Working Group agreed to continue the discussion of maritime berthing and public access at a future meeting and the meeting was adjourned.