



Waterfront Plan Working Group
Land Use Subcommittee Meeting
Final Meeting Notes: June 21, 2017

Present: Alice Rogers (chair), Larry Beard, Jon Golinger, Stewart Morton, Corinne Woods, Kirk Bennett, Ron Miguel, Karen Pierce

Not Present: Ellen Johnck, Jasper Rubin, Dee Dee Workman, Jane Connors

Other Working Group and Advisory Team Members Present: Linda Fadeke-Richardson; Amy Patrick

Port Staff: Diane Oshima, Kari Kilstrom, David Beaupre, Mike Martin, Anne Cook, Byron Rhett

Agency Staff: Reid Boggiano (State Lands via conference call)

1. Introductions
2. June 7, 2017 draft meeting notes: accepted
3. Public-oriented use criteria recommendations (with edits from prior meeting): accepted

Questions

What do these recommendations add? The criteria identify public-oriented characteristics that enable the use to further public trust objectives

Is Pilara (Pier 24 art gallery/storage) a successful trust use? It didn't undergo rigor of State Lands' process (less than 10 year lease) but the gallery is open to the public.

Comments

- The Waterfront Plan Update shouldn't try to predict the feasibility of specific uses – changing the focus to more public orientation, and allowing more flexibility to achieve that focus, is a good way to go
 - These ideas add a richness to the various ways that the public may enjoy the historic piers
 - Hope these criteria become part of the Plan – an exciting piece because this lays out the types of things we want.
4. Port Seawall Lot discussion (continuation of discussion from prior meeting)
 - June 7th meeting notes summarize comments from last meeting; those ideas may be incorporated into Subcommittee recommendations for Seawall lots
 - Discussion centered around three considerations/questions provided in a handout (see attached at end of meeting notes) from the June 7th Subcommittee meeting. A summary of additional comments/recommendations from the June 21 meeting discussion is provided below, in blue. The comment/recommendations from the accepted June 7th meeting notes is included, in green, for reference.

Note: These recommendations were further discussed and refined at the July 12 meeting for the purpose of creating stand-alone Seawall Lot recommendations.

Summary of Comments/Recommendations re Port Seawall Lots (SWL) from June 7 and June 21 Meetings (June 7 in green; June 21 in blue)

Design and development of seawall lots including ideas to improve integration with upland areas

- 1) The Waterfront Plan should continue to encourage SWL uses that integrate and connect with the surrounding neighborhood and waterfront.
- 2) Seek opportunities to improve connections between east and west sides of the Embarcadero.
- 3) SWL developments should achieve two desirable goals:
 - a. Incorporate public-oriented uses that can enliven the pedestrian/ground level experience in the neighborhood in a variety of ways (e.g. day/evening commercial-retail uses, pedestrian and landscape enhancements); research SF Planning Department design policies and criteria that promote ground floor pedestrian activation for inclusion in the Waterfront Plan
 - b. Generate revenue from development of a broad range of uses, including non-trust uses if needed (e.g. office, residential, general retail) to support Port capital improvements; non-trust uses would require State legislation to lift trust use restrictions for SWLs north of Market Street. Not opposed to more development intensity if it supports public goals and is accompanied by robust urban design.
- 4) SWL developments should emphasize access - physical and visual - from the street and sidewalk - to The Embarcadero, piers, and Bay, as well as access to a diverse range of users
- 5) Activate and clean-up underutilized seawall lot areas, which may be incorporated with public realm plans for the west side of the Embarcadero.

Acceptable uses and legislation to lift trust restrictions

- 1) Legislation to lift trust restrictions on the remaining seawall lots north of Market Street should be considered on a case-by-case basis, if necessary, to realize SWL goals and objectives. Enabling legislation must ensure that SWL development opportunities include public-oriented use requirements to activate and enhance public realm experience in the neighborhood.
- 2) The Plan should allow a broad range of uses and a flexible approach that invites new ideas to enhance surrounding neighborhoods, and physical and visual connections between the west and east sides of The Embarcadero and the Bay. Give planners the freedom to think creatively.
- 3) State legislation which has lifted trust use restriction and allowed SWLs to develop consistent with adjacent neighborhoods generates significant financial benefits to support historic rehabilitation of piers and BCDC-recognized waterfront parks and public access
- 4) Use of SWLs should as much as possible support the most diverse population (whether oriented to residents or visitors or workers)

Parking on Seawall Lots

- 1) Parking on SWLs is a trust use and furthers trust objectives by:
 - a. accommodating visitors to the waterfront from the region/state who drive
 - b. supporting services in waterfront attractions (i.e. Ferry Building Marketplace, Exploratorium)
 - c. providing revenue stream for Port capital needs on an interim basis, until long-term development is approved
- 2) Recommend a visitor study, including number of people visiting waterfront, that includes origin and destination points, and mode(s) of transportation used
- 3) Any parking garage design should improve the pedestrian experience at ground level

Seawall lot public comments were organized by three discussion questions below:

#1 Should the Plan continue to encourage SWL uses that reflect the surrounding neighborhood?

