

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION  
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
AND PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO'S  
WATERFRONT DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

JOINT REVIEW BY  
BCDC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
AND PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO'S  
WATERFRONT DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO  
PIER ONE - BAYSIDE CONFERENCE ROOM  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2014

6:00 P.M.

Reported by: John Cota

A P P E A R A N C E SBCDC Design Review Board (DRB) Members

John Kriken, Chair

Steve Thompson, Vice Chair

Cheryl Barton

Ephraim Hirsch

Stefan Pellegrini

Michael Smiley

Gary Strang

Port Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC) Members

Dan Hodapp, Chair

David Alumbaugh

Marsha Maytum

BCDC Staff

Brad McCrea, Regulatory Program Director

Bob Batha, Chief of Permits

Jaime Michaels, Principal Permit Analyst

Ellen Miramontes, Bay Development Design Analyst

A P P E A R A N C E SProject Team

David Carlock, Project Executive  
Kate Aufhauser  
GSW Arena, LLC

Clarke Miller, Development Manager  
Strada Investment Group

Brad Benson, Special Projects Director  
Diane Oshima, Deputy Director of Planning  
Byron Rhett, Deputy Director of Planning and Development  
Port of San Francisco

Anne Taupier  
John Gavin  
San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development

Chris Kern  
San Francisco Planning Department

Gary Oates  
Environmental Science Associates

Craig Dykers  
Michelle Delk  
Nicholas Rader  
Snøhetta/GSW Arena, LLC (GSW)

A P P E A R A N C E SAlso Present

Jamie Whitaker

Scott Emblidge,  
Moscone Emblidge Sater & Otis  
*representing* San Francisco Waterfront Alliance

John Cornwell

Earl Gee

Patrick Valentino

Barbara Inaba

Karen Nemsick

Dennis MacKenzie  
Round the Diamond

James Miller

Frederick Allardyce  
Recreation & Open Space for the Waterfront

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
1. Call to Order	6
2. Adoption/Approval of Draft Minutes	6
DRB Draft Minutes of March 10, 2014	6
WDAC Draft Minutes of December 9, 2013	7
3. Proposed Golden State Warriors' Arena on Pier 30-32 and development on Seawall Lot 330 (First Pre-Application Review before the DRB)	12
Introduction by Jaime Michaels, BCDC	12
<u>Project Proponents</u>	
Brad Benson	15
Craig Dykers	16
Board Members' Clarifying Questions	42
<u>Public Comment</u>	
Jamie Whitaker	58
Scott Emblidge	59
John Cornwell	60
Earl Gee	62
Patrick Valentino	63
Barbara Inaba	65
Karen Nemsick	66
Dennis MacKenzie	68
James Miller	70
Frederick Allardyce	71
Board Members' Questions, Comments and Discussion	74
Applicant's Response to Board Members' Questions, Comments and Discussion	95
4. Public Comments (WDAC)	97
5. Adjournment	98
Certificate of Reporter/Transcriber	99

P R O C E E D I N G S

6:07 p.m.

1  
2  
3 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I'd like to call to order the April  
4 7th meeting of the BCDC Design Review Board and the Port's  
5 Design Advisory Committee -- Waterfront Design Advisory  
6 Committee.

7 The first order of business is the approval of minutes  
8 of our March 10th meeting; and I believe you -- the Port  
9 also has some minutes.

10 So may I ask, are there any additions or deletions from  
11 those minutes?

12 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: I enjoyed reading them but I  
13 wasn't here.

14 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay.

15 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: I read them and they seemed like I  
16 was quoted correctly.

17 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay. May I have a raise of hands  
18 for the acceptance of these minutes.

19 (Show of hands.)

20 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you. Dan.

21 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: I'm Dan Hodapp with the Port's  
22 Waterfront Design Advisory Committee and we have Marsha  
23 Maytum and David Alumbaugh here.

24 Welcome to the Committee and thank you all for coming  
25 out tonight. I know it's a valuable part of your time

1 you're giving up and appreciate your patience and your  
2 participation in the meeting tonight as well look at this  
3 very interesting project.

4 I want to take just a moment -- I want to do two  
5 things. One, I've got minutes to adopt from the December  
6 9th, 2013 meeting. Are there any changes to those?

7 WDAC MEMBER ALUMBAUGH: I have one comment on the  
8 minutes. I believe in response to a question about the  
9 funding for the extension of 19th Street it was stated that  
10 the funds for the Crane Cove Park -- the extension wouldn't  
11 come from the Parks Bond and I don't see that in the  
12 minutes.

13 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: We'll make sure we add that to the  
14 minutes.

15 WDAC MEMBER ALUMBAUGH: Thank you.

16 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Any other changes to those minutes?

17 Okay, with that change they are adopted then.

18 I wanted to also just take a moment to tell you, the  
19 audience, a little bit about what the Waterfront Design  
20 Advisory is and I guess isn't. It's the City's Waterfront  
21 Advisory Committee and it's a committee that is here to  
22 advise the Port Commission and the City Planning Commission  
23 on design issues on Port property. The Committee is not  
24 here to decide on land use issues. It is not within the  
25 purview of this committee to do this in any way.

1           The committee members are experts in the field of  
2 architecture, landscape architecture, urban design and  
3 planning. And the committee members that are here volunteer  
4 their time to be part of this and to share their expertise.

5           Specifically the Committee's role is to evaluate  
6 projects for their consistency with the Port's Waterfront  
7 Design and Access Element. That's an element of the Land  
8 Use Plan and it's an urban design plan for Port property  
9 that outlines design criteria for individual projects. It  
10 lays out a public space plan, historic resource policies and  
11 view policies along the waterfront.

12           It is likely that the Committee will review a project  
13 several times, starting tonight with looking at a concept  
14 level design and then typically proceeding through schematic  
15 design and then more detailed design. And moving towards a  
16 final commendation that is also based on reviewing the  
17 environmental document. So I just wanted to lay that out.

18           And John and I will be sharing the microphone here as  
19 the Chair. Thank you.

20           DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I would also like to introduce Ellen  
21 Miramontes from BCDC.

22           MS. MIRAMONTES: Good evening, I am Ellen Miramontes  
23 with BCDC and I serve as the Bay Design Analyst for BCDC.  
24 In this role I serve as the secretary for our Design Review  
25 Board and I am just going to briefly describe the role of

1 the Board:

2 The Board serves as an advisory board to the  
3 Commission, its staff and project applicants.

4 It's recommendations are advisory only and are not of  
5 themselves grounds for denying or approving a permit.

6 The Board's focus is on public access to the Bay and  
7 its shoreline and any impacts a proposed project may have on  
8 existing or proposed access.

9 The Board members are experts in the fields of  
10 architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, planning  
11 and engineering. They volunteer their time and expertise.

12 The Commission's enabling law, the McAteer-Petris Act,  
13 directs the Commission to seek maximum feasible public  
14 access consistent with a proposed project.

15 The Board was formed to advise the Commission on the  
16 adequacy of public access as part of proposed projects in  
17 the Commission's jurisdiction.

18 Public access may include both physical improvements  
19 such as paths, plazas, landscaping, seating, as well as  
20 visual access through view corridors to the Bay.

21 Since views are a form of public access, the Commission  
22 relies on the Board's advice in assessing a project's  
23 impacts on public views.

24 The Commission's guiding policy documents, the San  
25 Francisco Bay Plan and the San Francisco Waterfront Special

1 Area Plan, cover policies on public access and views. The  
2 Board advises the Commission on a project's impacts on  
3 appearance, design and scenic views in accordance with these  
4 policies and also the Commission's Public Access Design  
5 Guidelines.

6 The Board assesses the quality, quantity and usefulness  
7 of public access and considers whether the public access is  
8 well-designed, useful and attractive.

9 Large projects are often reviewed by the Board several  
10 times. During their preliminary review the Board makes  
11 suggestions about design and public access generally but  
12 does not come to any final conclusions.

13 So that summarizes what the Board does.

14 Now, Dan, were you going to walk through the meeting  
15 schedule as well?

16 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Yes. Thank you, Ellen.

17 MS. MIRAMONTES: Okay.

18 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: I can go through that.

19 We have a process we follow for each project. The  
20 first part of it is to introduce the project and have a  
21 presentation by the applicant and that will be 20 or 25  
22 minutes here and you can see we are all set up for a show,  
23 as of such.

24 The second part of the meeting then is for questions  
25 from the Committee to the presenter for clarification. It's

1 not a comment period but it's a question period to further  
2 make sure that the project is fully understood.

3       Following that is public comment, where we'll ask who  
4 in the public would like to speak. And given the size of  
5 the group I assume we're going to put a time limit on such  
6 for each individual speaker so that we get a chance to hear  
7 from everybody while we still have everyone's full  
8 attention.

9       Following that it returns to the Committee and the  
10 Board for discussion and recommendations to the applicant as  
11 we go forward.

12       And then there is a final part where the applicant can  
13 respond to the questions that have come up.

14       So that's our procedure. And I guess now --

15       MS. MIRAMONTES: Actually, Dan, where would you like  
16 the public to place their speaker cards?

17       WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Thank you. We do have speaker  
18 cards; they're available on the table up front. And if they  
19 can be delivered to -- can you take them, Ellen? Deliver  
20 them to Ellen up front and then we'll call speakers in the  
21 order of such. And it will be one of the tools we'll use to  
22 keep the process moving tonight and be as efficient as we  
23 can during this meeting. So thank you.

24       DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I would now like to call on Jaime  
25 Michaels to introduce the project and the concerns of our

1 Commission.

2 MS. MICHAELS: Thank you. The proposed mixed-use  
3 project at Piers 30-32 in the City and County of San  
4 Francisco would involve pier reconstruction and the  
5 development of a basketball arena and event center, offices  
6 and team practice facility, a parking garage, a restaurant  
7 and retail complex, a firehouse, maritime operations and  
8 public spaces.

9 The project also includes Seawall Lot 330 located  
10 across the street from the piers, which would be developed  
11 into a mixed-use complex with residential, hotel, retail,  
12 restaurant and parking facilities. Piers 30-32 is located  
13 entirely within the Commission's, BCDC's, jurisdiction,  
14 while Seawall Lot 330 is located outside of BCDC's  
15 jurisdiction.

16 A permit application from BCDC has not been submitted  
17 for the project. However, the Commission has been briefed  
18 about it; and last year held several public meetings on  
19 state legislation through which the legislature found the  
20 project to be consistent with the public trust as long as  
21 the State Lands Commission, at a later date, finds that it  
22 conforms with certain conditions.

23 Tonight is the Board's first review of the project. In  
24 reviewing the pre-application proposal we ask the  
25 Commission's Board to focus its attention on those elements

1 falling under its purview: design, public access and public  
2 views.

3 In this early review, as indicated in our staff report,  
4 we have broken the project issues into six broad categories  
5 and ask the Board to consider the following:

6 First, regarding Massing and Character, we ask you to  
7 consider if the project at the piers would be compatible  
8 with and reflect the waterfront district identity and  
9 historic character.

10 Second, regarding Heights, we ask that the Board to  
11 consider if the heights and arrangement of the development  
12 at the piers would be appropriate for the location and would  
13 preserve Bay views to the maximum extent feasible. We ask  
14 you also to consider if these heights would allow for public  
15 views of the Bay Bridge and the distant hills.

16 Third, regarding Public Access and Adjoining Uses, we  
17 ask the Board to consider if access on the piers would  
18 provide opportunities to enjoy the Bay and be connected  
19 physically and visually to the water. You should also  
20 consider how outdoor dining, vessel docking and operational  
21 facilities for fireboats, water taxis and cruise ships would  
22 operate and be managed to maximize use and enjoyment of the  
23 public areas.

24 Fourth, regarding Views, the Board should consider if  
25 proposed public areas would have more of a relationship to

1 the water than to the mixed-use development at the piers.  
2 Also, you should consider whether the varying elevations of  
3 the access areas would be minor and whether any covered  
4 access areas would beneficially serve the public. Please  
5 also think about whether access located along the southern  
6 boundary takes advantage of the adjacent open water basin  
7 and whether public areas would provide views not only of the  
8 Bay but also of the City of San Francisco.

9       Regarding Circulation, we ask you to consider whether  
10 the proposed circulation and ingress/egress points for all  
11 vehicles, pedestrians, persons with disabilities and  
12 bicycles would facilitate efficient, safe and comfortable  
13 movement at the site.

14       And lastly, regarding Sea Level Rise, and based on the  
15 information provided thus far, the Board should review the  
16 proposed access areas in light of future potential  
17 conditions at the site.

18       And with that I'd like to introduce Brad Benson from  
19 the Port of San Francisco.

20       MR. BENSON: Good evening. My name is Brad Benson, I'm  
21 the Special Projects Director at the Port and the Project  
22 Manager on the Piers 30-32 and Seawall Lot 330 project.

23       I think Jaime has done an excellent job describing the  
24 project and so I won't add remarks there but I did want to  
25 introduce the Port team, the Golden State Warriors team,

1 city staff and consultants who are here tonight on the  
2 project.

3 First, representing the Golden State Warriors, the  
4 Project Executive David Carlock is here along with Kate  
5 Aufhauser with the Warriors as well.

6 Clarke Miller is with Strada Investment Group, the  
7 Development Manager for the project.

8 The City team consists of Jennifer Metz who is the  
9 Project Director representing the Mayor; she could not be  
10 here tonight. Anne Taupier is with the Office of Economic  
11 and Workforce Development along with John Gavin who is here  
12 tonight.

13 On the Port team we have Byron Rhett who is Deputy  
14 Director of Planning and Development for the Port, Diane  
15 Oshima is the Deputy Director of Planning for the Port.

16 We have Chris Kern from the San Francisco Planning  
17 Department and also Gary Oates who is the consultant with  
18 Environmental Science Associates who is leading the  
19 environmental review on the project.

