

December 29, 2011

TO: All Design Review Board Members

FROM: Ellen Miramontes, Bay Design Analyst [415/352-3643 ellenm@bcdc.ca.gov]
Ming Yeung, Coastal Program Analyst [415/352-3616 mingy@bcdc.ca.gov]

SUBJECT: 34th America's Cup Racing Event – Various Waterfront Locations, City and County of San Francisco; Third Review
(For Board consideration on January 9, 2012)

Project Summary

Project Applicants: Port of San Francisco and America's Cup Racing Authority

Project Representatives: Rosie Spaulding, America's Cup Event Authority (ACEA); Scott Preston, AECOM.

Background. On September 12, 2011, the Port's Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC) and the Commission's Design Review Board (Board) received a preliminary briefing on the 34th America's Cup Racing event and were presented with an overview of the proposed venue sites and activities that would occur in the San Francisco Bay during the Summer – Fall of 2012 and 2013. On November 7, 2011, the project sponsors returned for a second public hearing with more detailed exhibits for the sites along the waterfront and the public access proposal. The Board and WDAC had a number of questions for the project sponsors at that meeting, including questions on spectator estimates, the project's impacts to recreational boaters and public access users, and limitations at National Park Service areas, and requested that the applicants return with more information as well as specific site-planning details and design. On December 5, 2011, the WDAC and Board held an information briefing and were provided additional information to specifically address the questions they had on the project's impacts and mitigation measures, including spectator estimates, the City's proposed People Plan, the United States Coast Guard's Marine Vessel Traffic Management and lessons learned from the World Series events in San Diego, Cascais (Portugal), and Plymouth (England).

The January 9, 2012 meeting will follow-up on the Board's request for additional specific site-planning details and design and to provide responses also the Board's previous recommendations on the site plans and public access proposal. In addition, exhibits for proposed berthing within designated open water basins (including floating docks and super yacht berthing), uses and installations near the St. Francis Yacht Club, and new permanent public access, have been provided for this meeting.

Board Issues. At their last review of the project on November 7, 2011, the Board requested more information on the following issues. They are summarized below, followed by the applicant's response to each:



1. **Signage/Graphics on Branding and Lighting** – The Board requested more information regarding the proposed signage/graphics on branding and lighting at each of the sites.

Applicant Response: This package is still in development and is not anticipated to be available until early to mid-2012. The project sponsors will work with BCDC staff to develop the details of this package for possible review at a later DRB meeting, if needed.

2. **Specific Site-Planning Details and Design** – The Board requested more information on how the proposed structures would look, the physical nature of improvements, including tents and design of facilities. The Board requested that cross-sections of the sites be provided in the exhibit package and that landmarks and those responsible for each area be noted on the site plans.

Applicant Response: Some of this information was provided at the December 5, 2011 meeting, including photos and examples of proposed tents, bleachers, containers, and structures from other events. The proposed improvements are illustrated in perspectives included in the exhibit package and the exhibits have been updated to include some landmarks and National Park Service (NPS) areas. The project applicants have also included a number of cross-sections of the proposed sites in the attached exhibit package (see Exhibits, pp. 10, 13, 21, 31, 34, 43, 44, 45, 56).

3. **Bay Trail Buffer and Consolidate Improvements at Crissy Field and Marina Green** – The Board recommended that the Bay Trail be kept open at all times and that a buffer around the Bay Trail be provided to ensure a continuous corridor. The Board also requested that improvements and structures be consolidated and clustered together (specifically at Crissy Field and Marina Green) in order to preserve views and minimize footprint/impacts at each site. At Crissy Field, the Board suggested placing some uses in existing hangars. At Marina Green, the Board suggested clustering improvements near the Scott Street edge, moving smaller tents behind larger concessions tents and bleachers and relocating static displays to other areas of the waterfront such as near the Ferry Building, to create open view corridors from Marina Boulevard. The Board also recommended pulling structures back from the shoreline to create a 60-foot open area along the shoreline.

