

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

March 29, 2018

TO: Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Andrea Gaffney, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of the February 26, 2018, BCDC Design Review Board Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Safety Announcement.** Design Review Board (Board) Chair Karen Alschuler called the meeting to order at the Bay Area Metro Center, 375 Beale Street, Yerba Buena Room, First Floor, San Francisco, California, at approximately 5:30 p.m., and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Other Board members in attendance included Board Members Cheryl Barton, Tom Leader, Jacinta McCann, and Stefan Pellegrini. BCDC staff in attendance included Rebecca Coates-Maloon, Andrea Gaffney, and Ethan Lavine. Port of San Francisco Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC) members in attendance included Laura Crescimano, Dan Hodapp, Marcia Maytum, and Kathrin Moore. Mission Rock – Pier 70 Design Advisory Committee members in attendance included Jimmy Chan, Laura Crescimano, Marsha Maytum, Kathrin Moore, and Chris Wasney. The presenters were David Beaupre (Port of San Francisco), Alan Kawasaki (Shah Kawasaki Architects), Richard Kennedy (James Corner Field Operations), William Knudson (Power Engineering Construction), Leah Olson (Liftech Consultants), Anthony Rivera (SFFD), Magdalena Ryor (SFPW), Jack Sylvan (Forest City), Dilip Trivedi (Moffatt and Nichol Engineers), and Vito Vinoni (SFPW). Public comment via email was submitted by Howard Wang (Central Waterfront Advisory Group). Also in attendance was Bo Barnes.

2. **Other Announcements.** Andrea Gaffney, BCDC Bay Design Analyst, reviewed the safety protocols, meeting protocols, and meeting agenda. She provided the announcements as follows:

a. The next Board meeting will be held on March 5th. The Board will review the Alameda Marina. The Meeting Notice and Staff Report have been sent out, but the Exhibits will be posted to the website on Wednesday.

info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov
State of California | Edmund G. Brown — Governor



DRB MINUTES
February 26, 2018

b. A link to the Statement of Economic Interests, Form 700, has been sent to Board members. The form must be filled out and mailed back by April 2nd. The mailing address was included in the email.

c. The Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Public Arts Master Plan proposals will soon be launched. They will be on display on the island from March 22nd through April 3rd and are available for review online. Three to four artists will propose projects for each of the three sites that comprise the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Public Arts Master Plan: The Building One Plaza, the Waterfront Plaza, which is in the Commission's jurisdiction, and the Yerba Buena Hilltop Park.

3. Approval of Draft Minutes for January 22, 2018, Meeting. Mr. Leader referred to his comment at the bottom of page 8. He asked to incorporate the last sentence into the first sentence so it would read, "Mr. Leader continued with a comment to Question 2 in the Staff Report and stated the question of getting the theme to read stronger and having more richness and preciousness about it and how much interpretation belongs on the plaza is a judgment question. If there was not going to be that much interpretation, it still will need more texture and shadow created there to make the 'carpet' read as a functional item to organize the space. This could apply to different materials."

MOTION: Mr. Leader moved approval of the Minutes for the January 22, 2018, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as amended, seconded by Ms. Barton.

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 5-0-0 with Board Chair Alschuler and Board Members Barton, Leader, McCann, and Pellegrini voting approval with no abstentions.

4. Pier 70 Waterfront Site; City and County of San Francisco (Second Pre-Application Review). Ms. McCann recused herself from the Pier 70 Waterfront Site discussion to comply with conflict of interest rules.

Ms. Gaffney asked David Beaupre, Senior Waterfront Planner at the Port of San Francisco, to introduce the Mission Rock-Pier 70 Design Advisory Committee members.

Mr. Beaupre stated the Port of San Francisco now has two Design Advisory Committees. The existing established Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC) reviews all projects north of Mission Creek. He introduced its members in attendance: Laura Crescimano, Dan Hodapp, Marcia Maytum, and Kathrin Moore.

Mr. Beaupre stated the Port of San Francisco has established a new Design Advisory Committee called the Mission Rock – Pier 70 Design Advisory Committee (MR-P70 DAC). This Advisory Committee will review the Pier 70 Waterfront Site project along with DRB members. He stated Ms. Crescimano, Ms. Maytum, and Ms. Moore are also on this Advisory Committee along with Jimmy Chan and Chris Wasney.

Mr. Beaupre stated the purpose of the new Design Advisory Committee is to review parks within each of those projects to ensure that they are consistent with the design for development for Pier 70 and the design controls for the Mission Rock Project. He stated the MR-P70 DAC will jointly review projects with the Board that fall within both Pier 70 and Mission Rock locations, and the WDAC will jointly review projects with the Board north of China Basin.