20 So we have a full group here tonight representing the  
21 project and hopefully can answer any questions that you  
22 have.

23 And now I'd like to introduce the design team. Craig  
24 Dykers is here with Snøhetta. Snøhetta is very well known  
25 as an architecture firm. They worked on the Museum of

1 Modern Art expansion that's going on in the City. They have  
2 great expertise developing waterfront projects like the one  
3 that you'll see tonight. Craig is here with Nick Rader and  
4 Michelle Delk. And so I'll turn it over to Craig to give  
5 the presentation. Thank you.

6 MR. DYKERS: Thank you very much. We do have a slide  
7 presentation so it may be best for you to find a seat. I  
8 think they reserved some seats here.

9 First of all, very quickly I'd like to thank all of you  
10 for allowing us to get to this stage in the process; it has  
11 been a very long process. We have been working with  
12 different agencies, of course BCDC, the City of San  
13 Francisco, the planning authorities. And we have also been  
14 working and meeting with CAC groups and, in fact, having  
15 informal meetings with people on the street that live in the  
16 neighborhood. So it's been a long time and we are happy to  
17 have been given this chance to meet with your group for the  
18 first time.

19 And also I would say it is rather fortuitous, I  
20 suppose, in some ways that it's such a beautiful day today.  
21 I know that it's difficult to stay inside. But I think for  
22 us anyway it's fortuitous because this is the kind of day  
23 that we imagine this site at Piers 30-32 will be filled with  
24 people outside enjoying the sun and enjoying the facilities  
25 that we are also providing in addition to the event venue

1 and the retail complex. So for us this type of day is sort  
2 of at the heart of how our thinking has evolved for this  
3 project.

4 We have two primary goals that drive our thinking most  
5 of the time. One of them has already been mentioned and  
6 that is to maximize access to the waterfront. That is both  
7 physical and intellectual access to the waterfront. So  
8 views are very important but also being able to walk on the  
9 space in different ways drives our thinking.

10 But I would say that alone for us is not the -- that  
11 alone is not enough to make this place a great and important  
12 part of the city. We also want Piers 30-32 to be a  
13 complementary feature to the heart of San Francisco and the  
14 Bay that will help continue the tradition of providing  
15 places that people expect to see in the city that they know  
16 and love. Places that are useful for a collection of  
17 different types of people, diverse types of uses, different  
18 types of terrain, different perspectives. All those things  
19 that I think many people enjoy about the city. So those are  
20 the two things together that we hope to show for you today.

21 The second point that I made about this sort of  
22 addition to the city can easily be seen. If you look at a  
23 map of San Francisco and the waterfront you will find a  
24 number of important features that come all the way from the  
25 Presidio down along Fisherman's Wharf and of course over to

1 the Ferry Building and eventually down to AT&T Park and in  
2 the future I imagine at Pier 70.

3       There is a stretch of waterfront as you leave the Ferry  
4 Building, approach the pier and move towards AT&T Park where  
5 there - and Mission Bay, of course - where there is a kind  
6 of a lull in your access or your connection to the water.  
7 So we imagine that this particular point where Piers 30-32  
8 are could be a part of the string of events that help pace  
9 your movement along the waterfront. And currently today,  
10 with an empty pier that is fenced in and decaying we don't  
11 -- and it's adjoined, of course, by Brannan Wharf Park,  
12 which is an important feature, but commercial activity and a  
13 parking area on the other side. So we want to draw people  
14 more directly to this cultural context.

15       The pier itself is decaying at a very significant rate.  
16 A number of reports have been made by the Port that point to  
17 the rate of decay. There are various analyses that have  
18 been put forward but we are certainly seeing anywhere  
19 between 10 to 30 years of time at which various portions of  
20 this pier will decay. This has been important in  
21 understanding our project that we wish not to allow this  
22 place to remain in a state of decay but instead provide it  
23 as a useful area for people of the City. So that also is  
24 driving us and a significant amount of funding is being used  
25 to stabilize the pier and to make it functional in a way

1 that it is not able to provide today.

2       There are a number of features around this area that we  
3 have been looking at. Of course, as you well know, the  
4 waterfront is not a waterfront, it's many, many waterfronts  
5 of many different types of character. Sometimes there are  
6 finger piers that reach out into the Bay and create very  
7 narrow inlets of water, sometimes there are wide stretches  
8 of waterfront, sometimes there are wide piers. And of  
9 course Pier 30-32 is a wide pier. It never used to be, of  
10 course, it was two individual piers, but then it was joined  
11 together and it's actually quite a strange place to be. I'm  
12 sure you've spent time there. But if you stand at the edge  
13 it's actually hard to see the water reaching the land  
14 because it's so wide and so deep. So that's a different  
15 type of character than a finger pier traditionally has.

16       And so we looked at these different characters and, of  
17 course, looked at the scale of the buildings surrounding --  
18 the historical pier buildings that we all know and love  
19 along the Embarcadero, were part of the features that we  
20 began to understand. And very importantly, what is unique  
21 about this particular place and what views are unique here  
22 that we not only could protect but also invigorate with the  
23 design.

24       One of the features, although this is a pretty nasty  
25 picture because this is kind of how the pier looks much of

1 the time today. But if you imagine all of these tractors  
2 away, taken away, the Bay Bridge is a significant component  
3 of this place along the waterfront. It's a beautiful bridge  
4 and it has a wonderful character that you don't find, of  
5 course, until you get all the way around to where the Golden  
6 Gate Bridge is. And this is a part of the identity of the  
7 City, the bridge culture.

8 We looked at some of the previous designs that had been  
9 proposed or sketched in the newspapers which placed a  
10 building more towards the center of the site. Not just  
11 arena designs but there have been other previous designs  
12 shown at this site for terminals, et cetera, and they  
13 generally put the bulk of the massing at the center of the  
14 pier, which would mean you would actually block that view.

15 So our design from the very early sketches has tried to  
16 promote a different way of seeing the waterfront. We are  
17 not just talking about looking perpendicular to the  
18 Embarcadero, which we're dealing with also. We also want to  
19 create a design that runs parallel to the Embarcadero. So  
20 that as you are moving along the Embarcadero and you are not  
21 just standing facing away from the City, but as you are  
22 actually walking the Embarcadero there will be these framed  
23 moments. Especially as you move here from the south to the  
24 north where Brannan Wharf Park is. The buildings are pushed  
25 to the side. And so the event facility and the arena are

1 pushed as far to the east as possible and the retail against  
2 the Embarcadero that it frames this one rather significant  
3 view of the bridge pylon of the Bray Bridge. So that was a  
4 driving features of how we understood this site could be  
5 improved.

6 In the final design you can see we've managed to  
7 maintain that character although slightly different. There  
8 have been a number of other features that have been changed  
9 over time to respond to different characteristics of the  
10 waterfront and of its connection to the Embarcadero. But  
11 essentially we have managed to maintain this rather  
12 significant moment alongside, as you'll see later in the  
13 presentation, other views out towards Oakland and to the  
14 South Bay, which we also understand to be important aspects  
15 of the site.

16 The site plan itself began in a very different way.  
17 It's gone through a lot of versions, we are not going to  
18 spend a lot of time talking about the older versions, but  
19 there was much larger retail against the Embarcadero. A  
20 much larger girth to the arena and the event center itself,  
21 it was also a little taller. We made the retail smaller,  
22 smaller modules, you'll see in a moment. We reduced the  
23 girth of the arena and tried to reduce the height as much as  
24 we could. And this was all the result of various meetings  
25 that we've had during this phase.

1           We have also cut away pier area. So here you can see  
2 there was no pier cut away. But we want to expose as much  
3 water as we can so there's a number of areas you'll see in  
4 the new design where a pier has been cut away.

5           We are not going to really talk about the Seawall site  
6 tonight. I know that's very, very important to many people.  
7 You will just briefly see it here across the Embarcadero as  
8 a reference. There are a number of people that are probably  
9 wanting to comment about that but it is not the focus of  
10 this presentation. We are in the process -- of course the  
11 design team is in the process of studying design  
12 alternatives for that site. And as you may have read in the  
13 newspaper a number of those studies include the studying of  
14 a code compliant design which doesn't require changes to the  
15 existing zoning codes on the Seawall site. So these are all  
16 still out there. So if there is anybody who is wanting to  
17 talk about that, that's my comment about the Seawall site,  
18 and hopefully it will not generate the bulk of this  
19 presentation today.

20           In many of our meetings, especially with BCDC staff, we  
21 talked about access and massing. And so a good deal of the  
22 changes that have occurred have been in response to the city  
23 of San Francisco planning and BCDC suggestions. So we had a  
24 couple of meetings, more than a couple actually, where all  
25 of the parties sat down together.

1           This was an early sketch from BCDC staff where they  
2 wanted to widen the northwest corner access point. Which  
3 you may imagine, the northwest corner of this site is a  
4 very, very important way in which people will access the  
5 site because much of the public transportation and general  
6 bulk of the population comes from this northwest area. So a  
7 large number of people will be entering the site from that  
8 area.

9           We have tried to create more space between the  
10 buildings and the waterfront so we have enlarged the flat  
11 areas that you move alongside the building and against the  
12 water. We reduced the girth of the event center itself and  
13 opened up more views through the retail.

14           So I'll just flip back and forth. This is our sketch  
15 later, the current design, where we've tried to respond to  
16 City of San Francisco and BCDC comments. So here you can  
17 see some of the arrows that were made on the sketches given  
18 to us and how we sort of responded to that. We widened the  
19 apron in many areas, we have created more views through the  
20 retail and made more diagonal connections, a more porous  
21 kind of design in these areas.

22           So just to refresh our thoughts again: We want to  
23 improve access, we want an inviting place that is  
24 complementary to the architectural and natural context of  
25 the waterfront. We want to also provide more open park

1 space for people to use this area in a way that is  
2 comparable to many other park areas in the city.

3       So here is the new version. You can see the retail has  
4 gotten smaller in its footprint. It is also a much smaller  
5 module, so we imagine the retail will be of a size that is  
6 natural to the area, not big box kind of retail, although  
7 there will be well-known retailers we'd imagine, also in  
8 these locations.

9       We have opened up the northwest corner with a series of  
10 plazas and terraces. We have pulled back some of the areas  
11 where there was pier so that there could be water exposed  
12 along -- especially the south edge. We created -- the  
13 biggest bulk of the sort of wide access area is facing south  
14 towards Brannan Wharf Park.

15       This is a tilted surface so it's leading you up to a  
16 raised entry plaza and that's there for several reasons.  
17 First of all, the tilted surface will get more daylight  
18 hours or sunlight hours as it will face the sun more  
19 directly to the south. Also it creates an event entry plaza  
20 that will be removed from the basic sort of character of the  
21 Embarcadero itself, so when there are large events, things  
22 can happen along the Embarcadero without conflicting with  
23 the entries and exits.

24       And that is very important to recognize, this entry  
25 area is pulled quite far back from the street. So many of

1 you often think of, say, AT&T Park, which is really only --  
2 I don't remember the number exactly but I believe it's  
3 around 50 to 60 feet from the sidewalk edge to where the  
4 crowds actually gather. So we are trying to pull that away  
5 so that you can have independent activities during the day  
6 and in the evenings. There are raised areas that give you,  
7 promote higher views across to Treasure Island. There are  
8 lowered areas that bring you a little bit closer to the  
9 water without actually going into the water.

10 Many of you know Red's. We have actually kept Red's;  
11 so those of you that like their cheeseburgers you don't have  
12 to worry, but we are moving it. Part of its original  
13 location conflicted with the needs of those people that were  
14 providing -- accessing the site from the northwest. So  
15 we've given it a similar condition on the south side of the  
16 pier with a little more space around it for people to  
17 gather.

18 There's a couple of things here that have been  
19 contentious so it would be very interesting to hear your  
20 viewpoints. One was that we have always felt that Red's  
21 should be up against the pier edge as it is today and it's  
22 sort of more historically appropriate. There is a need  
23 though, of course, for BCDC and others to pull it back so I  
24 guess that's something it would be interesting to hear your  
25 viewpoint on.

1           The notion of cutting back the pier is also very  
2 interesting and somewhat problematic for some people. I  
3 don't think it's an issue so much here because what it does  
4 is it gives you a quicker access to the water by bringing it  
5 a little closer to the Embarcadero. But over here where  
6 we're providing a deep water berth, which is part of the  
7 sort of concession of creating this site, it means that the  
8 deep water berth can't actually function very well so that  
9 this may need to get filled out and we may need to transfer  
10 that cut to another portion. We kind of like this so it  
11 will be interesting to hear if you have any opinions.

12           We also have two sort of pier locations alongside the  
13 north edge. There is a water taxi location here that  
14 connect to other areas of the Bay and also two fire boat  
15 docking points. So there is a fire station on the site that  
16 is being integrated into this building.

17           Part of the idea for raising up the terraces also means  
18 that we can tuck in all of the service activities that an  
19 arena would normally have. There's a lot of delivery areas  
20 and a lot of things that have to happen. And rather than  
21 having those exposed or be a sort of a kind of a challenge  
22 to the noise levels of the site we tucked them in under this  
23 raised terrace. And the fire station is also tucked in  
24 under the raised terrace. So by raising up it gives you two  
25 things. One of the things it does is give a more commanding

1 perspective from an upper level that's diverse from the  
2 street level views and it allows us to tuck in all of the  
3 service activities below the terrace so that they don't  
4 affect your experiences there.

5       And by the way, I'm not sure if you want to -- shall I  
6 just keep going? Because I'm happy if anybody wants to ask  
7 questions. Okay, so I'll just keep moving.

8       There's a lot of numbers. I'll try not to read all  
9 these numbers but some of the important ones are, we feel  
10 that we have created about 7,6 acres of public access area  
11 that is open to the sky that's available for those people  
12 that live in the neighborhood and visitors and tourists  
13 alike. We are providing bike valet spaces. We are also  
14 providing a minimal amount of retail space and a minimal  
15 amount of parking just to keep the operations smooth and  
16 effective.