- Agree that the Plan should continue to encourage SWL uses that reflect the surrounding neighborhood; they should connect with neighborhood, not be a jarring, divergent use.
- The word “reflect” should not infer “identical”; SWL uses should be “compatible” or “integrate with” the neighborhood, and provide a bridge that strengthens relationship between upland City/neighborhood and waterfront.
- Residential is not a trust use, but it’s compatible with neighborhoods and can be allowed with legislation. Does the community want residential in the northern seawall lots?
- We should not specify an exact use – better to allow for a broader choice of uses to support diversity and creativity, to support our objectives to activate neighborhood and waterfront, and generate some revenue.

#2 Ideas to improve SWL integration with upland areas? West side of Embarcadero?

- Delancey [residential] in South Beach is a poor example of reflecting the neighborhood; it doesn’t activate the waterfront and the ground floor retail has been closed for years.
- Desirable uses are open in the day and evening, enlivening the street and waterfront.
- 88 Broadway (Port seawall project) is a good example – ground floor uses are primarily commercial, designed to bring people in – along with a new pedestrian corridor that draws people further up Broadway – enhancing the connection between waterfront neighborhood and North Beach.
- Activating ground level space has been a design objective for decades; implementation (and market demand) is the key. Successful retail clusters into a critical mass/magnet.
- Sometimes there isn’t a residential “neighborhood” behind the seawall lot, it’s a commercial area. Some commercial ‘neighborhoods’ such as Levi Plaza area are characterized by historic buildings; compatibility with that architecture is relevant.
- The ratio of pedestrian activity between the east (waterside) and west side of The Embarcadero appears to be about 15:1. The idea of ‘bridging’ that 150-foot wide street and drawing people across seems far-fetched. Maybe SWL development can be integrated with development of piers across the street.
- Let’s add a statement to encourage or require uses along the street and ground floor that enliven the area (expanding on public trust concepts).
- Forest City (Pier 70) and Mission Rock (Seawall Lot 337) are looking at active streets – lessons can be learned from the work in those projects. Note that Embarcadero isn’t Chestnut Street – it’s very wide and long – so it might not have active uses the entire length. Full active retail on a busy street may not be realistic.
- Prior Port planning efforts with BCDC led to community support to improve Embarcadero public realm, including pedestrian crossings of The Embarcadero. Port staff is working on plans for public realm improvements which play an important role in improving pedestrian activation at street level.

#3 Lifting trust use restrictions for seawall lots north of Market Street

- Lifting the trust use restriction should be accompanied with controls/rules that apply to all uses. (e.g. office, hotel, residential); enliven the ground floor with movement and activity.
- The waterfront is very active - 24 million visitors per year. Rehab the piers first; save the seawall lot assets. Interim parking lots give Port flexibility to accommodate large projects.
- Don't dismiss the west side from the public realm, bring it alive as part of this wonderful Embarcadero boulevard. Take care when lifting the public trust from seawall lots – maintain opportunities to incorporate public oriented uses.
- Community Vision for Northeast Waterfront (developed by Asian Neighborhood Design) recommends retaining the seawall lots in the public trust, so there could be controls and negotiation.
- There should be a goal to achieve revenue and achieve trust objectives. To activate the street-level you need density around the area, you don't want to restrict the type of uses.
- Integrate uses with neighborhood; bridge development on west to what is going on the east side; activation enhances compatibility. Give direction, show what the vision is, but allow flexibility so that new ideas can be taken advantage of. Don't limit to specific uses – new ideas may be offered in the future that achieve these goals.
- Encourage ground floor activation. Planning department has excellent language about activating streetsuse that.
- Concept here is public oriented uses as part of the project – not just or only ground floor retail; that's one example. Achieve public oriented use/space in the project somewhere – and achieve the goal of revenue generation. Goal is to accomplish both. And how to get people across the street.
- Good aspirational discussion; give planners the freedom to think as creatively as we have.
- Not support for mass lifting public trust, but can be case by case to generate revenue for the Port if the result is what everyone wants.
- Jasper Rubin provided ideas re seawall lots (read aloud by Corrine Woods in his absence):
 - Seawall lots have a unique role as interstice between street grid and curvature of waterfront. Seawall lot structures should emphasize access - physical and visual - from the street and sidewalk - to The Embarcadero, piers, and Bay.
 - "As for uses, development of seawall lots should as much as possible support the most diverse population (whether oriented to residents or visitors or workers). Their development should not become part of a *class barrier* to the waterfront - a different and more oppressive wall than any of the physical things many people are concerned with. That being said, I am not opposed to the Port pursuing development that may be more intense than currently supported, as long as it increases support for public/civic goals and robust urban design."