Ms. Alschuler asked who chairs the new Design Advisory Committee. Mr. Beaupre stated the chair has yet to be identified for the new MR-P70 DAC.

Ms. Alschuler asked about other projects going to the Commission for the Board to review. Ms. Gaffney stated there are none at this time but Mission Rock, Oyster Point, and South Bay Salt Ponds are scheduled to go to the Commission in the spring.

Ms. Alschuler asked Ms. Gaffney to inform the Board of the dates as soon as she learns them.

Ms. Gaffney summarized the role of the Board relative to the Commission and the project review process.

The Board held their second review, but the first joint review with the MR-P70 DAC, of a proposal by Forest City and the Port of San Francisco to redevelop an approximately 28-acre site, the "Waterfront Site," within the 67-acre Port-owned Pier 70 property, bound by Illinois Street to the west, the BAE Ship Repair Yard to the north, the Bay to the east, and the former Potrero Power Plant to the south, in the city and county of San Francisco.

The proposed project would include a 3-acre shoreline open space area, shoreline pathways for pedestrians and bicyclists, seating areas, a large lawn, areas for cafes and food vendors, and large-scale public art installations.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Ethan Lavine, the BCDC Coastal Program Manager, highlighted the changes made to the design since the Board's first pre-application review on October 17, 2016, which were included in the staff report. He showed a slide presentation of other park projects for scale comparison and summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the project:

(1) Provides an engaging mix of uses and flexibility along the waterfront and accommodates the expected level of use from new residents, employees, and visitors to this segment of the shoreline

(2) Takes advantage of the Bay setting, and provides for adequate opportunities to get close to and experience the water

(3) Provides for adequate visual transparency such that the viewing pavilions and rows of trees at the project's southern end enhance and dramatize, rather than detract from views to the Bay

(4) Adequately designs and connects the Bay Trail in each section of the waterfront to the other sections and nearby public rights of way

(5) Takes advantage of the unique historical features in its design of the Bay and its shoreline and enhances the public's understanding of the site and its relationship to the Bay

(6) Provides for equivalent access among users of different physical abilities

(7) Provides for users' sense of comfort given the mass of the nearby buildings

(8) Provides for user comfort given the microclimate conditions at the site

(9) Provides clear connections to the Bay from west to east and takes advantage of local street networks to inform the shoreline site design

(10) Minimizes the potential for conflicts among pedestrians and cyclists within the shoreline open space area

(11) Supports the anticipated level of demand at such future time as the rising sea levels require the lower lying access areas to be closed or removed

(12) Considers alternative or preferable future adaptation responses to sea level rise

b. **Project Presentation.** David Beaupre, Senior Waterfront Planner at the Port of San Francisco, introduced the members of his team and stated the plans have evolved tremendously and the team is excited to present the improved proposal.

Jack Sylvan, Vice President of Development at Forest City, the project developer, stated the Pier 70 site has amazing potential and asks for something remarkable. He stated the new schematic designs respect the historic character of the site, elevate it in the appropriate ways but do not freeze it in time, and introduce exciting elements that are opportunities for individuals to interact with the waterfront.

Richard Kennedy, Senior Principal at James Corner Field Operations, the landscape architect for the proposed project, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the site context and history, phasing, site plan, shoreline open spaces, and programming and event spaces.

Mr. Kennedy stated the open space and master plan has been developed with the concept that the Pier 70 project should build in the character of its industrial history and legacy as a major shipbuilding operation for the country and maintain that as an important quality within the project, but is also an extension of the Dogpatch Community, which is an entrepreneurial, creative, burgeoning neighborhood.

c. **Board Questions.** Following the presentation, the Board asked a series of questions:

Ms. Barton asked for additional detail on the project phasing. Mr. Sylvan stated two buildings are beginning the design phase. The hope is to deliver designs on four of the buildings in three years. The first phase of the parks and infrastructure is expected to be completed by that time. The first phase is almost half of the overall project because of needing to buildout the overall infrastructure. Mr. Sylvan noted the change to the project that has incorporated the waterfront park into the first phase of development.

Ms. Alschuler referred to the Vicinity Map slide and asked for clarification on the colored spaces. Mr. Kennedy pointed out the residential, office, and cultural arts or retail spaces and noted that the red bar that wraps some of the yellow buildings depicts residential buildings with ground floor retail spaces. The goal is to provide a mix and variety of uses on the ground floor adjacent to the open spaces and the waterfront.

Ms. Moore asked about the timing of the Orton Historic Core, which includes Buildings 113 through 115, 104, 102, and 101. Mr. Beaupre stated, by the end of this year, all of those buildings will be fully occupied, including the open spaces adjacent to them. The machine shop piazza is open today.