17       We are removing about 15,800 square feet of deck area  
18 so that we can expose more water to the sky. And we are  
19 also minimizing the height of the building, which is, by the  
20 way, taking a lot of engineering skill to bring it down to  
21 roughly 128 feet to the top point and 113 feet to the lower  
22 parapet. These numbers haven't changed, even though they  
23 may look new. It's because in previous iterations we have  
24 been measuring it from the plaza areas, not from the  
25 Embarcadero level. The building hasn't gotten higher, it's

1 just that we measured it from a lower point and that's why  
2 these numbers are here.

3       There are some quick numbers on the Seawall site, we  
4 won't go into those today.

5       There's a number of different areas that we are  
6 imagining to be used for different types of uses. Of course  
7 as you can see here with the green in this drawing, it's a  
8 lot of open park space. Retail and small modules in the  
9 arena space. We have a community room which you'll see in a  
10 moment. And that's complementary on the Seawall site where  
11 we have residential and stay use, like a hotel use. And  
12 again, we are not planning to talk about that but it's just  
13 there for reference.

14       There's a number of other -- sort of understandings of  
15 the connections to Brannan Wharf Park, which we wanted to  
16 keep open, and views that you will see in a moment in and  
17 around the site.

18       There are a number of different titles we have given  
19 the outdoor areas. It's actually pretty expansive; 7.6  
20 acres is a lot of outdoor space. It's so much, in fact,  
21 that people could potentially get lost or confused if it  
22 didn't have individual characters defining individual places  
23 within it. So just making it one open space would not be  
24 appropriate.

25       So they have different qualities. We have a Great Lawn

1 which is planted that overlooks the Promenade towards the  
2 south, we have a Viewing Terrace which is intimate and  
3 raised, we have an Event Plaza which is urban, we have the  
4 Entry Courtyard towards the northwest related to the retail.  
5 And the Promenade changes and at times it's green and at  
6 times it's a hardscape. So all of these are helping to  
7 define the character of the waterfront access.

8       They are at different levels. Maybe it was mentioned  
9 earlier. We've done a number of waterfront projects and we  
10 have always found providing various levels of perspective  
11 connects people more directly to where they are. So if you  
12 only see it on the flat it's hard to get always an  
13 impression of where you are and your connection to it. It's  
14 sometimes compromised, especially in an area this big. So  
15 we are providing as much flat space as we can but also some  
16 spaces that get you up. You can look down at people, people  
17 can look up at you. You can look off to further distances.  
18 All of these things we think are valuable.

19       Now, many people are discussing sea level rise. And of  
20 course this is no stranger to our work as we have worked  
21 with many waterfront projects around the world including, of  
22 course, the Oslo Opera in Norway. And as you can see  
23 there's been a number of studies that have been carried out,  
24 not only looking at mid-century water levels but end of  
25 century water levels.

1           We are creating a site which is actually higher than it  
2 is today. But for those of you -- because the site is so  
3 big you really don't notice it but actually even as it  
4 stands today the site is about 1.5 feet higher than the  
5 street level. It's just it's so big you can't see it but it  
6 is actually a little higher. We are adding on top of that 2  
7 more feet, which will put the bulk of the site about 3.5  
8 feet, about, above the current Embarcadero level. So this  
9 is rather significant.

10           And you can see in these studies where one projects  
11 flooding of the site at a particular elevation. These are  
12 the areas that will be maintained reasonably dry without  
13 even any temporary protection, which could be added also for  
14 even greater sea level rise issues.

15           We will consider as we go on details that might occur  
16 at the edge of the pier front and that will be, of course,  
17 developed as our studies get more detailed. One would  
18 imagine that this dry site, of course during a flood, will  
19 be hard to get to, but it could also offer a -- it could  
20 also offer a safe haven in some ways, depending on what the  
21 challenge is and how long it is. But we are doing  
22 everything we can to ensure that there would be negligible  
23 damage on site to the facility during such an event.

24           Another issue is views. We have been very cognizant of  
25 this from the very beginning so we have tried to place the

1 biggest bulk of the project and the massing of the landscape  
2 to the east so that when you are on the Embarcadero the  
3 lowest buildings, the small, low-scale retail which is about  
4 three stories high, similar in height to the neighboring  
5 buildings, will in a way block whatever views of the event  
6 center you might have. So your experience as you move along  
7 the Embarcadero should primarily be framed by the retail.  
8 And that only at points where your distance, where you can  
9 look back to the site, will the arena become an important  
10 feature. So it's about your approach but when you're there  
11 the scale is mitigated by the retail buildings.

12 We think this is rather significant, especially if you  
13 compare it to, say, AT&T Park. So these two views are from  
14 the same location across the street. It's obviously not the  
15 Embarcadero down by AT&T. But there's a significant view of  
16 the sky. Which I would guess, you know, how do you define  
17 view to the waterfront? Is it just looking at the water or  
18 is it also looking at the sky? So we want to make sure that  
19 you can see the sky quite a bit too as you approach the  
20 building. And that's been something we want to show here in  
21 this view.

22 Another issue that came up by many people as we began  
23 to develop the project, that it's not just about seeing the  
24 water right next to the waterfront, it's about seeing the  
25 vastness of the Bay itself. This is coming from various

1 public groups, grassroots committees who are interested in  
2 the site. It's also come from BCDC and others. That really  
3 the Bay is this huge magnificent thing and you should be  
4 able to respond to the distant views. So not only are we  
5 trying to provide views to the Oakland Hills across the pier  
6 as you look straight across, we also want to ensure that you  
7 can see down to Mission Peak and down to the South Bay,  
8 which on a real clear day sometimes you get to see. And so  
9 we want to protect that sort of wide horizon from the site.

10       So already you can see in some of the perspectives.  
11 Actually the pier buildings here cut away a little bit from  
12 the view but you're looking down on a clear day towards the  
13 South Bay. In addition, obviously, looking across you see  
14 towards Oakland Hills.

15       Part of the Great Lawn is to rise you up in such a way  
16 that you get even more of a view. So if you're standing  
17 down here it's actually a little harder to see the  
18 mountains. But up in this elevated portion of the lawn and  
19 above the Promenade you can have a stronger view of that  
20 distant area.

21       In addition not only do we have views perpendicular to  
22 the Embarcadero, we are creating diagonal views through the  
23 retail in both directions. The big view, which is of course  
24 back and forth to the Bay Bridge, and views from across the  
25 street. So we pulled these facades back as much as we can.

1 We are making it so that you can quickly get around the  
2 retail and up to the terraces and get over to the viewing  
3 terrace if you like. There are systems to get you up and  
4 down in all locations so you don't have to go up and come  
5 back, you can keep going and go down. You can go around and  
6 come up. You can come up over here and go down there, you  
7 can go through the retail. There's a whole lot of porosity  
8 in the design and diversity in the way in which you enter  
9 the site.

10 This is a view looking back towards the retail from the  
11 south, showing that we are also working to protect views to  
12 the Bay Bridge from the Embarcadero. And also, of course,  
13 off to Oakland in the other direction. So that's, I think,  
14 another view that might be important to you.

15 This is from Brannan Wharf Park. So you're looking off  
16 with the retail to the left, the bridge in the center and  
17 the view of the event center and the arena here with Oakland  
18 off in the distance. So maintaining the sort of pier-edge  
19 character here, although creating more park space as you  
20 look towards that central area of collection.

21 We do have a community room, I mentioned earlier. This  
22 came as a concession also. It was not really part of the  
23 program but after talking to people it seemed like it was a  
24 very good idea and very useful and very important so it was  
25 integrated into the design. And it wasn't put in a place

1 where it was hidden, it's given a really great spot looking  
2 to the south to where the public is with a glazed facade so  
3 it's not hidden or lost. So we think this will be a vibrant  
4 addition to the community there in the -- not only the  
5 community nearby but in the distant community also.

6 We have also provided views from the interior of the  
7 arena itself off to the Bay Bridge. A number of seats were  
8 removed here and some were repositioned and you're able to  
9 look from the inside out to the bridge. And there is a  
10 walkway on the outside, which I'll show you. Actually I  
11 could show you here. This is an open air walkway which  
12 leads from the raised plaza up the edge of the building,  
13 swoops around towards Treasure Island and takes you up about  
14 80, 90 -- I think it's 88 feet. I'm sorry, I don't remember  
15 the specific number but it's up in the eighties. Where  
16 you're able to look across the city back to the Financial  
17 District, over across the Bay. And as you turn around  
18 you're given a view into the arena itself so we; think that  
19 will be a very exciting moment for people.

20 We want it to be a destination, that point, so we  
21 deliberately made it that you go up and you return. We  
22 didn't want that it just continues back down, so that that  
23 high point would feel transitory. We want you to know that  
24 you're getting there. Almost like the flame on the top of  
25 the Statue of Liberty or something, you've arrived at a

1 point and many, many things happen.

2       There's a number of issues that we are working with in  
3 terms of vehicular circulation. There are two curb cuts.  
4 We used to have vehicles entering in the northwest corner  
5 but it created a challenge for pedestrian access. So we  
6 moved the vehicular service entry to the center of the site,  
7 which is traditional for many of the pier buildings, we  
8 feel, and we also have emergency vehicle access around the  
9 site.

10       There is a firehouse which has a need to access with  
11 their fire trucks. The traditional way of entering and  
12 leaving the building for the fire trucks is through the  
13 parking garage so they won't be using the pier edge except  
14 during emergencies, or so we are told by the fire  
15 department. So only in an emergency would they actually  
16 leave this point. They'd close off the pedestrian areas and  
17 leave directly out.

18       In this particular firehouse we are told that they use  
19 their boats more than the truck so it's actually the boat  
20 dock over here that will be used more often, probably, but  
21 we, of course, can never foresee the future. The idea is  
22 that the main access be the access point for all vehicular  
23 service points. There is the service parking below the  
24 raised plaza and the firehouse tucked in underneath.

25       There is a lot of -- it's a lot of arrows. So if

1 anybody can count the number of arrows here I'll give them a  
2 prize because I just -- it's too many arrows. But it tells  
3 you that there's a lot of different ways that bicycles can  
4 move around the site. We have -- the main circulation will  
5 work, with detailed designs that will keep the cyclists  
6 clear of any outdoor seating that might occur there or at  
7 least crowds that are moving in.

8       There's a number of designs for that already in  
9 existence along the Embarcadero. But generally speaking,  
10 much of the pedestrian access will move through this sort of  
11 rising, gently ramping walkway. You can also move up the  
12 great sort of lawn area up into the event center itself.  
13 There is a venue entry here, which is on the arena. We also  
14 have a theater entry here, so that will be closer to the  
15 Embarcadero. It will be used on nights when the building is  
16 not being used for a sports event.

17       There's a number of exits from inside the building.  
18 And as you might know with these kinds of events, people  
19 generally will enter through one location and they leave  
20 through many locations. And they generally -- that means  
21 that they are less concentrated as they leave.

22       The other thing that is important here is we have a lot  
23 of accessibility movement locations that we have been  
24 thinking of including ramps as well as lift mechanisms so  
25 that it's possible to move not only by simple body movement

1 or wheelchair movement but also very quickly through lifts  
2 that are located in different areas of key interest.

3 It is also important to recognize that the northwest  
4 corner's opening is as generous as we can make it. There's  
5 about 170 feet of space for people to move through this walk  
6 system or up a set of stairs to get to the raised plaza  
7 itself. And that's right near the existing inlet near to  
8 Pier 28.

9 So this is approaching that walkway that moves through  
10 the retail. It gives you a view to the water as soon as you  
11 get to the edge of it and then you move -- then you turn  
12 backwards and you see the bridge again. There is the fire  
13 department. These are happy people that the renderers  
14 decided to put in so sorry, we have to apologize for that.  
15 The renderers went a little crazy but anyway, there they  
16 are. So pretend those people aren't there.

17 And you can see we have a number of places where you  
18 can sit along the edge here. There will be three different  
19 terraces in an upper-level park above the retail here so  
20 that the massing steps down, what we think is in an organic  
21 way. The buildings, the retail buildings themselves have a  
22 shed-like appearance that you might find on some of the  
23 waterfront structures. We pulled back as much as we can  
24 from the water's edge all of the facades. In this case this  
25 is where the firehouse is so we're trying to create an

1 overhang to protect the trucks but still we have a little  
2 over 25 feet between the edge of the upper level parapet and  
3 the edge of the pier itself. That's one particular  
4 location.

5 This is the raised terrace where you can rise up and  
6 sit and overlook the water, the surroundings of the Bay.

7 These are the heights that we're looking at. As I  
8 said, about 128 and 113 to the parapet. Sorry, I need some  
9 water. A beer would be great on a day like today, an Anchor  
10 Steam or something.

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. DYKERS: It was very deliberate to pull back the  
13 highest portion of the building behind the parapet and so  
14 generally you will experience this height rather than that  
15 one as this is kind of a cutoff for the perspective lines so  
16 that's a sort of interesting quality that we created.

17 That's the open ramp that leads you up to the top.  
18 We've taken the raised terrace area to about 41 feet so that  
19 you get up in a pretty significant area there, although the  
20 other areas are lower.

21 We have pulled the shape of the arena back so that it  
22 provides, again, maximum area at the street level for  
23 various people moving along the edges of the building.

24 We have created a little park to the southeast. This  
25 is that area where we are being told we probably have to

1 fill it in. But originally our thought was, let's pull it  
2 away, it softens the edge. Make a little park for families  
3 and so forth there. Hardscape here. That is a view of that  
4 park looking off to Treasure Island, off to the other side  
5 of the Bay, the East Bay there. And we would imagine this  
6 would be a great spot for families to enjoy.

