



Waterfront Plan Working Group

Meeting: September 19, 2017

Working Group Subcommittee Recommendations for Part 2 of the Waterfront Plan Update Public Process

Draft Meeting Notes

Members Present: Grant Ballard, Lawrence Beard, Reid Boggiano, Kevin Carroll, Jeffrey Congdon , Jane Connors, Aaron Hyland, Ellen Johnck, Janice Li, Ron Miguel, Stewart Morton, Rudy Nothenberg, Linda Fadeke Richardson, Alice Rogers, Jasper Rubin, Cristina Rubke, Peter Summerville, John Tobias, Anne Turner, Corinne Woods, Dee Dee Workman

Absent: Kirk Bennett, Mike Buhler, Chris Christensen, Pia Hinkle, Karen Pierce, Tom Radulovich, Dilip Trivedi

Meeting Video: Please use the link, below, to view the SFGovTV meeting video for Port Waterfront Working Group 9/19/17: http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=28792

Meeting Materials: Below is a link to the “Part 2 Summary Report – Working Group Subcommittee Recommendations” discussed by Working Group and available at the meeting:

 [9.11.17 Waterfront Update Part 2 Summary Report.pdf](#)

1. Welcome from Co-Chair Rudy Nothenberg

- Encouraged continuing the civility of discourse exhibited by the Working Group thus far, and honoring the Subcommittee deliberations and process.
- After Working Group review and discussion, the Port Commission will receive a Part 2 report that represents the preponderance of the Working Group’s opinion; -alternative views may also be - included in the report, if/where necessary.
- Each Subcommittee Chair will provide a brief overview of their Subcommittee’s work. Pia Hinkle, chair of the Resilience Subcommittee is ill, so Port staff will provide the overview for that subcommittee.
- Our goal is to allow the Subcommittee reports to be accepted where there is consensus.

- Where there is not consensus, we will discuss the issue this evening and, if needed, Port staff can work with individual Working Group members, or with subcommittees, to develop language to augment or edit the recommendations.
- If time permits this evening, we may discuss Part 3 of our working group process, including the workshops proposed.
- It is intended that the work of the subcommittees, once accepted by the Working Group and including any alternative recommendations where no consensus is reached will be presented to the Port Commission by Port staff as a progress report and in order to get some feedback from the Commission prior to the Final Report of the Working Group to be rendered later in 2018.
- Co-chair note: The Part 2 Subcommittee Report reflects the wide range of ideas that arose during subcommittee meetings, including those ideas appropriate for the Waterfront Land Use Plan update, as well as those better suited to the Port's Strategic Plan or to another Port or City policy or plan. All these ideas are documented in the Working Group reports; Port staff will ensure they reach their appropriate destinations.

Procedural questions

- Should we sever the new financial table from our discussion/acceptance of the recommendations to allow additional time for review/discussion; it is a large document and Working Group members may not agree with each assessment of financial impact or funding option? Co-chair Nothenberg answered yes, Working Group members can take additional time to review the Financial Table. Financial information was requested to acknowledge the complex financial needs and tradeoffs associated with policy recommendations that should not be ignored. Working Group members should take the time needed to review. The Financial table is a staff product and will be included in the final report to the Port Commission after a review by the Working Group in a future meeting.
- A recent Business Times article reports that the Port is preparing a Request for Interest (RFI) for 8 piers; can the Port pull back on that until the Working Group process is complete? Diane Oshima provided a brief update on the status of Pier 38, noting that the negotiations with the Pier 38 developer have ended due to pier repair cost issues that made the project financially infeasible. Pier 38 has been a case study for the Waterfront Plan Update, illustrating the financial, structural and historic preservation needs and tradeoffs in the Embarcadero Historic District. The Port seeks to keep piers leased and occupied. In light of public comments and recommendations to promote public-oriented uses, Port staff has been thinking about a possible RFI as a means to discern market interest in developing public-oriented uses on piers. This idea was briefly raised at a Land Use Subcommittee meeting, and is still under staff review. The Land Use Subcommittee Chair added that the RFI concept seemed well-received, though it was not pursued further during subcommittee meetings. Diane Oshima explained that any further action on an RFI would be subject to public review and Port Commission public hearings.
- What are public-oriented uses? Cultural, arts, recreation and other uses that attract the public but are sometimes low or moderate revenue generators

2. Resilience Subcommittee: Co-chair report and discussion of recommendations

Pia Hinkle sends her regrets for being absent; Port staff (Carol Bach and Anne Cook) provided a brief overview of the Resilience Subcommittee's approach and recommendations, using Pia's talking points.

General Questions/Comments from the Resilience Subcommittee

1. Commend Port staff – the last paragraph of Item D (page 12) - the Subcommittee went over that a lot, and it ended up being very well written.
2. Subcommittee welcomes this feedback from the group – we believe this is a strong effort at a first time topic for the Waterfront Plan.