Ms. Moore stated she read a few days ago that ship repair is suspended. Mr. Beaupre stated the operator of ship repair operations was lost in May of 2017. A Request for Proposal (RFP) went out for new operators in the fall. Four responses were received. Two were good responses but it became apparent that the way the RFP framed the request for operators did not align with the needs of the potential operators. The Port is in the process of recrafting the RFP and will send it out within the next month. A new operator is expected to be in place by the end of this year. The Port intends to maintain that facility for ship repair.

Mr. Chan asked if Forest City is responsible for 20th Street repaving, infrastructure, and public improvements. Mr. Kennedy stated 20th Street will be built in large part to Maryland Street within the first phase and continued in the second phase.

Mr. Chan asked how the project proponents are thinking about knitting surrounding projects together. Mr. Kennedy stated the streets are a main part of what will connect the city back to Dogpatch. The design ensures there are many linkages north and south between Pier 70 and the former Potrero Power Plant site. The historic 20th Street will be restored and maintained as a major connection, the non-historic 22nd Street will be extended through to link back into the grid, and Maryland Street will connect 20th and 22nd Streets and also will connect down to the former Potrero Power Plant. There are also other connections: The new 21st Street is an unmapped street that zig-zags around historic Building 2 through the center of the site and is an east/west connector that will allow for porosity and connectivity between the neighborhood, the city, and the waterfront.

Ms. Moore asked how Irish Hill changed between 2016 and 2018 to create another connection through the open space. Mr. Kennedy pointed to locations showing the main change to Irish Hill on the D4D planning slide. He stated the midblock passage off of Illinois Street has been rotated on a diagonal. This makes a more visible opening at the 22nd Street corner and makes the park visible, accessible, and known to the residents in the area.

Chair Alschuler asked about the historic Pier 70 site. Mr. Beaupre stated the plans for the actual Pier 70 are to demolish that pier because it is no longer functional. He pointed to the demolition areas on the presentation slides and stated the demolition will not be a part of this project.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board has heard questions about the decision to make the design so that individuals do not touch the water. Mr. Beaupre stated the decision was made due to safety and security issues. Access along the waterfront is unprotected from storm events, tides, and wave action coming from the southeast to the northwest. Crane Cove Park has been identified as the optimal place for water access due to its tidal protection from the ship repair facility.

Ms. Maytum asked if there is a plan for ways to better secure those areas after hours. Mr. Beaupre stated the Port does have plans for Crane Cove Park and there is a plan with the City and development partner for funding to be set aside to ensure security for the land portions of the park at all times.

Ms. Maytum asked if the security will be provided by people or fences. Mr. Beaupre stated it is by people. There will not be any fencing or closing any of these parks.

Ms. Maytum asked about the shore edge and how individuals can be stopped. Mr. Kennedy stated the shoreline will be reinforced with riprap for much of the edge. There also will be new railings added to the piers for protection. Mr. Beaupre stated the Port is unsure about the appropriateness of the cobble beach in this project to prevent people to access the water.

Ms. Maytum asked about the details of the design and when these items will be reviewed. Ms. Alschuler added the question about whether or not the joint DRB/DAC will review the project again. Ms. Gaffney identified the supplemental pages provided to the Board from the D4D document. Mr. Beaupre clarified that this review constitutes schematic design and suggested the discussion today could focus on the larger design concepts, while a future meeting could focus on the details for lighting and signage.

Mr. Leader asked if the site is a place to encourage intertidal habitat and artificial reefs. Mr. Kennedy stated the water movement and wave action makes it difficult to establish vegetation, and the water depth challenges. Ms. Alschuler asked about the tidal flux and Mr. Trivedi responded the tide fluctuates six to seven feet above and below mean sea level.

Ms. Alschuler stated another question the Board was asked is whether the streets, intersections, and varied uses were a challenge to the design. She asked about the character of the street and the introduction of the Blue Greenway. Mr. Kennedy stated 20th Street is a historic cobbled street with a continuous sidewalk on the south side and the San Francisco Bay Trail runs along the north side of the street. It is a consistent treatment from the edge of Illinois Street to the waterfront.

Mr. Beaupre added that there is a 16-foot multipurpose pathway on the north side of 20th Street between Georgia Street and the waterfront.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the asterisks with “potential vehicular public parking location” at all sites throughout the presentation slides. Mr. Kennedy stated the asterisks are on the building parcels that will potentially have public parking.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the parking garage in the earlier design. Mr. Kennedy stated that is an evolution in the plan. In the early design, there was district parking there.