7 Using wild grasses and so forth. Different kinds of  
8 trees. We have Strawberry Trees here facing south and  
9 Cypress to the north. The Cypress are kind of like a  
10 Monterey Cypress so they should be healthy for the  
11 environment.

12 It's a gentle slope and these are only -- these aren't  
13 ramps, these are sloping surfaces at about 1-to-20 so they  
14 don't need a rail. So we don't foresee any significant  
15 erosion issues here because the slope is fairly shallow.  
16 And we could plant different kinds of grass that will keep  
17 it reasonably clean as long as the maintenance is there.

18 There's little parks that are against the edge of the  
19 waterfront and some very nice hardscape terraced areas that  
20 allow visitors to congregate in different social conditions.  
21 So that's a view of the lawn leading up.

22 We have wood in areas, we're using some Corten steel  
23 edges in some places. Generally a kind of very simple  
24 pattern that integrates the sloping movement condition into  
25 the stair condition.

1           That's the retail as it overlooks Red's and of course  
2 the south pier.

3           That's the walkway, which we're using some wood inside  
4 that surface and we're using glass and metal panels that  
5 will have a kind of ephemeral quality. We've tried to --  
6 our goal is to make the architecture as smooth and clean as  
7 possible. So I don't know how many basketball arenas you've  
8 seen or been to, they tend to be pretty complicated.  
9 They've got stair towers sticking out of them, all kinds of  
10 strange things. This one is one, clean, very contemporary  
11 form that has a lot of strong engineering in it so we think  
12 it will relate to the quality of the Bay Bridge, which is a  
13 highly engineered structure.

14           Whereas the retail itself has a different quality so we  
15 did try to match them on purpose. There's blackened steel,  
16 it's fairly clear floor plates and a kind of almost  
17 industrial quality to them.

18           So there is the lawn overlooking the Bay. The ramp  
19 that I mentioned earlier and the retail on the left. These  
20 are the levels of the raised terrace. So you go up to about  
21 28 feet over the street, up to 37 feet, which is the  
22 entrance into the arena and event center itself.

23           So you can have a -- what's interesting about this, by  
24 the way: One thing that's really great is that because the  
25 door is slightly higher than what you might call the event

1 plaza, when the arena is not in use and the doors are closed  
2 for whatever reason you don't feel that you are in an empty  
3 place next to some closed building. So you have your own  
4 space adjacent to the raised terrace so that you move up  
5 into the doors there. So that we think is an interesting  
6 feature that will promote the social character of this  
7 raised plaza. So that's the 37 and the 28 foot areas. All  
8 of these are handicapped accessible.

9       These are some of the -- a cross-section through the  
10 building. We can't take the entry any lower, otherwise we'd  
11 bring the event center and arena down into the waterfront so  
12 that's the given conditions there. We worked quite hard to  
13 bring the height down without going into the water.

14       This is the stair leading up the Great Lawn to the  
15 event plaza and the retail terraces with the retail beyond.  
16 This looks down towards where we cut back. We are actually  
17 going to take a small portion of the pier edge a little bit  
18 lower so that you can get a little closer to the water. It  
19 won't go into the water; we really wanted to do that, but it  
20 doesn't seem like that is possible here so -- the tidal  
21 conditions make it very difficult so that's not happening.

22       That's looking across. That's the theater entrance,  
23 the event center entrance to the top. Large, new Great Lawn  
24 Park. That's Red's on the right and the terraces and retail  
25 up there. Up on the event center plaza itself, different

1 places for outdoor seating. All kinds of activities, we  
2 imagine, both in day and night that would bring people  
3 together.

4       And here is the last slide, as everyone I'm sure is a  
5 bit to the -- it's getting a little warm. This shows the  
6 event center and the retail in relation to the skyline. We  
7 know there is a lot of talk about stepping down towards the  
8 water so we are trying to create a way that feels twice that  
9 it steps down, once is with the retail along the Embarcadero  
10 but also seen from a distance. There is a correlation  
11 between the Bay Bridge, the new towers in the financial  
12 district and the relatively horizontal character of the  
13 arena. So we have worked very carefully to make it feel  
14 horizontal. Horizontality is a luxury in cities so we are  
15 presenting that quality here, especially considering the  
16 horizontal nature of the nearby surroundings.

17       And that is the final slide. I think I got through  
18 most of it and hopefully in some reasonable amount of time.  
19 We are happy to answer questions. There are groups from the  
20 development team, from the design team, owner's  
21 representatives, we have a whole bevy of people prepared to  
22 talk to you.

23       DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I'd like to just further be more  
24 specific about our next step, which is questions that have  
25 to do with clarification of the presentation from either our

1 committee or our Design Review Board, the Design Advisory  
2 Committee or Design Review Board.

3 WDAC MEMBER MAYTUM: I have two quick questions. One,  
4 could you describe the interaction between the deep water  
5 berth. How often that is anticipated to be used and how  
6 people will flow from the boat and interact, say, on a game  
7 night?

8 MR. DYKERS: Yes. As far as I know, and I may ask  
9 others to step in, the use is fairly infrequent. We have  
10 been imagining three to four times a year. Three to five  
11 times a year.

12 WDAC MEMBER MAYTUM: Okay, that's helpful.

13 MR. DYKERS: So it's very infrequent. It's meant to be  
14 a berthing of last resort so I imagine that -- because there  
15 are other berthing, other deep-water berths on the  
16 waterfront. So I imagine that in the event of a deep-water  
17 berthing need that would be coordinated in such a way that  
18 it would be feasible for it to function. Otherwise people  
19 disembark the boat on the waterfront and move from the  
20 waterfront to the Embarcadero in a fairly natural way as  
21 they do at the other pier areas or deep-water berths.

22 DRB MEMBER BARTON: These are cruise ships?

23 MR. DYKERS: Generally speaking, yes. I don't know  
24 about military.

25 MR. BENSON: So as Craig said, this would be the Port's

1 fourth berth for cruise berthing. We have Pier 27, Piers  
2 35-North and South, and those are full very infrequently.  
3 We would be looking to this berth --

4 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Speak into the mic, please.

5 MR. BENSON: When the other port berths are full we  
6 would be looking to this berth. Other types of berthing  
7 would be ceremonial vessels; Fleet Week sometimes happens at  
8 Pier 30-32. So that would be the range of berthing  
9 activities.

10 MR. DYKERS: I can point out that many people have  
11 talked about issue as it occurs today. There are many boats  
12 that do berth there. Our arena design is actually lower  
13 than the majority of the boats that have been berthing.

14 WDAC MEMBER MAYTUM: And then the second question is a  
15 clarification. The theater, you pointed to the entry to the  
16 theater. What scale of theater is anticipated?

17 MR. DYKERS: The theater is inside the arena so it's  
18 not that there is a separate theater. Actually what is  
19 meant to occur is that on theater venue nights, as opposed  
20 to sports nights, or cultural events that may occur there,  
21 it could be a symposium or something else, you can change  
22 the number of events that are being used. And rather than  
23 taking those visitors up to the event plaza and in, which  
24 they could do and they could still use, it was a desire to  
25 have a kind of cultural access point closer to the street.

1 So they go in that entrance then they walk through a sort of  
2 area that's like a foyer and they eventually get into the  
3 arena itself and then they move into their seats.

4 WDAC MEMBER MAYTUM: Great. And one last question just  
5 to clarify the fire station. So to clarify, all of the  
6 emergency routing will be on the pier edge and just the day-  
7 to-day non-emergency will be through the garage entry?

8 MR. DYKERS: Yes. The pier edge is not meant for use  
9 by the fire department. It's just in case there were an  
10 event on the site and they needed to bring vehicles to the  
11 pier edge, so that's what that perimeter blue dashed line  
12 was. The actual fire trucks themselves in the fire  
13 department would only use the little bit of pier edge at the  
14 northwest corner.

15 WDAC MEMBER MAYTUM: But they -- on the pier edge, not  
16 coming out, okay.

17 MR. DYKERS: Yes. And they would only use that pier  
18 edge location. And we have done turning radius studies.  
19 They would only use that location, as we have been told,  
20 during emergencies. Otherwise they'd be moving in and out  
21 of the central service access point in the center of the  
22 site. But you need to have space all along the edge in case  
23 there were a fire and other event.

24 WDAC MEMBER MAYTUM: Thank you.

25 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Any more questions to the right?

1 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: I had a couple of questions.

2 MR. DYKERS: It's hard to hear you. Yes?

3 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: Sorry. Is it working now?

4 MR. DYKERS: It was working.

5 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: What have we done?

6 (Working with microphone.)

7 MR. DYKERS: Yes, thank you.

8 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: I had a couple of confusions.

9 One was when I began to really analyze the plans I was  
10 looking for the accessibility for the semi-truck fleet that  
11 seems to be ensconced deep in the guts of this building  
12 someplace and I couldn't figure out how they get in there  
13 and how they get out or whether they interrupt part of the  
14 parking levels in order to do that?

15 MR. DYKERS: Right. All vehicular access for  
16 supporting the building comes through one location which is  
17 that vehicular access point in the center of the site. Even  
18 tall vehicles, either 18-wheelers, et cetera. There is a  
19 route from that entrance that is high that allows trucks to  
20 get to the loading dock, which is nearby, adjacent to the  
21 fire department area so it's in the sort of northern central  
22 area. And they leave by the same location.

23 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: The other observation I had  
24 about loading was that there is apparently a retail --

25 MR. DYKERS: Yes.

1 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: -- loading space that is  
2 independent of that.

3 MR. DYKERS: Yes, and that's also the --

4 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: I couldn't figure out quite  
5 how you get to that.

6 MR. DYKERS: It's a great question and one of the big  
7 challenges we've had but we have designed it in the current  
8 plan so that loading primarily occurs through the same  
9 service point that everyone else enters. There's service  
10 corridors that run under and alongside the retail component  
11 so that -- like in a traditional sort of mall, the service  
12 comes through those corridors and in to the restaurants and  
13 shops. It doesn't have to occur on the street.

14 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: Is that by elevator or how do  
15 you get up and down?

16 MR. DYKERS: Yes, there are service lifts and there are  
17 also stairs and other ways to move. And some of them are  
18 straight in because they are on the same level. You could  
19 theoretically load from the street. You know, you see  
20 sometimes that happening but it's not meant to load from the  
21 street.

22 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: And the last question I have  
23 is frequency of use and types of use. It occurs to me that  
24 one of the most famous uses of Candlestick Park was the  
25 Beatles in 1968 or '69, which is why many people remember

1 that place. And I'm wondering whether we are going to have  
2 a chance to remember this one because of the venues that  
3 might happen there.

4 MR. DYKERS: Yes, the idea is --

5 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: And if so, how often would  
6 they happen and how long is the basketball season after all?

7 MR. DYKERS: There are about 40 to 48 games, I think,  
8 depending on how far you get in the championship. And  
9 that's home games. So there are a number of other games  
10 that are away from home. So you can imagine between 40 and  
11 48, roughly, times in which the event will be used  
12 specifically for a basketball event related to the Golden  
13 State Warriors. You could have other sports events. It  
14 could have a high school game or something like that. They  
15 do a lot of work with education.

16 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: But it's probably not big  
17 enough to have a baseball game inside there?

18 MR. DYKERS: No, it's very specifically designed  
19 exactly in the opposite direction. We want it to be  
20 intimate inside so you really feel like a --

21 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: So you could have a major  
22 tennis championship going on on that floor.

23 MR. DYKERS: I suppose you could, yes. It's meant to  
24 have -- it's meant to have important cultural life in the  
25 city of a venue that is somewhat unique that doesn't

1 currently easily exist. It could have anything all the way  
2 from symposiums, meetings, seminars. There's a lot of that  
3 that occurs in this city. There's a lot of use of different  
4 events and there's often stress on those event venues for  
5 cultural events or business-related events.

6 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: So the Warriors might --

7 MR. DYKERS: Music.

8 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: The Warriors might be a small  
9 part of the use.

10 MR. DYKERS: I suppose you could say that, it just  
11 depends on how you define it. In the number of days that  
12 the event is used specifically for an NBA game, yes. But I  
13 think in its identity people love the team, the team has a  
14 strong connection to the community and I think it will  
15 always be seen in that way.

16 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you.

17 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Are there any more questions?

18 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: Yes, I have a --

19 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay, let's go fast.

20 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: Yes, I'll try to go fast.

21 The lawn. I think you said it would be natural grass.  
22 In terms of drought, obviously, a lawn is a questionable  
23 thing.

24 MR. DYKERS: We have multiple areas of landscape. Many  
25 of them use natural grasses that are maintainable in this

1 climate and are from the area. But you're correct, the type  
2 of lawn that would occur in that one particular area would  
3 be similar to other park spaces in the city and similar to  
4 what you find in Brannan Wharf Park or Dolores Park. There  
5 is a degree of maintenance required but we felt it is  
6 necessary to bring people to a comfortable place where they  
7 can lay outside and have a picnic or something.

8 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: I think you said the gradient was  
9 1-in-20 on the ramp.

10 MR. DYKERS: Yes.

11 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: Not ramp, the non-ramps.

12 MR. DYKERS: Yes, the --

13 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: But the cross-gradient will be much  
14 greater.

15 MR. DYKERS: Not much greater. I think it's -- can  
16 you -- around 17 percent is the gradient. It is still  
17 relatively shallow by, for example, San Francisco standards.

18 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: Will the exterior circular ramp be  
19 accessible when there is not a game?

20 MR. DYKERS: The idea of the ramp was to create an open  
21 space, open access point for people at all times, including  
22 during a game I suppose.

23 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: No.

24 MR. DYKERS: Because you're able to get up and look --

25 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: I mean non-game.

1 MR. DYKERS: Yes, yes.

2 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: It would be, okay. What is the  
3 high water mark in the 50 or 100 year versus the platform  
4 elevation?