General Questions/Comments from other Working Group members and public

1. Reminder for everyone: maritime tenants are the Port's greatest assets in terms of delivering environmental sustainability
 - Tenants operate under a litany of environmental mitigations and requirements
 - In the event of transportation disruptions, maritime tenants are available to deliver goods by boat – moving people across the Bay, delivering goods, services
 - Re social equity – the PASHA cargo terminal operation and agreements with neighborhood in terms of jobs, etc. generate a sense of social cohesion with the neighborhood
2. Kudos to the Subcommittee for taking a very broad approach to the topic, and for defining the term 'resilience'.
3. Good recommendation #46, to meet or exceed affordable housing mandates
4. Comments about parking will be taken up by the Transportation Subcommittee.

Aside from the following list of comments that require revisions to Resilience Subcommittee recommendations, the Working Group accepted the Resilience Subcommittee Report.

Comments that would require revisions to Subcommittee Recommendations

1. The Port should serve as a guardian/leader for research, monitoring and education about Bay water quality.
2. The water quality recommendations should address aquatic-borne invasive species (e.g. bilge water can carry invasive seaweed and crabs)
3. There does not appear to be any cohesive thinking about how sea level rise might dramatically affect which land uses are appropriate along the waterfront. In response, Port staff suggests augmenting the recommendation regarding a "strategy for long-mid-short term timeframes" to look at appropriate use of lands over time.
4. The recommendation for the Port Strategic Plan that addresses tenants earthquake preparedness (first bullet on p. 13) should require (not encourage) tenants to evaluate their earthquake risk.
5. The section on water quality and conservation should include stretch policies that go beyond continuing to implement the City's existing plans and policies (e.g., they should address how to reduce wastewater releases into the Bay).

3. Transportation Subcommittee: Co-chair report and discussion of recommendations

Linda Fadeke Richardson provided a brief overview of the Transportation Subcommittee’s approach and recommendations. David Beaupre (Port staff) assisted the discussion.

General Questions/Comments from Working Group members and public

1. Good job by the Subcommittee. Port can acknowledge its transportation-related responsibilities to tenants and visitors, and advocate for its goals with other agencies.
2. Land Use Subcommittee Recommendation #44 supports parking to achieve trust objectives, especially for families, seniors, etc. and recognized that the Land Use and Transportation Recommendations from these two subcommittees would be knitted together. Land Use Subcommittee discussed parking, but did not discuss nor recommend a prohibition of new parking spaces.
3. Add a recommendation(s) that considers ride-hailing, a growing mode of transportation for families. Note: Ride-sharing is referred to as “transportation network companies (TNCs)”

Edits/modifications to be made by Port staff based on direction of the Working Group (or in coordination with Working Group member)

1. PP 25, Recommendation #50: Add “taxis” to the recommendation about ridesharing.

Aside from the following list of comments that require revision to Subcommittee Recommendations, the Working Group accepted the Transportation Subcommittee Report.

Comments that would require revisions to Subcommittee Recommendations

1. Review/augment the Transportation Recommendations to incorporate the concepts of inclusion, equity and diversity of access to the waterfront regardless of income level, age, visitor, or local. Consider importance of parking for parents carrying equipment for small children, neighborhoods that are underserved by transit, elderly or disabled, etc.
2. Recommendation #1 (Integrated Transportation Systems): Revisit/reconsider use of the term “hierarchy” and consider: optics of placing ‘bicycling’ before ‘transit’; encourage a “holistic” approach to walking, biking, coexisting along cars and transit; and equity/fairness of access.
3. Recommendation #14 (Walking and Bicycling): Should the Port establish a policy that prohibits motorized vehicles (and bikes) on sidewalk (without eliminating motorized wheelchairs)? Port staff notes that the policy intends to reduce conflicts; enacting the policy may lead to a law that prohibits motorized vehicles, etc.
4. Recommendation #21 (Public Transit):
 - Consider asking the City to study a MUNI underground tunnel (big idea) from Mission Bay to Fish Wharf to address MUNI and seawall/pier seismic issues. This Plan is a good place to come up with a big dream....vs how to park cars, get buses through, etc.
 - Consider adding reference to the Concept Study from Chinatown to Fisherman’s wharf.

- Consider recommendations about ride-hailing, a growing mode of transportation for families. Note: Ride-sharing is referred to as “transportation network companies (TNCs)”. Also, separating modes that have dangerous conflicts, especially TNC’s and bikes.
 - Consider recommending inexpensive ways to access the waterfront, such as free-shuttles from downtown to fisherman’s wharf. Or a free “loop” service along the waterfront. No capital improvements required for implementation.
5. Recommendation #26 (Water Transportation) Is “water-taxi” service an appropriate term? Or is it “small-vessel ferry” or “water shuttle”? Consider adding expansion of these types of facilities. Recommendation#40 (Parking and Auto Access): Consider a prohibition of new parking spaces, rather than limiting new auto parking spaces, and/or eliminating non-essential parking.

4. Meeting adjourned, 8:00 PM

- Discussion of Land Use Subcommittee recommendations was postponed to the next meeting.
- Next Meeting Date: Tuesday, October 3, 2017 6:00-8:00 PM