Mr. Sylvan added that the design moved away from the larger district parking structure. There is much less parking overall in the site currently. Building 12 will have publicly accessible parking under it. It is likely there will be publicly accessible parking provided in other plots, in addition to the on-street parking.

Mr. Leader stated the slipways are an important feature for preserving history and for organization. He asked Mr. Kennedy to discuss more about how the slipways are expressed. Mr. Kennedy stated the craneway piers are maintained in place. The rectangles that frame them are made of high-contrast pavement and include inscribed historical crane tracks. The slipways are buried below grade; however, the Slipways Commons multifunctional lawn is reminiscent of those areas. Other inscriptions can be included to describe what these spaces were and the history of how the site functioned.

Ms. Maytum asked how a more literal description of the history of the site will be integrated into the design. Mr. Kennedy stated the last few presentation slides were about the Historic Interpretive Master Plan. The site has much potential for historic interpretation. He stated there are techniques embedded in the Historic Interpretation conceptual diagram slide. He pointed out the alternate hub locations, features and artifacts, linear pathways, and individual plaques, signage, or other materials shown on the slide. Ms. Maytum stated that she wants to see further details about the historic interpretation.

Mr. Leader asked how the Interpretive Master Plan will be curated. Mr. Kennedy stated there is an interpretive design consultant on the team that will develop and curate the exhibits and work with an historian to identify narratives.

Mr. Chan asked about how the slipways interact with the building architecture. Mr. Kennedy stated the D4D has a number of guidelines about how the buildings relate to the open space. How the slipways may be inscribed into the buildings is an interpretation of the guidelines, but they are aligned as major pathways from the ground floor to the piers and become a major access point to the frontage or retail entryway and coordinate with design of the buildings.

Mr. Chan asked if the craneway piers will be rebuilt. Mr. Kennedy stated some of the piers will be renovated and restored as part of the shoreline improvements and others will be maintained in place and a railing applied to the structure.

Mr. Chan asked if they show signs of their industrial use and if the intent is to preserve that as a historical aspect. Mr. Kennedy stated a concrete finish will be applied. It needs to be a seamless, nonskid, hearty material to fill in cracks and make them level for accessibility.

Ms. Barton asked if potable water will be available on the site. Mr. Kennedy stated the project site is being designed for both. It will be potable in the near term with backflow preventers built into the irrigation system. It is designed to be potable but, when the reclaimed water system is in place, the site will accommodate that.

Ms. Barton stated the quality of reclaimed water will completely change the plant palette. Mr. Kennedy stated the plant palette will be able to adapt to the change in the water supply.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the lower, narrow walkway and sea level rise. She asked Mr. Kennedy to point out areas on the presentation slides that will be lost due to sea level rise. Mr. Kennedy pointed out the shoreline path on the site and stated the path is the same elevation as the craneway piers. The lower path is a minimum of six-feet clear with eight feet with railings. The blue areas on the slides (Exhibit Page 10) show what will be lost after the 2050 sea level rise projection during the 100-year storm events. Dilip Trivedi, Coastal Engineer, Moffatt and Nichol, provided further detail about the sea level rise projections (see Exhibit page 9). Mr. Trivedi stated the lower pathway will be inundated at the 100-year storm event with 24 inches of sea level rise. Mr. Sylvan stated that they decided to keep the lower path to allow people to get closer to the water today instead of designing the entire shoreline to a future sea level scenario that further distances people from the water.

Mr. Pellegrini asked how far back the 15.3 elevation goes onto the site to the west, and if it begins to conflict with existing base elevations of the historic buildings. Mr. Kennedy stated it is always held parallel to the shoreline pathway. The rightmost edge of the orange figure on the presentation slide (Exhibit Page 10) is held at elevation 15.5 and steps down from there in the form of green slopes, steps, and seating terraces. It is a reinforced band that makes a transition between 15.5 and 11.5. Everything west of the site is at that uniform level of 15.5. Building 12 will be elevated to the new grade. Building 21 is being moved and raised. Building 2 is a large concrete building that will not be elevated, but the finished floor is higher in elevation due to the existing loading dock.

d. **Public Hearing.** Bo Barnes, Board Member, Bay Access, stated Bay Access wrote the legislation for the San Francisco Bay Water Trail. He stated the currents along the lower area are substantial. It is not a place for swimming or kayaking; however, Crane Cove Park is perfect for water activities.

e. **Board Discussion.** Ms. Gaffney stated the MR-P70 DAC question to discuss is if the design proposal is consistent with the design for development document.