5 MR. DYKERS: Gee, I have like this stack of papers here  
6 and there's a number of reports that we have been looking  
7 at.

8 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: Roughly.

9 MR. DYKERS: Can you help me with that?

10 MR. MILLER: I should preface it. We are very early on  
11 with our studies at the water measurement levels. We've  
12 hired Moffatt & Nichol to help us in that effort so I think  
13 we'll have better information for you going forward.

14 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: Does the --

15 MR. MILLER: The measurements that we have today that  
16 we are working with are for the mid-century. I'm not sure  
17 if this is actually answering your question or clarifying or  
18 not. But the mid-century water level we are predicting is  
19 16 inches above 100 year still-water levels and at end of  
20 century it's 55 inches.

21 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: What I mean is, what's the  
22 difference between that elevation and the elevation of the  
23 deck?

24 MR. MILLER: So the -- as Craig showed, there was that  
25 top and bottom slide that showed on the bottom the deck

1 which is going to be about three and a half feet above the  
2 existing Embarcadero curb. That will be above the 55 inch  
3 level.

4 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: How much above?

5 MR. MILLER: Yes, by about a foot above the existing -  
6 excuse me - above that 55 inch level.

7 MR. DYKERS: So what he's saying, if you have a flood,  
8 a major catastrophic flood, you're about one foot above the  
9 high line of that water in this particular study.

10 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: So about a foot and a half is what  
11 you're saying.

12 MR. DYKERS: There's a lot of numbers and they come all  
13 over the place. We're making it, at least according to  
14 current reports.

15 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: You mentioned that you couldn't  
16 lower the --

17 MR. DYKERS: Right. And you wouldn't want to do that  
18 anyway, especially due to sea level rise, the lower you take  
19 it.

20 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I think we should go through this in  
21 more detail later when we have our discussion.

22 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: I was just trying to get an idea.

23 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: And may I ask our Board to defer  
24 their questions so we can get on with the audience.

25 MS. MIRAMONTES: I think if there are any remaining

1 questions we should probably clarify them now.

2 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: Cheryl.

3 DRB MEMBER BARTON: Just a question or a clarification  
4 on this pier additions and removal. So what are the issues  
5 behind that?

6 MR. DYKERS: We want, just as a general design feature,  
7 to expose water.

8 DRB MEMBER BARTON: Yes, that's good. What's the issue  
9 with filling it back in?

10 MR. DYKERS: Well, the deep water berth runs along the  
11 east edge and there's a number of boat mooring points that  
12 are required. And so when we remove water from that corner  
13 it's harder to moor a boat. So there's a trend for us to  
14 fill that back in and use a cut elsewhere.

15 DRB MEMBER BARTON: You're going to trade off then.

16 MR. DYKERS: Yes, we would try to trade it off; we  
17 haven't studied that yet.

18 DRB MEMBER SMILEY: I'll try to make this quick. I'll  
19 make the question, anyway, as quick as I can. We are being  
20 asked in the staff report, which I'm sure you've seen, one  
21 of the questions is we should consider whether the proposed  
22 Piers 30-32 Project would be compatible with and reflect  
23 waterfront district identity and the joint character.

24 MR. DYKERS: Yes.

25 DRB MEMBER SMILEY: It's relating to what the Special

1 Area Plan Waterfront Design Policy suggests, things like the  
2 historic character of the waterfront, not use of reflective  
3 glass, things of that type. It's a two-part question and if  
4 you can answer it all in one answer it would be good.

5 MR. DYKERS: Yes.

6 DRB MEMBER SMILEY: In your words you touched on it but  
7 I'd like to hear -- talking about design. In your words,  
8 how does this building then fit with those statements?

9 MR. DYKERS: Yes.

10 DRB MEMBER SMILEY: And then second, it appears to me  
11 that the landscape relates to the building and the use of  
12 curb forms and a variety of things. So how does the  
13 landscape relate to the history and character of the  
14 waterfront as well?

15 MR. DYKERS: Yes, that's a really great question. I  
16 think from the very beginning we tried to create a design  
17 which felt a part of the San Francisco of today but was  
18 linked to the San Francisco of the past. We have  
19 deliberately used materials like, for example, the blackened  
20 steel that we have, which are like an industrial steel glass  
21 window. Shed-like forms on the retail.

22 Not all pier buildings are, you know, finger piers out  
23 in the water, there's a lot of conglomerates of strange  
24 structures that meet each other in unusual ways. So we  
25 tried to create that kind of character for the retail

1 buildings, which is the way you see the Embarcadero -- see  
2 the project from the Embarcadero. So the shapes, the  
3 massing, the forms of the roofs, the choice of materials,  
4 are all doing that for us. And that's for the retail  
5 component.

6 We deliberately did not go in and make a new recreation  
7 or reproduction of a 100 year old style that exists on the  
8 pier today because we felt that would not promote the  
9 identity of this being a project which connects both worlds  
10 old and new; so we are trying to work with the old while  
11 linking to the new. We feel that that provides a more  
12 honest link to this place today.

13 The arena itself, we tried to look more at the Bridge  
14 as an inspiration. The Bridge piers are probably the  
15 biggest things out there, really, in this neighborhood.  
16 They are very refined engineering and we've created a very  
17 simple form that somehow relates to the simplicity of the  
18 Bay Bridge itself, the curves and that ramp that slopes up  
19 takes the same curves as the cables of the Bridge. Those  
20 sorts of things will be a part of how you feel the place.

21 Are the materials appropriate for the arena? What we  
22 are trying to do is not make highly reflective facades. In  
23 fact, we are trying to make a slightly misty look to it so  
24 it's kind of a white and metal pattern that works together,  
25 almost like the fog that sometimes occurs in the Bay. All

1 of these things are rather poetic and not clichés. And we  
2 are also using -- we are also using in times -- like we've  
3 said, we might use Corten steel on some of the edge  
4 conditions. These are about the rusty, sort of slightly  
5 decayed portion that is also interesting that Ferlinghetti  
6 and other people write about. So we are also trying to  
7 react to those conditions too.

8 The landscape. Yeah. It's a different kind of pier so  
9 it's not an urban pier. It's a wide, super-wide and deep  
10 pier that needs lots of comfortable spaces for people to sit  
11 and relax. So you can't rely on sort of palm trees spaced  
12 here and there, you can't rely on just big lawns without any  
13 shade. So we are trying to provide a vegetation that  
14 provides shade and also links it to -- by the way, this  
15 walkway continues on down to Pier 70 and beyond so there are  
16 many parts of the Bay that have natural qualities associated  
17 with them. We're trying to bring a little bit of that to  
18 this pier.

19 Sorry. That was a big question.

20 DRB MEMBER STRANG: Quick question. I just wonder if  
21 you could tell us how the Embarcadero, Herb Caen Way, would  
22 be treated and what is the fate of the --

23 MR. DYKERS: I'm sorry, the Hurricane Way. Is that --

24 DRB MEMBER STRANG: Herb Caen, Herb Caen, Herb Caen  
25 Way.

1 MR. DYKERS: Oh, sorry, I didn't understand you.

2 DRB MEMBER STRANG: Sorry about that.

3 MR. DYKERS: Yes. There is an already created  
4 aesthetics that is there. We have not been given a  
5 directive to continue that per se but we have allowed for  
6 all of those characteristics that exist there that there is  
7 a way for people to walk and, of course, a way for bicycles  
8 to move. That will continue to exist along the Embarcadero.  
9 We are not being told to continue the concrete and lighted  
10 forms that are there currently.

11 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I'd like to ask the audience, how  
12 many of you wish to speak tonight?

13 (Show of hands.)

14 MR. DYKERS: I thought everybody would want to speak.

15 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: And if so, could you bring your  
16 speaker cards up to Ellen.

17 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Okay, thank you for bringing your  
18 cards up here and we are going to have those delivered up  
19 front. If you could please step towards the front of the  
20 group when your name is called so that -- excuse me, up to  
21 the podium to make your comments so that you can speak into  
22 the microphone and everybody in the room has the benefit of  
23 hearing your comments. We are going to limit comments to  
24 three minutes each. And for the courtesy of everyone in the  
25 room we appreciate you staying with that but we are anxious

1 to hear.

2 The first speaker is Jamie Whitaker, who will be  
3 followed by Scott Emblidge.

4 MR. WHITAKER: Good evening, my name is Jamie Whitaker  
5 and I live at Main Street and Harrison Street in the Rincon  
6 Hill neighborhood so fairly close by.

7 I guess the main comments I have regarding the design  
8 are I would prefer that the 500 parking spaces be eliminated  
9 down to zero. I don't like having cars crossing the  
10 Embarcadero pedestrian promenade. It's very busy with  
11 walkers, bicyclists, babies in strollers. Since the  
12 Warriors are planning to buy the property on the other side  
13 of the Embarcadero I would suggest zero parking spaces for  
14 the arena on Piers 30-32, put the parking on the Seawall Lot  
15 330 instead.

16 Sea level rise is a bit issue I see. I don't think  
17 we're going to be swimming to the arena, as pretty as it is.

18 Shore side power. If there is going to be a boat, a  
19 deep boat berth there at all let's consider that Piers 30-32  
20 sits in the San Francisco Health Code Article 38 Air  
21 Pollution Hot Zone. That means that it sits in an area --  
22 because of the Bay Bridge carrying 280,000 cars a day that  
23 has bad air quality. The World Health Organization last  
24 month told us that bad air quality contributed to seven  
25 million deaths worldwide. Living in the neighborhood we see

1 black soot on our window sills; we know that there's a lot  
2 of crap in the air already.

3 The vegetation. Vegetation could be planted that does  
4 absorb the carbon, that would be helpful.

5 I would hope that we don't have any individual car  
6 parking on Piers 30-32. Perhaps that could be used for Uber  
7 Cars, taxicabs, busses to come in, get off the Embarcadero  
8 and pick up people that need to use those services.

9 But my main, main issue is I hope the BCDC does not  
10 allow any parking spaces on a pier. That's a practice that  
11 we've had in the past that hurts, it hurts the waterfront.  
12 Thank you.

13 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Next is Scott Emblidge, to be  
14 followed by John Cornwell. I hope I said that right. Thank  
15 you.

16 MR. EMBLIDGE: Thank you. My name is Scott Emblidge.  
17 I am a partner with the law firm of Moscone, Emblidge, Sater  
18 & Otis, and one of our clients is the San Francisco  
19 Waterfront Alliance, that has been very interested in this  
20 project since its inception.

21 You've had a great presentation tonight by some  
22 talented and thoughtful people about the way they are trying  
23 to approach this situation. I have some questions that the  
24 Waterfront Alliance is raising. I have them in writing to  
25 try to save a little bit of time for you and I'll give those

1 to staff to pass out.

2 But the main issues that we are concerned about at this  
3 point are the massing and the character and the height and  
4 the views. And frankly, the fact that is really trying to  
5 drive a square peg into a round hole, the round hole being  
6 the specific Area Plan you've got here for the waterfront.

7 This project just can't be squared with that plan. And  
8 if you're going to amend the Plan, change the Plan that you  
9 had and you adopt it after a public process then the public  
10 really needs to understand why you make an exception to a  
11 well thought out plan for this particular project.

12 The other issue is sea level rise. We understand that  
13 this is a preliminary presentation, that you don't have all  
14 the figures. But we think from the very illustrations you  
15 have seen there are some major questions about sea level  
16 rise that are going to need to be answered as you explore  
17 the project. Thank you very much.

18 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Thank you.

19 John Cornwell, followed by Earl Gee.

20 MR. CORNWELL: Hi, my name is John Cornwell; I'm a  
21 long-term resident of the neighborhood.

22 I think it probably speaks for itself, this design and  
23 the use in this space. You guys are all design  
24 professionals, civic planners, engineers, I mean, you see  
25 this project really is probably not the best project for

1 this space. I can't imagine a use that less leverages the  
2 unique nature of this site. You're right on the water so  
3 you're going to put a giant sports facility that is inward  
4 looking that has 200-and-some-odd events in the evening and  
5 put it right near one of the biggest regional choke points  
6 in the area.

7 So in terms of this drawing others from the  
8 neighborhood to use this area. You know, when there's  
9 Giants games we -- most of the neighbors actually post the  
10 Giants schedule because we try and get out of the  
11 neighborhood when these events happen, right. If you're  
12 going to the game, fine, but if you're not you really need  
13 to clear out. The sidewalks are packed, my kids can't -- I  
14 mean, they're going to get hit by bikes and roller skaters.  
15 I mean, we basically clear out. So the idea that somehow  
16 this is a -- brings the community to the waterfront I think  
17 is disingenuous. If anything, it's repellant, right.

18 And the majority of this use will occur at night, it's  
19 inward looking, it really doesn't leverage the special  
20 location. And I mean --

21 (Time signal tone sounded.)

22 MR. CORNWELL: I mean, look at it. There's a reason  
23 that these drawings only show a very small amount.

24 Thank you very much.

25 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Thank you very much.

1           So we have Earl Gee followed by Patrick Valentino.

2           MR. GEE: My name is Earl Gee. some of the speakers  
3 you will hear from today -- unlike some of the speakers you  
4 will hear from today, I live and work a few hundred feet  
5 from the proposed arena on Piers 30-32.

6           I experience the gridlock and congestion firsthand on a  
7 daily basis. Consequently, I am firmly against the proposed  
8 arena at this location. With all due respect, the project  
9 fails to resolve the single, biggest design obstacle, its  
10 location at the entrance to the Bay Bridge, Highway 280 and  
11 101. Anyone who has spent hours sitting in traffic on  
12 Beale, Main, Bryant or Harrison Streets waiting to get onto  
13 the Bay Bridge knows that to consider putting a development  
14 of this scale at this site is urban planning at its worst.

