

SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

50 California Street • Suite 2600 • San Francisco, California 94111 • (415) 352-3600 • Fax: (415) 352-3606 • www.bcdc.ca.gov

September 25, 2009

TO: All Design Review Board Members

FROM: Will Travis, Executive Director [415/352-3653 travis@bcdc.ca.gov]
Jaime Michaels, Coastal Program Analyst [415/352-3613 jaimem@bcdc.ca.gov]

SUBJECT: Hunters Point Shipyard-Candlestick Point Project, City and County of San Francisco; Pre-Application Review
(For Board consideration on October 5, 2009)

Project Summary

Project Sponsor: San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRDA) and HPS Development Co., LP, and CP Development Co., LP (a joint venture between Lennar and Scala Real Estate Partners, Hillwood, and Estein and Associates, USA)

Project Representatives: Tiffany Bohee and Michael Cohen, SFRDA; Kofi Bonner and Stephen Proud, Lennar Corporation

Project Site. The 702-acre site is located along a 9.6-mile section of the southeastern waterfront in the City and County of San Francisco. The project site is bounded by India Basin to the north, San Francisco Bay to the east, and the Bayview-Hunters Point district and Highway 101 to the west.

The project site is comprised of two primary areas, the Hunter's Point Shipyard (Shipyard) and Candlestick Point (Candlestick). (Exhibits 1 and 2)

Hunter's Point Shipyard. The site includes approximately 420 acres of dry land and 440 acres of submerged land in the Bay. Various dilapidated structures—many dating from the World War II era—, e.g., storage and construction facilities, dry docks, and piers, exist at the site. (Exhibits 3 and 4) The broadest area of tidal marsh located along the southern Shipyard shoreline is dominated by cordgrass, pickleweed, and marsh gumplant, and provides habitat for terrestrial garter snakes, shorebirds, and wading birds. The southern portion of the Shipyard is accessed by Crisp Road, Spear Avenue, and Fisher Avenue. The northern portion of the site is accessed from Innes Avenue, Galvez Avenue, and Robinson Street. Because access to the site has been historically controlled for security purposes, most of it remains fenced and closed to the public. At an 86-acre parcel, site remediation and clean-up was completed in 2005, allowing for the construction of approximately 1,600 residences and associated infrastructure and parks. The proposed project site will remain under the U.S. Navy's jurisdiction until site remediation and clean-up is complete. The proposed project will not commence until clean-up and site transfer occurs.



Making San Francisco Bay Better

Candlestick Point. The 280-acre site is comprised of existing residential structures and facilities (e.g., the 256-unit Alice Griffith public housing complex, and a 165-space recreational vehicle facility), the Candlestick Park stadium and associated parking, and the 72-acre Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (State Park). The State Park is unpaved with trails, restrooms, picnic facilities, two fishing piers, lookout points, an abandoned boat launch, and a popular windsurfing beach adjacent to Hunters Point Expressway. Approximately 100 acres of the Candlestick site, including the area surrounding Yosemite Slough and the vacant lots on Jamestown Avenue, are undeveloped and occasionally used for overflow stadium parking. (Exhibit 5) Existing access to the Candlestick site is limited to an arterial loop road encircling the stadium and parking lot. Carroll Avenue and Walker Drive provide access to the Alice Griffith housing facility, the streets of which are mostly internally-oriented.

The State Park contains Monterey pine and cypress trees that serve as nesting and foraging habitat for common bird species. During spring and fall, small numbers of migrant songbirds forage in the trees. The adjacent Bay provides foraging habitat for grebes, ducks, gulls, terns, double-crested cormorants, and California brown pelicans. In the South Basin, foraging and resting waterbirds are common, including surf scoters, greater scaup, lesser scaup, double-crested cormorants, and Caspian terns. Intertidal mudflats are limited primarily near the mouth of Yosemite Slough. Double Rock, an island in the South Basin, supports 10 to 15 pairs of nesting western gulls.