Applicant Response: The Bay Trail will be kept open at all times throughout the event sites. At Crissy Field, the project sponsors have pulled the bleachers 25 feet back from the edge of the Bay Trail and have provided a cross-section to illustrate this change (see Exhibits, pp. 9, 10, 30, and 31). At the December 5, 2011 meeting, the sponsors explained that per NPS and ACEA planning efforts, placing temporary spectator services in the hangars may not be compatible with Presidio Trust operations, plus there is a rationale for putting those services where they best serve the users. According to the project applicants, “the main ‘heavy’ spectator users have been placed in the central area per the NPS desire to contain the heavy use and temporary structures in this area. The additional temporary spectator services (food and beverage, restrooms, etc. as tents and portable facilities) are best placed in the outer areas to better distribute spectator services, reduce crowding/lines and locate those where they can be easily seen/accessed as well as providing services to the areas adjacent to the main event area.”

At Marina Green, some temporary spectator concession services along Marina Boulevard have been relocated to areas behind the primary large tent/bleachers to maintain view corridors. The north east corner of Marina Green has been opened up some by moving the structure on the most eastern side westward an additional 20 feet to allow for better circulation at that corner. However, static displays have remained as previously proposed and the structures remain set back between 28 to 65 feet from the edge of the shoreline. (See Exhibits, pp. 12 - 16 and 33 - 37). The proposed bleachers would be located 28 feet from the shoreline edge. Section

BB on Exhibit pages 13 and 34 depicts the current proposal that would allow only the existing 16-foot-wide promenade and 12-foot-wide grass median to remain open. Next to this 28-foot-wide area there would be a fence enclosing the private bleacher area. Additionally, the current proposal shows a 25-foot-wide corridor around the De-gaussing station.

4. **Aquatic Park** – The Board recommended moving the video screen within Aquatic Park to address the Dolphin Club’s concerns and suggested using and/or improving existing restrooms at the site rather than adding more portable toilets.

Applicant Response: The project applicants state that, “the video barge is an important part of activating and enhancing the experience of the large number of spectators on the shore and in the permanent bleachers which seat 2,500.” They have provided more information on the video barge. The barge would be approximately 140 feet long and would hold an LED video screen approximately 44 feet high by 22 feet tall. The screen would be in use approximately 3 to 4 hours during the afternoon races, which they say would not conflict with the swimmers’ primary time in the morning or evening. There would be a 100-foot buffer between the video barge and the swimming lanes. Details on the generator needed for the video screen include: 48 dBA at 50 feet so according to the applicants, no noise would be heard onshore and minimally heard 100 feet away. The generator would consist of 300 HP loaded to 65%, USEPA Tier 3 emission standards and fueling would be expected every 2 to 3 days. The applicants have provided an illustration of how the video screen would look (see Exhibits, p. 19).

5. **Piers 27 - 29** – The Board recommended making the area around the Foredeck Club at the tip of Piers 27-29 wider (suggesting a 50-foot-band) and requested that the red dashed line on the plan be removed.

Applicant Response: The project applicants state that, “the Foredeck Club is located in the optimal location for the public. Managed public access on the North and East side would be 25 feet minimum and then vary on the East up to 64 feet. Moving the Foredeck Club as suggested and as indicated on the Piers 27-29 Enlarged Plan (Exhibits, p. 42) as well as the dotted line on Rendering 5 (Exhibits, p. 50) from the bleachers would have a negative impact on the primary event space which will allow for fewer people, would limit the ability to have the boats on the deck for the very popular dock in/out show and would limit the view shed/site lines to the finish line from the bleachers. Therefore, we recommend not moving the Foredeck Club from its current optimal location.” This area is illustrated on pages 41 - 44 and 46 - 50 of the Exhibits.