15           Most well-designed arenas enjoy vehicular access on  
16 multiple sides if not all four. The proposed venue has only  
17 a single, narrow driveway for 500 cars and 17,000 attendees.  
18 When this empties onto one of the most gridlocked  
19 thoroughfares in the city, which also must function as an  
20 emergency lane for the fire station serving the area, no  
21 amount of civic boosterism or PR spin can change the facts  
22 on the ground that this is an untenable location for this  
23 development.

24           The Special Area Plan's Bay Use Policy states: New  
25 development on piers should preserve or improve views of the

1 Bay. The Appearance, Design and Scenic Views Policy states:  
2 Building height and bulk should generally be low in scale to  
3 preserve views of the Bay.

4 For the millions of visitors to our Bay I can think of  
5 no worse way to deny public access and block public views to  
6 the Bay than to erect a massive, 13-story enclosed arena in  
7 direct conflict with the Plan.

8 To get to the arena pedestrians at street level are  
9 confronted with an equally massive three story mound of  
10 above-ground parking for 500 cars. Upon scaling this mound  
11 they need to go around the entire perimeter of the building  
12 to experience the views of the Bay. It is irrefutably clear  
13 that the proposed arena does far more to block public access  
14 and public views to the Bay than to promote them.

15 I respectfully urge this body to reject the proposed  
16 arena on the basis that the project fails to achieve the  
17 goals of providing the public access, public views and open  
18 space this body was created to protect. Thank you.

19 (Applause.)

20 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Thank you.

21 Patrick Valentino, followed by Barbara Inaba.

22 MR. VALENTINO: Hi, my name is Pat Valentino, I live  
23 about a block and a half from the site.

24 I actually disagree quite a bit with the prior speaker.  
25 I think this site actually creates incredible opportunities

1 to view the Bay. Currently it's a 13 acre parking lot  
2 that's rotting and at some point or another we are going to  
3 have to deal with that issue.

4 We just saw a presentation, and I can see from the view  
5 boards, I would prefer very much instead of walking down the  
6 street and having a 13 acre, walled off, chained off parking  
7 lot that no one stops on, spends any time there on any day.  
8 You will not see anybody stopping and hanging out and  
9 looking out at the views. To have significant increased  
10 views, any kind of a structure, if you're -- I'm six-foot-  
11 four, any structure of one story or taller is going to block  
12 your view, you'd have to walk around it.

13 This, I think, is a fairly thoughtful design that  
14 enhances our opportunities to have views of the Bay. You  
15 don't have to walk entirely around it, you only have to walk  
16 partially around it. But I think it would be greater. Just  
17 the same way we use the Giants -- living in the neighborhood  
18 we use the Giants stadium, the Giants arena to walk around  
19 that and get better views as well. The park space is  
20 significant. Brannan Street Wharf is one acre, this is  
21 seven and a half acres. That's fairly significant.

22 The fire station value I think is extremely significant  
23 given what the fire station needs are.

24 It's bike friendly, it's transit friendly. You can get  
25 from all nine counties without a transfer on public transit

1 to this site reasonably well as far as being -- probably  
2 adding access points from the water itself. So I think  
3 those are significant and important.

4 I know it will block the views of some of my neighbors  
5 who have views of the Bay from their apartments or condos.  
6 But like many of us, bringing people to the bayfront and  
7 allowing them to - from all over the world, not only the  
8 city, all of the region, all of the world - will be a  
9 significant enhancement to our bayfront. Thank you.

10 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Thank you.

11 Barbara Inaba, followed by Karen Nemsick.

12 MS. INABA: Good evening. I would like to thank you  
13 for having this evening meeting so that I could attend.

14 I have been a resident of the area for 20 years this  
15 May and I love living in the area, in the neighborhood  
16 actually across the street, because I was born and raised on  
17 an island and I have to live right near the water. I can't  
18 live inland on a lake but I have to live near ocean water.  
19 I have to see the water.

20 And contrary to what the gentleman before me said, I  
21 marvel at all the people, ordinary people that come from the  
22 surrounding areas to enjoy the pier. Every day at different  
23 times of the day there are people who just wander. There's  
24 people who might go there with their cars and so forth.

25 But with respect to the massiveness and the character

1 of the facility proposed on the pier: I believe it is  
2 totally contrary to what the pier should be. The scale is  
3 too massive. Actually, the height of it at about 130 feet  
4 is almost the height of the underside of the Bay Bridge.

5 If you notice that all of the development along the  
6 water from the Ferry Building -- in fact, I think that the  
7 height of it is almost as tall as the clock tower here at  
8 the Ferry Building. Along the waterfront, if you notice,  
9 that when they built the Gap building, they built the Gap  
10 building so that the Gap headquarters building on the  
11 Embarcadero front stepped back to be consistent with the  
12 adjoining building of the Hills Brothers, the tower was set  
13 back on Folsom Street.

14 So this building here that is being proposed is totally  
15 contrary to the scale of the whole waterfront and I hope  
16 that the BCDC can appreciate that it will block the public  
17 use and enjoyment of the waterfront. Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Thank you.

20 Karen Nemsick followed by Dennis MacKenzie.

21 MS. NEMSICK: Hi. My office is right on the  
22 Embarcadero right at Pier 28 so I see a lot of the traffic,  
23 I have a pretty good eye on the last five years' traffic  
24 patterns.

25 I am really very concerned about how the City and the

1 Warriors personnel will manage traffic, pedestrian traffic  
2 and bicycle traffic on game days. Putting 500 cars into  
3 that building disrupts hundreds and hundreds of people who  
4 are walking, riding, jobbing along the pedestrian. So we're  
5 going to need a lot more traffic control just as we do for  
6 AT&T Park to manage that kind of pedestrian traffic so that  
7 nobody gets hurt during game or event days. And I  
8 understand that that's more than 44 days a year. They are  
9 looking at events two out of three days of the year.

10 Secondly, with regard to the traffic. Five hundred  
11 cars is nearly a mile long. If you walked here today you  
12 saw that the Embarcadero gets backed up every evening.  
13 Those cars back up onto 280, they back up onto surface  
14 streets. It's a huge, huge amount of exhaust coming onto  
15 the residential neighborhoods and along the Embarcadero.

16 And in thinking long-term, there is a plan in place or  
17 a plan being talked about about taking down a part of the  
18 280 freeway. You're going to move that many more cars onto  
19 residential surface streets if that happens in the long-  
20 term. That brings a lot more congestion to this area down  
21 by CalTrain.

22 And then my final point was just sort of looking at the  
23 area long-term. What is the life cycle of this building?  
24 It's glass and it's metal and it's a waterfront that is  
25 notorious for being really hard on buildings with the fog

1 and the sea water. So what is the life cycle of this  
2 building? How long do the Warriors plan to be at this  
3 building? It's a very uniquely built edifice for  
4 basketball. And what happens to this building if the team  
5 or when the team decides to leave? Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Thank you.

8 Dennis MacKenzie followed by James Miller.

9 MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you, Board Members. I am Dennis  
10 MacKenzie, Round the Diamond consulting and education. I  
11 have been also teaching high school in San Francisco public  
12 high schools for the last 13 years.

13 I provided you a letter, a brief update on my proposal  
14 that I provided to you and all the city officials and the  
15 Warriors for over the past five years since they have been  
16 discussing this issue. As you know, my proposal is asking  
17 that the Warriors and the City and everyone involved  
18 collaborate to create a high school/college career pathway  
19 and field study classroom inside this arena.

20 As Mr. Dykers was pointing out, the community room.  
21 They mentioned that there could be space in that facility to  
22 have a high school classroom, which in my estimation,  
23 obviously for high school and college students to learn all  
24 the trades and jobs and careers and internships. The front  
25 of that community room I am hopeful has a courtside view

1 where all of our kids can be trained and learn all the  
2 positions involved with providing and presenting not just  
3 sports. But basketball, for example, all the multimedia,  
4 video taping, editing, journalism and of the positions and  
5 jobs that are a part of this arena. Those jobs are also not  
6 just for sports facilities but they can be translated in the  
7 world.

8         And as I have been promoting this for many years. I  
9 started this proposal based on my master's thesis in 1985  
10 and took it and transformed it into a proposal to the San  
11 Francisco Giants in 1985. I have been evolving and  
12 promoting this ever since.

13         Another aspect of my proposal, I provided you copies  
14 and I spoke at the BCDC meetings last year twice in May and  
15 June. I also believe this can be a magnet and attract  
16 visitors with public access inside the arena for bringing  
17 our schools and kids and teachers and business leaders and  
18 political government leaders throughout the state of  
19 California. My letter today addresses the fact that you are  
20 here to support state access and state benefits and that's  
21 why my proposal - several of my components deal with.

22         This model facility, a high school classroom, could  
23 bring kids in schools from around the state here to visit  
24 and meet our kids here and observe and learn from this  
25 facility, as well as across the country.

1           And another element of my proposal is stating the fact  
2 that we have sister city relationships around the world, yet  
3 not one with the Americas. I have been working with a  
4 number of Native American groups for many years and I  
5 believe this could be a stepping stone, a model that could  
6 be used and expanded throughout the Americas, bringing  
7 cultures and people and schools and leaders, political  
8 leaders, business leaders, to this city --

9           (Time signal tone sounded.)

10          MR. MACKENZIE: -- using this arena as a cross-cultural  
11 exchange program. Thank you very much.

12          WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Thank you.

13          James Miller, followed by Fred Alivercycle (sic).  
14 Excuse me, I'm not well with the last name. But James  
15 Miller, please.

16          MR. MILLER: My name is James Miller, I live in Rincon  
17 Towers on Howard and Steuart with a view of the pier just,  
18 just right off to the edge.

19          But one thing that I wanted to mention, it's admirable  
20 that the project talks often about sea water levels. We're  
21 talking about something that is sixty-some years from now in  
22 the future. If you take a look at -- you could just look at  
23 Wikipedia and look at the history of all the different  
24 arenas for basketball stadiums, this isn't going to be  
25 around much longer. So think of the long-term use of this

1 building and this space.

2 Also think about the fact that we have a major  
3 earthquake fault, the Hayward Fault, which is due for a  
4 major quake, 6, 7 or even higher. And that will actually  
5 cause major catastrophes, major destruction. For those of  
6 us who lived in this area in '89 and saw the Embarcadero  
7 Freeway and the damage that was done during the Loma Prieta  
8 quake, which could possibly have been a smaller quake than  
9 what we expect in the future, and also with what we have  
10 seen happen over at the Nimitz Freeway. This is a building  
11 set on piers, very, very much like the Nimitz Freeway. What  
12 is going to happen when there is an earthquake? There is no  
13 discussion about that.

14 There is discussion about sea level rise 60 years from  
15 now. This arena is going to be around for 20, 30 years. I  
16 think the Oracle Arena is probably one of the -- one of the  
17 oldest or longest actually used. But most basketball  
18 stadiums last only about 20 years. So keep that in mind.  
19 We need to look at the long-term use of this facility, of  
20 the space. This isn't right.

21 (Applause.)

22 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Thank you, Mr. Miller.

23 Fred. And could you help -- there's Fred.

24 MR. ALLARDYCE: Hello. My name is Frederick Allardyce  
25 and I am founder and operate a little group called

1 Recreation & Open Space for the Waterfront that includes  
2 residents that reside at the project right across the street  
3 from the proposed arena, it includes the Golden Gateway  
4 Center across the street, the Golden Gateway Commons across  
5 the street, 733 Front Street, Telegraph Landing and 101  
6 Lombard. They were all potentially inundated by the sea  
7 level report that's been given out tonight.

8 Now if I am not mistaken, at page 4 specifically it  
9 states that according to the project proponents, not against  
10 it but proponents, "the existing Piers 30-32 would be  
11 inundated by a 55-inch raise in sea level." And as number 4  
12 down below, this is something that hasn't been totally  
13 quantified yet.

14 Now I've appeared before your group, the Bay  
15 Conservation and Development group, for decades for all  
16 kinds of things, America's Cup and blah-blah-blah, Pier 39,  
17 everything else that's happened here.

18 And I know you gentleman are not just considered for an  
19 outdoor arena. They will probably have 300 nights a year  
20 just like the Oracle can have to have basketball and every  
21 other thing that a developer like these gentlemen would want  
22 to have and take advantage of.

23 But you're going to be considerate about how the  
24 flooding of this waterfront happens over the next 50 or 60  
25 years and what it does not just to here but what happens in

1 San Jose and Berkeley and the Marina and Sausalito and this  
2 whole waterfront. What are you going to do when this whole  
3 thing goes up about 55 inches more than what it is today?  
4 You showed one little slide of this thing showing that --  
5 and your report says, we can cover everything except the  
6 lower floor and the driveway and whatever and we can deal  
7 with that. But how do you get them across the street? How  
8 do you get the fans in there if you're your own island?

9 I mean, let's start to be responsible about what your  
10 responsibilities really are. They're not about building an  
11 arena and how that can be done with views and whatever and  
12 how it can be done economically, but you're addressing that  
13 we live on an island. It's called the San Francisco Bay.

14 So thank you very much for your time and effort. Enjoy  
15 your responsibilities about our future. Bye-bye.

16 (Applause.)

17 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Thank you very much. I don't have  
18 any -- I do not have any more speaker cards but is there  
19 anyone else that would like to address the Board?

20 Seeing none we will close the public comment period. I  
21 want to thank you all for being so timely with your comments  
22 and helping us move the meeting along and for really  
23 presenting clear points. Thank you very much.

24 John, do you want to --

25 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I was going to say, this evening the

1 members of the Advisory Committee and Design Review Board  
2 will discuss now what we've heard and ultimately come to  
3 some recommendations. Who would like to begin?

4 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: Well. All right, I'll -- no one  
5 else volunteered, I will.