Proposed Project and Public Access/Amenities. The proposed project would involve the development of two currently separate sites, the Shipyard and Candlestick, which would ultimately function as a single integrated area through a phased-development approach. (Exhibit 41) The proposed project would be made up of nine distinct character areas. (Exhibit 6) The proposed development project would involve the construction of 10,500 residential units, a ferry terminal, a 300-berth marina, a bridge at Yosemite Slough, a public housing facility to replace the existing Alice Griffith complex, and a new 69,000-seat stadium in place of the existing stadium. In addition, the project would involve the development of 885,000 square feet of retail space, 2,650,000 square feet of office/research and development (R&D) space, a 150,000-square-foot, 220-room hotel, a 75,000-square-foot cultural arena, and a 225,000-square-foot artist's studio facility. (Exhibit 7) Building heights include three-story townhomes, four-story stacked residential flats, six- to 24-story mid-rise residential units, and 32-story-plus highrises (Exhibit 12). The site would be developed to include and facilitate pedestrian and bicycle circulation, and public transit to and from the site, and along its 9.6-mile shoreline. (Exhibits 8, 9, and 10) The proposed project would also involve the development of and improvements to 353 acres of park and open space area. (Exhibits 23 and 28) The project would occur within an approximately 98-acre area of the Commission's 100-foot shoreline band jurisdiction. Although, the project would likely involve fill in the Commission's Bay jurisdiction, precise fill area and quantities are not yet available. (Exhibit 11)

Distinct Character Areas. The nine distinct areas include a variety of public amenities, e.g., a continuous 9.6-mile public shoreline trail that would be a part of the San Francisco Bay Trail system, and other improvements to and expansion of the State Park, as described further below:

1

¹ Specific design detail on the State Parks is subject to the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area General Plan Amendment, and the process to amend the General Plan is underway.

1. **Hunters Point Northside Park.** A 12.4-acre parcel located at the northernmost point of the project site. Located adjacent to the Bay, the park would have recreational features, and picnic areas, shade shelters, and waterfront pathways. (Exhibit 25) Various types and designs of public access amenities for the project site (including Northside Park) are under consideration (Exhibits 37 and 38).
2. **Hunters Point.** At the adjoining site, the project would involve the development of residential units of varying heights, including a tower and mid-rise buildings. The proposed waterfront promenade would include shipyard artifacts, seating areas, and landscaping. (Exhibit 13)
3. **Hunters Point Village Center and Green R&D.** South of the above-described area would be a mixed-use district revolving around a R&D facility housed partly in a highrise structure. Proposed residential structures would also be highrise buildings. A two-berth ferry terminal and a 300-berth marina and new breakwaters are proposed, both with landside support facilities. A new transit center would be located in this district. The proposed 15.7-acre Heritage Park would honor the Shipyard history, containing interpretive elements and possibly a museum. An existing pier would be improved to facilitate recreation and special events. (Exhibits 14 and 26)
4. **Stadium.** The proposed Stadium district would be dominated by the sports complex and associated parking. (Exhibit 15) If a new stadium is not constructed, this district would be used for R&D facilities, associated parking, and open space. (Exhibit 16) The State Park would extend into this area at the area's southern edge. This expanded park area would two parcels: a 45.1-acre parcel (Grasslands Ecology Park, Parcel E) for visitor facilities, including overlooks, a visitor/interpretive center and parking; and a 37.2-acre parcel (Grasslands Ecology Park, Parcel E2), which would focus on the Yosemite Slough Wetland Restoration area sponsored by the California State Parks Foundation. (Exhibit 24)
5. **Alice Griffith.** The proposed redeveloped Alice Griffith public housing complex would be integrated into the proposed project particularly via street and traffic corridors, but is located outside of the Commission's jurisdiction. (Exhibit 17)
6. **Candlestick North.** A mixed-use area with residences located partly in highrise buildings. An 8.4-acre of State Park property, which is largely undeveloped and used for game-day stadium parking, would be improved with overlooks, restrooms, and parking. A 6.6-acre area would be used as part of a tidal marsh restoration project. (Exhibits 18, 24, and 27)
7. **Candlestick Village Center.** The area would include residences, a proposed hotel, and a new cultural center, and would be integrated into the proposed project via street corridors, but is located outside of the Commission's jurisdiction. (Exhibit 19)
8. **Candlestick South.** The proposed district includes a 15.9-acre area of the State Park, a.k.a., The Last Rubble, which would be developed to include a park ranger station/visitor's center, a Great Meadow, a bio-filtration pond, and various services including a restaurant/café. The 11.1-acre Wind Meadow site includes the Main Beach, which would be raised and reconfigured to interface with the proposed adjacent neighborhood park. At an approximately 27.5-acre State Park area, including Heart of the Park, The Point, and The Neck, improvements would include pedestrian pathways, upgraded restrooms, overlooks, an interpretive amphitheater, parking, and a windsurf/kayak launch. The adjoining 14.5-acre site, a.k.a., the Last Port, would be revitalized with access to the Bay for swimming, kayaking, and windsurfing. (Exhibits 20, 21, and 24)