5. Discussion about Public Process for Port leasing and development projects (continuation of an initial discussion from March 16, 2017 Land Use Subcommittee meeting)

Alice Rogers divided the initial ideas/comments from the March 16th Subcommittee Meeting into four categories – to facilitate the continued discussion and development of recommendations. Karen Pierce is an active member of the Port’s Southern Waterfront Advisory Group, and will be absent at the next Subcommittee meeting (July 12) so the group began with the discussion of the “Port Advisory Groups”.

Are there gaps, refinements or changes in process that would better serve the effectiveness of Advisory Groups?

Comments

Maintain consensus-based Advisory Group discussions and conclusions

- Maintain efforts to develop consensus through public discussion, not voting. The majority rule approach undermines efforts to discuss and work through issues and community concerns.
- Strong agreement here. Working to build consensus gives stakeholders more say in where you end up. Fuller discussion. More equitable.

Interaction between Port Commission and Advisory Groups

- Concern that Port Commission isn’t getting advised – staff meets with Advisory Groups but the Commission doesn’t hear what the community wants. To increase input and exchange, consider having Advisory Groups provide periodic written or verbal reports to Port Commission, or possibly have designated Commissioners attend advisory group meetings.
- The RFP selection process that includes a community member is good, and confidentiality between selection panel and Port Commission is important. But the community learns of the selection on the day the decision is made – is there a way to discuss the selection first?
- Find way to inform Advisory Group of project details early in process, without getting ahead of Port Commission’s briefing on the same project
- David Beaupre described process for Southern Waterfront projects: Port Commission receives an “informational” presentation in a public meeting; then Port staff discuss the project with SWAC; then Port staff takes to Commission for action including reporting of community feedback.
- Brown Act meeting rules are not flexible, and allow time limits to be set for public comments. Port Commission limits public comment to 2-3 mins, which frustrates ability to get into detail. The only way to exchange information with Commissioners beyond the public comment time limit is if Commissioners ask questions, which is not guaranteed.
- Port staff creates Advisory Groups which are not subject to Brown Act public comment rules, and are intended to provide a forum for interactive exchange. This allows more in-depth information and discussion.
- Important to have a step in the process where community can interact more with Port Commission and be heard. The key is getting project information in a timely manner to review and discuss, and provide input to Port Commission before decisions are made.
- Commission needs to be more cognizant of Advisory Groups.
- Port staff has planning or related expertise and represent the Port Commission – they attend Advisory Group meetings and advise the Commission as to what the community is thinking.

- Port staff-community discussions are not the only avenue - anyone can talk to a Commissioner. Advisory Group members can take the initiative to inform the Commissioners on issues of concern.
- Should there be some citywide forum – beyond the local waterfront, that allows the whole city to participate? We rely on people who choose to be involved; you can't force citywide participation. No idea how you present an issue Citywide. If we are going to do this work, Advisory Group members have the responsibility to get the word out and bring broader views back to group.
- Large projects require more time for community review/input. During the EIR review period, CWAG has given people opportunity to discuss project questions that aren't necessarily related to the EIR. Very helpful with significant, complicated projects.
- A true public process takes longer, so government needs to adjust timetables if you want genuine input. Best to take the time and get the community involved early-on in the goals and choices.
- The timeframe should be balanced so that it doesn't take so long that original interest group 'falls off' and newly interested don't have the history.

No meeting next week (June 28). Next meeting will be July 12. July 20th works for everyone in attendance (if another meeting is needed).

Meeting adjourned.

[Seawall Lot Discussion Handout attached on next page]:

Waterfront Plan Policies for Seawall Lots

SWL Acceptable Uses reflect surrounding neighborhood mix of uses:

Hotels, Housing, Office, Retail, Parking Acceptable Uses on most SWLs;
Assembly & Entertainment, Artist, Recreational and Open Space on some sites

Provide transition and connections between the City and pier waterfront

Mix of uses on piers and seawall lots that together complement neighboring development and serve needs of diverse interest groups

Architectural and urban design on west side that frames Embarcadero Historic District on the east side

Considerations for Waterfront Plan Policy Discussions

SWL development can generate revenue and IFD proceeds for Port capital improvements

Note that Part 3 allows for more specific focus on South Beach and Northeast Waterfront areas, including SWLs for site-specific ideas and discussions.

Policy Questions

Should Waterfront Plan continue to encourage SWL uses that reflect surrounding neighborhood?

[Are there] Ideas that should be considered to improve SWL integration with upland areas? With east side of Embarcadero?

Should trust use restriction be lifted for north of Market St. SWLs?

SB815 lifted trust use restrictions, allows non-trust uses which must generate fair market value for Harbor Fund; Originally proposed for all Embarcadero SWLs; final authorization applied to South of Market Street SWLs

Revenues are to be expended on maritime, historic rehabilitation, and waterfront public open spaces recognized in BCDC plans