6 We have two sets of photographs, I mean photographs and  
7 renderings. There are two sets -- on page -- I can't read  
8 the page. Page 2 and then page 19. I would like to see the  
9 renderings placed on the same viewpoint as on the actual  
10 photographs. The existing photographs, take the rendering  
11 from the same vantage point as was shown here. I don't  
12 think these -- they don't match.

13 DRB MEMBER BARTON: The exhibits?

14 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: Yes, Exhibit 19 and Exhibit 2  
15 should match each other for point of view. There's six here  
16 and four here and they don't match anyway. So that's one  
17 I'd like to see.

18 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I'd like to follow up on that.  
19 Admittedly this is a difficult, complex project but I found  
20 the presentation somewhat sketchy and hard to really come to  
21 conclusions about. And I was wondering if one of the things  
22 we could do this afternoon is to identify studies that could  
23 - just as you were talking - that would help us better  
24 understand the impact.

25 For example, I would like to see separate access

1 drawings that deal with all the different trucks, the  
2 loading docks, the parking and the major pedestrian  
3 movements.

4 I would like to see a study of the views, particularly  
5 from Embarcadero, looking in both directions. And to  
6 identify, for example, this would be one, at least,  
7 approach. The points where the tower of the bridge  
8 disappears from view if you are coming down the Embarcadero  
9 sidewalk and vice versa from the other direction to other  
10 possible views. Because it's still -- I felt at least I  
11 couldn't understand what --

12 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: And maybe a moving --

13 DRB MEMBER BARTON: A dynamic, yes.

14 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Yes.

15 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: A dynamic. You know, not  
16 photographs but a video.

17 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Yes, a video. But in any case,  
18 something that will tell us where we lose the important  
19 views.

20 I was wondering about security in the category of  
21 access, for example. All of these public areas, are they  
22 open all the time, 24 hours a day? Are they -- if they are  
23 open late at night is there some security or is it gated off  
24 or how exactly would that be managed?

25 I would like to see, have a better and a clearer

1 understanding of the mix of uses and the -- to help address  
2 the compatibility between them and this part of the city.

3 And so on and so forth. I mean, we can kind of think  
4 about a list as we variously bring up our issues.

5 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: Has this been presented before the  
6 BCDC Engineering Criteria Review Board yet?

7 MS. MICHAELS: No, not yet.

8 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: That I'd like to hear some data on.

9 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: John, I wonder. In the past on  
10 some other projects we have broken down the review into  
11 components in areas that are typically commented on.

12 And in this project we might want to look at the  
13 overall massing and collect comments.

14 We may want to look at overall site circulation, both  
15 vehicular and pedestrian and service access, see if we have  
16 comments on that.

17 And then we should have a discussion on the public  
18 spaces and what we can see at this point.

19 Then there were some issues raised in the comments  
20 earlier about compatibility with the waterfront environment  
21 and that had to do not only with history but with character.

22 So those are four categories that we could frame our  
23 comments in.

24 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I think that's -- I think that's  
25 fine but I do think we need more data from the applicant.

1           WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: I developed a list of the ones that  
2 we have already discussed just a moment ago. Regarding  
3 parking circulation, security, a more thorough analysis of  
4 where you get the bridge views and not. And there was an --  
5 also a better understanding of mix and uses. So that's a  
6 beginning of that list. And as more of those come about --

7           DRB MEMBER BARTON: Could we add with the circulation,  
8 vehicular and pedestrian, some scenarios. Game day/not game  
9 day, event and not event day, morning/evening. Just to get  
10 a really complete picture.

11          DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: And also the --

12          DRB MEMBER BARTON: The choke point, the choke point  
13 issue.

14          DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: And also the convergence of Giants  
15 games and the Warriors' games. Is there an overlap time?

16          WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Giants versus Warriors. Marsha  
17 also mentioned boat and berthing, which I am going to  
18 extrapolate to say has to do with major ships coming in and  
19 the circulation on the site required for that.

20          DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: I'd be curious about timing  
21 of the project overall and what are the expectations. How  
22 long would it take for these to actualize.

23          WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Timing of the project is what Steve  
24 just said. We are a little short on microphones so we have  
25 to speak up so that we get -- so that we communicate to the

1 whole crowd.

2 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: A megaphone.

3 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Your timing comment, what were you?

4 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: I'm interested in the  
5 schedule. How long would it take to actualize this project?

6 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: So a timing concern for  
7 construction?

8 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah. We have a time line  
9 showing that it will last until '81 -- I'm sorry, 2081,  
10 before they lose their land lease. I'm curious about where  
11 the water is going to be by the time we get to 2081 and what  
12 you do about it. And I remember Venice and --

13 (Several members of the audience asked  
14 Mr. Thompson to speak louder.)

15 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: I have the dilemma of Venice  
16 where I see photographs of people walking across St. Mark's  
17 Plaza on little concrete blocks in order to get to a dry  
18 place they'd like to be. And I can't imagine how you would  
19 get transit to work, how you would get BART to work. How do  
20 all those systems actually integrate? Don't you lose all  
21 that stuff somewhere along the way?

22 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: I think we are going to try to  
23 limit our comments to this project and not take on the  
24 larger waterfront, city or Bay Area but thank you, Steven.

25 DRB VICE CHAIR THOMPSON: An island.

1 DRB MEMBER STRANG: I wonder if we could to the list --

2 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: No arena is an island unto itself.

3 DRB MEMBER STRANG: -- some more detail on the north  
4 entry core would be helpful. Some views from there.

5 And I'm also -- you know, I appreciate the large  
6 welcoming steps but I'd like to see how the accessible  
7 access works so that the accessible routes are as welcoming  
8 as the big stairs. Because the ramps seem to be tucked  
9 around, you know, in the back and kind of constricted, at  
10 least from the north. but I am not sure if I am really  
11 reading the plans correctly.

12 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: Well, I'd be remiss if I didn't put  
13 on my engineer's hat and -- the gentleman did raise the  
14 point about seismic and I think I'd welcome hearing some  
15 feedback on how far this has progressed with your  
16 engineering team, both as the deck replacement and piling;  
17 and on the seismicity the interaction of the pier with this  
18 massive structure sitting on top of it. I'm sure you have  
19 competent engineers but I'd like to hear what the, what the  
20 evaluations are. Thank you.

21 WDAC MEMBER MAYTUM: I have another quick question; or  
22 not a question, a comment. In addition to the items that  
23 Dan has listed and everybody has mentioned about the  
24 circulation and the tightness of the activities on the site  
25 and the changing of the venue over time.

1 I am really interested in the foreground building, the  
2 retail section, because I think that that's a really  
3 important part. Not only do we have a string of parks along  
4 the waterfront but we have always had -- also have a series  
5 of buildings and urban edge that's implied around the  
6 waterfront. And so I think that that's a very important  
7 feature that we need to not lose sight of as we're focused  
8 on the arena, which clearly has a requirement, a  
9 programmatic requirement that's incredibly tight. I think  
10 you provided us with a huge amount of information in a very  
11 short period of time and I appreciate the level of detail  
12 that you were able to go into. Although this is a very big  
13 and complex project that is going to take a bit of time to  
14 really deeply understand so that we can make wise comments.

15 But I would like to add the foreground building and the  
16 urban edge as something that we need a bit more information  
17 about and how that knits together with the surrounding  
18 buildings.

19 DRB MEMBER BARTON: I have a staff request. Can we  
20 make the Strategic Area Plan available online so we could  
21 all kind of -- the Special Area Plan, sorry.

22 MS. MIRAMONTES: I can point you to it, it's on our  
23 website.

24 DRB MEMBER BARTON: That would be great.

25 MS. MIRAMONTES: It's in the Library section.

1 DRB MEMBER BARTON: Great.

2 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Stefan.

3 DRB MEMBER PELLEGRINI: I have just two concerns. One  
4 is that I think there is a great deal of space that would be  
5 created for the public but a great deal of it is not flat.  
6 I think we heard that the slope is 1-6 on the grassy areas.  
7 That gives me a concern about thermal comfort and the  
8 scenario of creating a small hill here that might have an  
9 adverse effect on the winds that at times come from the  
10 north. I think which is something that we need more  
11 information on, whether or not the public space that we're  
12 creating is actually good public space that could be used in  
13 a great variety of scenarios.

14 I'm also just generally skeptical about a lot of  
15 greenery that is on top of a podium or on top of other event  
16 spaces, particularly large trees like Monterey Pines that  
17 might require a certain amount of space for their roots.  
18 And I think if we are thinking about designing the large  
19 open spaces that can accommodate a lot of people, those  
20 things and the opportunity of those environments to actually  
21 have a sustainable (indiscernible) is really important and  
22 is something that we need more information on.

23 And I just have one last comment that I think the  
24 community room is a great asset, but there is also  
25 potentially 600 feet of facade that wraps around the eastern

1 portion of the building that would provide the frontage for  
2 the Bay Promenade and in the plan I see that it's largely  
3 lined with back-of-house. So these -- from understanding  
4 what the materiality of what that facade is for the people  
5 who are using that path. I think that it's an opportunity  
6 to use the Bay but we also would want to make sure that it's  
7 not a blank wall that is just not providing a hospitable  
8 environment.

9 We've heard some concepts about the materiality of the  
10 building, but I think as John said, it's still very sketchy  
11 what it is and how it can relate to someone that is of a  
12 pedestrian scale.

13 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Mike.

14 DRB MEMBER SMILEY: I'd like to build on that comment,  
15 actually, because the materiality of the use of that back-  
16 of-the-house adjacent to the promenade is probably a  
17 problem. But the -- I think the -- it would be nice to know  
18 more about the actual programming of the open space. It's  
19 pretty obvious what's going on with the arena. The retail,  
20 I can understand that.

21 What I can't understand necessarily is we see kayakers  
22 in the renderings, we see a lot of things that -- is  
23 somebody going to be renting kayaks on a daily basis?

24 What's happening in that events plaza? Is it a place  
25 where it's programmed beyond game days, game nights, even

1 other events and times?

2           So it would be nice to know what is programmed for this  
3 open space because I think it's got -- it's potentially, I  
4 think, building on what you said. It can potentially be  
5 quite a problem. And we faced this the greatest times when  
6 we looked at the Ferry Plaza. And there have been efforts  
7 that we have reviewed for various proposals at the Ferry  
8 Plaza. When it's a market it's great but a lot of the time  
9 then it's -- it's BART mid-shaft. And we have this problem  
10 with these kinds of spaces so this probably needs some  
11 pretty serious programming to actually be successful in its  
12 non-event days.

13           DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: David?

14           WDAC MEMBER ALUMBAUGH: Yes, I just want to say --  
15 first I want to thank the public for their comments tonight.  
16 I thought they were really constructive and it will be  
17 interesting to see how those are carried forward into the  
18 work as it progresses.

19           And I did -- I thought today we were going to talk more  
20 about general siting and massing and all of that, so. I do  
21 think the general moves that we see here, if you talk about  
22 putting an arena on Piers 30-32, are probably as good and as  
23 balanced as they can get, given the challenges that you are  
24 facing in putting this into the City and being sensitive to  
25 its location and being sensitive to its -- at the same time

1 creating this sort of modern, special place that people can  
2 go to and sort of be excited about. You know, the access  
3 around the piers, I think the open spaces.

4 Stefan, I hear the concern about going up in the air  
5 but I do think that you can also do that very nicely. And I  
6 think if it's done nicely then this open space -- I've  
7 forgotten what you call it. It would be the northeast  
8 corner where you're up and you can see the Bridge and you  
9 can see the City and you can see the Bay and the hills  
10 behind I think could be spectacular in the way that the only  
11 other rise at the waterfront is right at the water's edge is  
12 actually over at Fort Mason. And so, yes, it's created,  
13 it's manmade created, but it's still a wonderful place to be  
14 at in the waterfront.

15 I think that as we see that articulated -- I mean,  
16 certainly we have to see how it's detailed but I think as an  
17 expression I think it's an interesting theme to explore. I  
18 did -- in our design and access documents as well.

19 You know, there's a lot to do about views and it's not  
20 -- if you read through the instructions about how to design  
21 and to build on the waterfront, it's not just about  
22 preserving views but there is actually almost equal amounts  
23 of language about creating new, wonderful views for the  
24 City. It's not that the waterfront is now sort of  
25 solidified and we ought never to change it again but it's

1 how we sensitively build in this place and keep the values  
2 of the waterfront that we have. And I think that will be an  
3 interesting thing to do, to look at as we, as we go forward.  
4 And it's specific about that views should include the City  
5 and parts of the City. And you can look at the arena as a  
6 part of the City.

7 I also wanted to say, there were some questions asked  
8 here specifically tonight. I think Craig, you may have  
9 asked, about the southeast corner. And to my way of  
10 thinking, and if you look at the site plan, which is over  
11 nearest Stefan, you get to the corner there -- to me that's  
12 sort of the problem with the ship, if you will. You get to  
13 that southeast corner, you're on the Bay, you've got the Bay  
14 right in front of you. It's the one place where you're  
15 really, really surrounded by water where you can be immersed  
16 in the Bay.

17 And I think the cutting away of that corner would be  
18 something that I think you should think about. I think  
19 actually extending the corner so that it's a big, firm prow  
20 and you can get to it, would be something that you should  
21 explore. That said, I think I sort of like the idea of the  
22 cutting away of the pier as much as can be done. So taking  
23 that space and getting it somewhere else I think would be  
24 certainly something that would be worthwhile exploring.

25 I would say too, in some of the work that I have seen

1 on our waterfront, not just in the port lands but in  
2 Candlestick Point and Hunters Point and some of the stuff  
3 that we see being done by the federal government as well at  
4 GGNRA, I think we lose the fact that we ought to be very,  
5 very playful with our water's edge.

6 And then I look at other cities and sort of how they're  
7 faced with some of the same challenges that we are, we have  
8 tide, we have storms, we have waves, we've got a built up  
9 urban waterfront. But they are able to transcend that.  
10 Copenhagen is a great city as examples of ways to do that.  
11 New York, for heaven's sake, drags a great big boat around  
12 and it's a -- it's a swim barge and they drag it around to  
13 different parts of the city and people can go out and  
14 actually swim at the water's edge.