9. **Jamestown.** The district would be integrated into the proposed project site particularly via street corridors, but is located outside of the Commission's jurisdiction. (Exhibit 22)

Bay Fill. Depending on their existing condition and location, existing bulkheads at the project site could require repair, replacement, or bolstering (i.e., the construction of a new concrete or steel wall behind or in front of an existing bulkhead), which would likely involve Bay fill. Additionally, various proposed public access improvements would involve fill in the Bay, e.g., boardwalks, fishing piers, overlooks, and floating docks.

As proposed, the Yosemite Slough Causeway would be designed to serve various purposes and be constructed with alternating lengths of asphalt, landscaping, and boardwalk. (Exhibits 29 and 30) During most of the year, the bridge would be closed to all vehicle traffic except public transit at dedicated lanes and open for pedestrian and bicycle use. (Exhibit 31) During game days, the new bridge would be dedicated almost entirely to vehicular traffic while a pedestrian/bicycle pathway would also remain open. (Exhibit 32) The bridge would be designed as a pile-supported structure. (Exhibit 33)

Where public access areas would be located adjacent to the shoreline, the project proponents propose an adaptive management strategy for addressing future sea level rise and flooding. The strategy would involve raising levees or other as-built structures (e.g., boardwalks), as needed. (Exhibit 34) If, in time, the height of shoreline levees exceeds the elevation of adjacent shoreline pathways, the public's view of the Bay would be impeded or obstructed entirely. At areas where existing shoreline protection cannot be increased in height, a foreshore berm/wave tripper would potentially be constructed and, depending on slope, possibly within the intertidal zone. At currently unprotected shoreline areas, new rip rap would likely be placed. Proposed shoreline protection approaches could result in Bay fill. (Exhibits 35, 36, 39, and 40)

San Francisco Bay Plan Policies. The *San Francisco Bay Plan* (Bay Plan) **Public Access** policies state, in part, that "a proposed fill project should increase public access to the Bay to the maximum extent feasible." Further, these policies state that access should "be provided in and through every new development in the Bay or on the shoreline," be designed—using the Commission's *Public Access Design Guidelines*—"to encourage diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline," be conveniently located near parking and public transit, "permit barrier free access for the physically handicapped...and include an ongoing maintenance program." Additionally, these policies state in part that "public access should be sited, designed and managed to prevent significant adverse effects on wildlife."

The Bay Plan **Appearance, Design and Scenic Views** policies state in part that "all bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay" and that "maximum efforts should be made to provide, enhance, or preserve views of the Bay and shoreline, especially from public areas, from the Bay itself, and from the opposite shore." These policies also state, in part, that "Shoreline developments should be built in clusters, leaving open area around them to permit more frequent views of the Bay," and, further, "towers, bridges or other structures near or over the Bay should be designed as landmarks that suggest the location of the waterfront when it is not visible especially in flat areas." Lastly, these policies state, in part, that "additional bridges over the Bay should be avoided, to the extent possible, to preserve the visual impact of the large expanse of the Bay. The design of new crossings deemed necessary should relate to others nearby and should be located between promontories or other land forms that naturally suggest themselves as connections reaching across the Bay."