6. **Piers 30 - 32** – The Board recommended providing public access along the north edge of the pier to see the back of house functions, to move the private event area (labeled 8 on page 20 of the Exhibits) to give Red’s Java House more room, to provide more information on the fencing proposed along the edge of the pier, and to continue the industrial character and lighting in this area.

Applicant Response: The project applicants have added a north-south public access corridor down the middle of the pier and along the northwest corner of the pier adjacent to Red’s Java House (see Exhibits, pp. 20 - 22). They state that “access is not recommended along the North as it is just a trailer office compound (nothing to see) and will provide operational access for the teams while the viewing/public access is allowed in the areas where the real “show” is happening...” The Event tent labeled “8” has been moved southward.

7. **Public Access** – The Board requested more design and detail on the public access elements, including design of the parklets and the proposed improvements at Marina Green.

Applicant Response: Since the Board's last review, the project applicants have added additional temporary and permanent public access to its proposal, based on feedback from the Board, the public and BCDC staff. The proposed public access is summarized in the attached memo from the Port of San Francisco and includes sailboard storage at Crissy Field, improvements to help complete two Bay Trail segments, accessible kayak launch sites, parklets, apron access, and landscaping treatment at Marina Green. The exhibits illustrating the new public access plans can be found on pages 62 - 83.

Additional Items. The following additional exhibits have been provided for review at this meeting:

1. Exhibits for proposed docks and berthing within designated open water basins (see Exhibits, pp. 41-48 and 51-59);
2. Proposed bleachers and tents near the St. Francis Yacht Club (see Exhibits, pp. 11 and 32); and
3. New temporary and permanent public access (see Exhibits, pp. 62-83).

Board Feedback. The Board's feedback is sought on whether the applicant has adequately responded to its concerns on the issues listed above and on the additional items that have been presented. In particular, BCDC staff seeks feedback on:

1. Whether improvements and structures have been adequately clustered and consolidated at the various locations to preserve views and minimize footprint/impacts at each site.
2. Whether the buffer between the Bay shoreline and the structures at Marina Green is sufficient to allow for comfortable and safe passage of public access users along the shoreline.
 - The Board recommended that improvements be set back at least 60 feet from the shoreline edge (approximately to the centerline of the Marina Green parking lot) to accommodate public movement and viewing along the shoreline. The project applicants have set back the private tent at the northeast corner to 48'-6" (previously setback 28 feet) but the adjacent bleachers remain set back only 28 feet. Staff continues to believe that the location of the bleachers and proposed fencing around the bleacher area will create a very narrow public access corridor at this spot (particularly around the De-gaussing station) and believes that additional room is needed to allow comfortable passage by the public around this edge. Staff continues to recommend that the structures to be set back further and seeks the Board's advice and recommendation on this issue.
3. Whether the proposed video screen at Aquatic Park is appropriately sited to minimize impacts to public access users (such as swimmers and boaters) and preserve views from the shoreline or should be relocated elsewhere.
4. Whether the corridor around the tip of Piers 27-29 in front of the Foredeck Club is appropriate and wide enough for public access when this area is not closed for security purposes.
 - The Board recommended widening the area around the Foredeck Club to 50 feet. The current plan shows a width of 25 feet at the narrow section and 64 feet at the widest section, with an average width of 32 feet. The applicants maintain that this is the optimal location for the Club.
5. Whether structures and uses not previously reviewed by the Board (such as near St. Francis Yacht Club) and the designated open water basins are appropriately designed and sited to minimize impacts to public access and views from the shoreline.
6. Whether there are comments and recommendations on the design and detail of the temporary public access spaces, such as at Piers 30-32, the parklets, the Piers 9, 19 and 23 aprons, and the Crissy Field sailboard storage. The Board's general advice on the permanent public access components is also appreciated, however, the Board will have the opportunity to review some of these projects in more detail at later Board meetings. We would appreciate the Board's general recommendations for the design of these spaces if there are any, but saving specific design comments for a later review of the individual public access projects.