15 So I am not suggesting those things. What I am just  
16 saying, being very playful with the water's edge and getting  
17 people engaged with the water and not just walking around it  
18 and looking at it, might be something you can incorporate in  
19 that investigation as you look at the southern edge and  
20 curve away the pier and perhaps some other places instead of  
21 that corner.

22 And I think that's my major commenting. And I think  
23 the basic siting moves are as good as they can be and it  
24 will be interesting to see the design evolve.

25 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: There is one issue that has not

1 been raised yet, just occurred to me. I don't see anything  
2 shown here or referred to about lighting, both lighting at  
3 night onto the public access and lighting from the facility  
4 which will be seen by the residents around. In other words,  
5 how will it be lit when it's just public access and when  
6 there is an event how will that be lit and how much light  
7 comes out from the arena or advertising the arena? So I  
8 think next time we see this I think we'd like to hear about  
9 that.

10 DRB MEMBER STRANG: I just wanted to say I really  
11 appreciate the simplicity of the lines of the stadium and  
12 how that relates to the Bridge and the big sky and the big  
13 view of the water that we have here. And I think when it  
14 come to the buildings in front, just in terms of the massing  
15 and scale, it seems very active and very busy. And I have  
16 some questions about the scale of those buildings and if it  
17 wouldn't be possible to look at some simplification of  
18 those. And, you know, in looking at the plans there are  
19 also some small and trapezoidal retail spaces and maybe that  
20 would help to add to the resiliency of those buildings and  
21 to make them stand the test of time better.

22 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: So I think I'd like to, again, sort  
23 of restate the studies that help us come to conclusions on  
24 this project.

25 I don't think we see excess in all of its dimensions,

1 cars, people, loading, event goers, the recreational  
2 walkers, all that. The way the joint uses will work, are  
3 they serving the neighborhood nearby or are they strictly  
4 based on a sort of visitor, arena visitor public? I'd like  
5 to know.

6 I think one of our panel members mentioned the wind and  
7 sun exposure and how comfortable some of those spaces will  
8 be when we do -- we know that the wind will be shaped around  
9 the forms that you've produced.

10 And then the various questions that have come up about  
11 landscaping.

12 And I think that would help us put the project  
13 together.

14 MR. DYKERS: Could I make one quick comment very fast?

15 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Sure.

16 MR. DYKERS: Only that we think, obviously, these  
17 comments are very good. We do cover a lot of this material  
18 in the CEQA documentation.

19 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: We can't hear you.

20 MR. DYKERS: We have a lot of the material in the CEQA  
21 documentation and in the Environmental Impact Analysis. So  
22 that's an important feature of our work so we are happy to  
23 put together for you and show it to you. I just want to  
24 make sure that you understand that it's not that we haven't  
25 done it; it's only that we compressed our talk into a fairly

1 short period of time. I'd say nearly everything that was  
2 raised we have material on and it's easy to access for you  
3 and there are a number of features of that material that  
4 would clarify a lot of things.

5 I think there was a little bit of a misunderstanding,  
6 for example, on sea level rise, which was brought up  
7 earlier. That event that you were looking at is actually a  
8 catastrophic event, it's not a permanent sea level rise  
9 issue that that was addressing. So the fact that it becomes  
10 an island was only a temporary kind of thing that is a part  
11 of the study. But all of that is in that information and  
12 we're happy to provide it.

13 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Well, thank you very much. I think  
14 the presentation tonight was a great introduction to the  
15 project. It really got us a chance to see the scope of it,  
16 the scale of it. We heard some great comments from the  
17 public and the type of concerns that are coming up. We  
18 haven't been exposed to all the different community meetings  
19 and public meetings that have been going on.

20 I am going to go through a list that summarizes some of  
21 the information that's desired here to help this committee  
22 provide more detailed recommendations.

23 But first I wanted to be complimentary, not just on the  
24 presentation but on some of the major moves of the project.  
25 One, how the mass of the arena is set further out on the

1 pier; which, one, allows the buildings along the Embarcadero  
2 to be what's part of the view and pushes the large mass out.  
3 It also opens up some views of the Bay Bridge from different  
4 points along the promenade and from other points in the  
5 City. I thought that was very successful.

6 I also wanted to compliment the approach to creating  
7 many different types of public space, the elevations of  
8 those. And as much as we are not ready to comment  
9 specifically on those, there is a lot of interest that has  
10 come up here. There's a lot of variety and there's a lot of  
11 thought.

12 Also some of the finishes that are beginning to be  
13 shown of how it's not meant to be a beacon-type building but  
14 how it's meant to really fit into this area, for the size of  
15 the structure it is. So there's a lot of great thinking  
16 that's going on.

17 And this group would like to do a lot of great thinking  
18 on it too but there's a bit more information. I'm going to  
19 try to go through that list and everyone on the Committee  
20 please chime in when I miss something here or do not go  
21 through it sufficiently.

22 There was a desire for the renderings that are  
23 expressed to show in the packet, the photos, to also include  
24 the proposed project adjacent to those so you can do a side-  
25 by-side so they can have that type of comparison of the

1 visuals of it.

2 The greater desire for information on circulation. Of  
3 how parking comes in and out, how the loading vehicles come  
4 in and out, and we didn't get a chance to go through all  
5 that tonight. There was a drawing in the package showing  
6 pedestrian and bicycle circulation and I think it was also a  
7 desire, from what I hear, to understand how it relates to  
8 the adjacent neighborhood a bit more too on the Embarcadero.  
9 And I'm seeing head nodding on that.

10 A desire to understand the security better. What is  
11 open 24 hours and what is not? What part -- how accessible  
12 is the public access? Understanding that plan.

13 To understand the mix of uses on the site and how that  
14 relates to adjacent uses as well. I think you've got that  
15 information, it's just a matter of what we can absorb at one  
16 time.

17 On game day, the vehicular and pedestrian flows. On  
18 game day and non-game day and on boat berthing days. To  
19 understand the differences on how the site is going to  
20 function. Where is it going to be? Where are the crowds  
21 going to be? How are they going to work together?

22 And I believe I also heard, if not from the Committee,  
23 from the audience, to understand the relationship when a  
24 Giants game may be happening and whether that occurs at the  
25 same hours. How does that -- how that impacts traffic and

1 pedestrian circulation on the promenade.

2       There was a request for information about timing for  
3 construction so I assume that had to do with construction  
4 impacts.

5       Greater information about the north court entry. So we  
6 can understand the building relationships and how it relates  
7 to the adjacent piers and bulkheads.

8       MR. DYKERS: Is that this? I just want to clarify.  
9 This area here?

10       WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Yes.

11       MS. MIRAMONTES: Which I think it was specific to  
12 accessibility issues there.

13       WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: I think it was accessibility but  
14 also to architecture. The building stepped back there.  
15 There's a little different treatment to the building  
16 architecture as opposed to on the promenade so I think it  
17 probably had to do with relationship to that as well.

18       Information on seismic stability, engineering data.

19       Greater information on the retail buildings, the  
20 proposed finishes. There was some discussion on that but  
21 just to limit it to a reasonable amount of drawings you  
22 could show us. The Committee desires a greater  
23 understanding of the architecture and I think -- I believe  
24 that's a better understanding of how the architecture is  
25 compatible with adjacent waterfront development or how it

1 makes its relationship regarding that.

2 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: Lighting?

3 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Thank you. Yes, a lighting concept  
4 for the pier. I don't think we need to go into lighting  
5 detail very soon but a concept for how the arena would be  
6 lit, how the public spaces would be lit and how the retail  
7 and other buildings would be lit along the promenade, so a  
8 concept for that.

9 More about the actually program of the open space,  
10 information. There's about -- I can't remember if there  
11 were five or seven different types of open space. Some of  
12 them would obviously be more programmed than others. A  
13 couple of them might be more programmed. And what the  
14 thoughts are of that, whether any of that would be actively  
15 programmed.

16 And some of the uses that are adjacent to that, that  
17 assist that programming such as the kayak rental or retail.

18 DRB MEMBER SMILEY: I was just going to add,  
19 programming of the water sheet (sic) itself as well.

20 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Programming of the water itself?

21 DRB MEMBER SMILEY: Right.

22 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: The Bay.

23 DRB MEMBER SMILEY: As part of the open space  
24 programming.

25 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Thank you.

1 MS. MIRAMONTES: Dan, I had a couple of points I can  
2 add.

3 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Please, I think I'm about through  
4 my list here. I'm just going through it.

5 MS. MIRAMONTES: Okay. Also regarding the retail  
6 buildings, looking at greater simplicity with those.

7 Then specifically the landscape concerns about thermal  
8 conditions and trees on a podium.

9 And then the eastern facade, a greater connection with  
10 the adjacent pedestrian promenade and the extension of it.

11 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: To understand that relationship as  
12 to how it connects with the promenade.

13 MS. MIRAMONTES: Greater connection with the eastern  
14 facade --

15 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: With the Bay promenade.

16 MS. MIRAMONTES: -- and the pedestrian promenade on the  
17 eastern facade.

18 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Okay.

19 MS. MIRAMONTES: And there was mention of actually a  
20 preferred extension of the southeast corner rather than  
21 cutaway. Being playful at the water's edge.

22 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: So a request to look at if that is  
23 the appropriate place to cut away or to create a view point,  
24 a new view point. So a little greater sight piece on that.

25 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I think we also should know the

1 hours of day the public open spaces are available.

2 DRB MEMBER STRANG: And can we get a little specificity  
3 on the -- on the yard ribbon and whether it's going to be  
4 altered or whatever.

5 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Oh, yes. That's the preservation of  
6 the Herb Caen Way and the programs that went to identify  
7 that.

8 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Any other comments from the  
9 Committee for that list?

10 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: We did a good list there.

11 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: That's a good list, thank you.

12 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Actually, the last phase of this  
13 discussion is if the applicant would care to respond to what  
14 they have heard today.

15 MR. DYKERS: Actually, I think I already clarified one  
16 thing and that is that a lot of the material that you  
17 requested has been made. I guess we sort of refined it down  
18 to a 25 minute talk. It is a very, very large area. It's  
19 almost many projects. Each one could use its own 25 minute  
20 presentation.

21 It would be interesting to know how in the next  
22 meetings you would like us to respond. Because even just  
23 the material that you've asked us for, we are happy to do  
24 but can it be presented in such a short period is hard to  
25 know. I think we can probably push through a lot of it and

1 certainly the preparatory material that you get will answer  
2 a lot of the questions so that maybe during the verbal  
3 presentation we only treat them in a narrow way and you have  
4 the written material to refer to; is that correct?

5 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I think that's correct.

6 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: It is such a large and diverse  
7 project with so many areas to cover. We may go back and  
8 talk amongst the staffs and see if we should approach  
9 further reviews more topic-specific or if there is some way  
10 we get -- some way we can get through all the parts of the  
11 project that are of concern to this group.

12 DRB MEMBER SMILEY: I was going to ask that question,  
13 actually, to our two co-chairs. It seems that maybe to  
14 package it in the meetings, however number of meetings we  
15 schedule. We want to be as efficient as we can but maybe to  
16 package it by topics that cover certain things. I can  
17 imagine -- I mean, one of our big -- at least the Design  
18 Review Board, one of the big sort of topic areas of our  
19 greatest concern is the public space, the outdoor space.  
20 And it seems that some of the things that are on list that  
21 relate to the open space would cover -- I mean, as a subject  
22 a whole meeting could deal with the open space, its  
23 programming, its lighting, a whole variety of things. Just  
24 the open space subject itself.

25 It seems like circulation and access is another one

1 that we could spend quite a bit of time on and maybe that  
2 would be a topic of the meeting.

3 The architecture maybe not so much but there are some  
4 things that we want to talk about that relates to the  
5 presence of the retail on the Embarcadero and so on. So  
6 maybe that one, I don't know if that would need a whole  
7 meeting by itself but it could be something that could be  
8 blended in with its relationship to the open space, for  
9 example, and what it does for the Embarcadero.

10 I can see two very clear topic areas for -- in terms of  
11 meetings.

12 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: I just thought of another one and  
13 it's the lighting. Sound from the arena.

14 MR. DYKERS: And again, something we have covered and  
15 discussed so we are happy to provide you with the  
16 information.

17 DRB MEMBER HIRSCH: That would just be for the public  
18 as well as the Committee.

19 DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay.

20 WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Thank you very much. Thank you  
21 again for the really fantastic presentation and the quality  
22 of the graphics. That concludes this item on the agenda.

23 There is one more item for the Waterfront Design  
24 Committee. That's the spot on the agenda in case there are  
25 any items, any person has a comment on any item not listed

1 on the agenda. It's a chance for public comment.

2 Seeing none, the meeting is adjourned.

3 (Thereupon, the joint meeting of the Design Review  
4 Board and Port of San Francisco's Waterfront Design  
5 Advisory Committee was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.)

6 --oOo--

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER  
2

3 I, JOHN COTA, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify  
4 that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the  
5 foregoing joint meeting of the BCDC Design Review Board and  
6 the Port of San Francisco's Waterfront Design Advisory  
7 Committee; that the recording was thereafter transcribed.

8 I further certify that I am not of counsel nor attorney  
9 for any of the parties to said meeting, or in any way  
10 interested in the outcome of said meeting.

11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this  
12 21st day of April, 2014.

13  
14 s/s John O. Cota

15 JOHN O. COTA  
16

17 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER  
18

19 I, RAMONA COTA, a Certified Electronic Reporter and  
20 Transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct  
21 transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic  
22 recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.  
23

24 /s/ Ramona Cota

April 21, 2014

25 RAMONA COTA, CERT\*\*478