The Bay Plan **Transportation** policies state partly that "ferry terminals should be sited at locations that are near navigable channels..." and, wherever possible, "near higher density, mixed-use development served by public transit." In addition, these policies state that shoreline projects and bridges over the Bay "should include pedestrian and bicycle paths that will either be a part of the Bay Trail or connect the Bay Trail with other regional and community trails."

The Bay Plan **Recreation** policies state partly that “ferry terminal configuration and operation should not disrupt continuous shoreline access.” Regarding new marinas, the recreation policies state partly that development “should include public amenities, such as viewing areas, restrooms, public mooring docks or floats and moorages for transient recreational boaters, non-motorized small boat launching facilities, public parking, [and] substantial physical and visual access...” These policies also state, in part, that waterfront parks should also include launch facilities for a variety of boats, including non-motorized, and camping facilities accessible by boat.

The Bay Plan **Safety of Fills** policies state in part that, “[t]o prevent damage from flooding, structures on fill or near the shoreline should have adequate flood protection including consideration of future relative sea level rise as determined by competent engineers.” Additionally, the policies state that, “[t]o minimize the potential hazard to Bay fill projects and bayside development from subsidence, all proposed development should be sufficiently high above the highest estimated tide level for the expected life of the project or sufficiently protected by levees...”.

Lastly, the **Bay Plan Map** No. 5 identifies the proposed Candlestick site for waterfront beach/park priority use noting: “Some fill may be needed. Preserve fishing, camping, picnicking, windsurfing, hiking and viewing opportunities. Potential water trail camping site. Provide signage regarding fish consumption advisories for anglers.” The Bay Plan Map also identifies part of the proposed Shipyard site as a port-priority use area noting: “Develop shoreline park and integrate with Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, consistent with San Francisco redevelopment plan. Potential water trail camping site. Some fill may be needed.” It should be noted that implementation of the proposed project at the Candlestick site would require an amendment to Bay Plan Map No. 5 to change or delete the site’s current priority use designation.

Public Access Issues. The staff believes that the project raises four primary issues for the Design Review Board (Board) to address in its review: (1) whether the proposed project provides adequate, usable and attractive public access spaces, and whether the project provides adequate connections to and continuity along the shoreline; (2) whether the proposed project maintains and preserves the visual quality of the Bay and shoreline, and enhances the public’s view of the Bay and shoreline especially in relation to the proposed structures; (3); whether the proposed project is adequately designed to address the effect of sea level rise on public access areas; and (4) whether interim access improvements could be installed and, if so, how such improvements would be designed and implemented.

1. **Does the proposed project provide adequate, usable, and attractive public access spaces?** In addition to the Bay Plan Public Access policies, the *Public Access Design Guidelines* (Guidelines) state that public access spaces should be “designed and built to encourage diverse, Bay-related activities along the shoreline”, to create a “sense of place”, and be “designed for a wide range of users.” The Guidelines also state that, “access areas are utilized most if they provide direct connections to public rights-of-way such as streets and sidewalks...” The Guidelines further state that this may be accomplished by “incorporating the designated Bay Trail route into shoreline projects and providing clear and continuous transitions to adjacent developments.”

The proposed project, which includes 10,500 residential units and a replacement public housing facility, a 69,000-seat football stadium, a 300-berth marina, 885,000 square feet of retail space, 2,650,000 square feet of office/R&D space, a 220-room hotel, a 75,000-square-foot cultural arena, a 225,000-square-foot artist's studio facility, a new transit center, and ferry terminal, would also result in approximately 350 acres of new and/or improved public park and open space, including a 9.6-mile public shoreline trail that would be part of the Bay Trail. Some of the featured public areas include: parks offering active and passive recreational opportunities, interpretative areas focused on the Shipyard history, a large pier dedicated to access and special events, an expanded State Park that includes wildlife-focused restoration and recreation opportunities, parking facilities, fishing piers, and a non-motorized boat launching area. As proposed, the project does not include a motorized boat launching facility or shoreline camping areas. As proposed, the site would be designed to connect to the adjacent existing city-street grid via foot, bicycle, public transit, and car.

Design details of several key shoreline features, e.g., the ferry terminal, marina, interpretive museum, and State Park visitor center and related facilities, are not yet available. Therefore, it is not clear, for example, how the design of the ferry terminal would affect continuous shoreline access or whether the new marina would include public access amenities, such as viewing areas and public parking.

The Board should advise the Commission and the project proponents whether the proposed public access areas are sufficient to accommodate the expected level of use and variety of users, designed to take advantage of existing site characteristics and opportunities, facilitate access in and through the developed areas, and are conveniently located near transit and parking facilities. The Board should also consider whether the structural integrity of the existing pier would adequately and safely support proposed access, and, further, whether the areas proposed for habitat restoration would be sited, designed and managed to prevent adverse effects on wildlife.

2. **Does the proposed project maintain and enhance the visual quality of the Bay, shoreline and adjacent developments?** In addition to the previously-cited Bay Plan Appearance, Design and Scenic Views policies, the Design Guidelines state that "the design character of public access areas should relate to the scale and intensity of the proposed development." In order to achieve this objective, the Guidelines suggest "using forms, materials, colors and textures that are compatible with the Bay and adjacent development" and "utilizing the shoreline for Bay-related land uses as much as possible..." The Guidelines further state that "[v]iew opportunities, shoreline configuration and access points are factors that determine a site's inherent public access opportunities."

The proposed project is made up of nine distinct character areas with structures of varying heights located mostly away from the shoreline and adjacent to a 9.6-mile shoreline trail. Building heights include three-story townhomes, four-story stacked residential flats, six- to 24-story mid-rise residential units, and 32-story-plus towers constructed mostly in clusters. According to the project proponents, larger buildings and towers would be located in areas that minimize impacts of shadows on open spaces and towers would be located at key intersections. Design details of several key shoreline features, e.g., the ferry terminal, marina, an interpretive museum, and State Park visitor center and related facilities, are not yet available.

As proposed, the approximately 80-foot-wide bridge over Yosemite Slough would be a causeway elevated above the water by concrete pilings with a bridge deck constructed of alternating panels of asphalt, landscaping, and boardwalk. The bridge would be used for public transit vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles except on football game-days when it would be used mostly for vehicular traffic, including private cars. The McAteer-Petris Act (Act) allows fill in the Bay for water-oriented uses, including bridges, and, further, a "minor" amount of fill for public access. However, the Act also provides that fill is allowed if it is the minimum necessary to achieve the project purpose and if there is no upland alternative.

The Board should advise the Commission and the project proponents whether the proposed project design complements and enhances the public's view of the Bay from the shoreline and through the project site especially in relation to the various proposed structures. Although, the proposed site and building design is in an early stage, advice is sought on whether the building form, materials, and colors would create an attractive addition to the area and would be compatible with the Bay. The Board should also advise on the potential visual impact of the proposed bridge/causeway and its design as a multi-use roadway with a public access component.

3. **Is the proposed project adequately designed to address the effect of sea level rise on public access areas?** In addition to the Bay Plan policies on the safety of fills (as stated previously), the Bay Plan provides that public access should be maintained and also that the public's view of the Bay and shoreline should be preserved.

The project proponents propose an adaptive management strategy for addressing future sea level rise and flooding. The strategy would involve raising levees or other as-built structures (e.g., boardwalks), as sea level rises and/or if flooding conditions warrant. Employing this approach at shoreline areas with adjacent at-grade public access would result over time in shoreline protection structures that partly or entirely obstruct the public's view of the Bay.

The Board should advise on whether the proposed adaptive management approach for addressing sea level rise and flooding would be adequate for maintaining the public's maximum use of the shoreline and views of the adjacent Bay.

4. **If interim public access improvements are installed, how would such improvements be designed and implemented?** The proposed project would be implemented in phases with portions of the Shipyard's northern shoreline implemented during Phase 1, the remaining areas at the Shipyard site and the northern shoreline at the Candlestick site implemented during Phase 2, and the remainder of the Candlestick site constructed during Phases 3 and 4. In light of the phased construction approach and consequent delay in implementing the entire suite of proposed access improvements, the project proponent is considering "interim" access amenities at sites proposed for development during later phases. A specific interim plan has not been developed to date.

The Board should advise on the design of and construction scheduling for interim public access improvements.