The Board and MR-P70 DAC members responded to questions from the staff report:

Physical and Visual Access:

(1) The project proposes a series of public rooms along the water. Does this concept provide an engaging mix of uses and flexibility along the waterfront? Is the proposed public access—in terms of area and the amenities provided—sufficient to accommodate the expected level of use from new residents, employees, and visitors to this segment of the shoreline?

(2) Does the design of the public space take advantage of the Bay setting, and does it provide for adequate opportunities to get close to and experience the water?

(3) Do proposed project elements—including the viewing pavilions and rows of trees at the project’s southern end—provide for adequate visual transparency such that they enhance and dramatize, rather than detract from, views to the Bay?

(4) Is the experience of the Bay Trail in each section of the waterfront adequately designed and connected to the other sections and nearby public rights of way? Does the waterfront promenade along the southern end feel inviting to the public?

Ms. Alschuler stated the changes made were positive with more options for public access.

Mr. Leader agreed that the project is clear and beautifully illustrated. The design has the right amount of interpretation and recall and is comfortable. He stated he is interested in the slipways and how they are expressed. He suggested that they be more emphatic in terms of woods of defining the edge or the inlay or a combination of both – something powerful and consistent.

Mr. Leader stated he appreciated how the public walkway down to the water is for people but, when the slipways come to the stairs and go down, at some point they will be inundated. He suggested that a piece of the slipway come out and around and a smaller stair pushed through, so it would have a strong expression of the slipway in the future.

Mr. Leader stated he loved the three pavillions. There is nothing about them that significantly blocks views but improves and focuses the views. He suggested that they be a little different in their shape. The one on 22nd Street in particular feels a little domestic in scale – almost on the level of a parking garage. He suggested that they have more specific personalities. He encouraged experimenting more. He suggested for the horizontal crane with the swings that 40 percent of the swings be on the left looking out to the view and 60 percent be left open.

Ms. Moore member stated working with the historic features of the site, making them the primary focus, and designing new features to complement the old is exemplary. The design is masterfully done, is appropriate in scale, and makes coming to the waterfront a transformation from the past as an industrial area where the public could not go to where the public is now invited to be at the water’s edge. The slightly denser configuration on the inside of the site and then pulling individuals to the waterfront through the open space is also masterfully done. The balance and the proximity between Crane Cove Park and this project fulfills the mission of what open space on the waterfront should do.

Ms. Alschuler stated there was a question about 22nd Street and seeing the pavilion at the end and whether the trees were in the way or if there were too many trees.

Mr. Wasney stated it is a larger question of how soft landscape elements are introduced into the industrial landscaping and the historic cultural landscape and how to introduce greenery where there was none. In the D4D, it uses grasses that inhabited the site.

The treatment of landscaping feels right. Individuals will now be living, working, and recreating in this space, not building ships. The amount of planting is respectful of the historic nature of the site, does not disproportionately block views, and is well done.

Ms. Maytum stated she appreciated the view corridors along the street. She agreed with everyone's comments that this will be a spectacular space that feels right and is respectful of the historical aspects of it. She stated she also appreciates the sequences of spaces along the waterfront and that it is not just one blank lawn. The variety of the Bay edge is interesting in this area with many nooks and crannies and the project design is a great interpretation of that with the series of outdoor spaces and rooms with different characteristics, rhythm, and cadence going down the waterfront.

Ms. Gaffney stated E3 and H2 could both be residential buildings. She stated there was concern that the amount of public space is tightened up coming around the corner of building E3 and whether that is still inviting to the public.

Mr. Leader did not think the southern waterfront appeared tight. Ms. Alschuler noted the craneways extend the waterfront in this section.

Ms. Maytum stated the 22nd Street pavilion area would be the public punctuation for that zone depending on how it is detailed. Mr. Kennedy stated all the ground floor uses there are retail in function and are meant to be interactive uses. There are no residential entries there.

Mr. Chan stated the future Bay Trail connection at 22nd Street going into former Potrero Power Plant will change the dynamic of that, as well.

Ms. Maytum he expressed concern about how the project will move forward and whether or not the Board/DAC will see the project again. She expressed concern for these wonderful public amenities might be at risk for value engineering and she wants to make sure they remain part of the public benefits. She stated that she wants to support the project and better understand the intersection of the new and the old, the history and design details.

Sense of Place and Historical Interpretation:

(5) Does the design take advantage of the unique historical features in its design of the Bay and its shoreline? Are there additional opportunities to enhance the public's understanding of the site and its relationship to the Bay?

Ms. Maytum stated the execution and final selection of the materials is important. There is an incredible opportunity for the integration of historic interpretation. There will also be a public art program that has yet to be detailed. The potential of the intersection of all these things is tremendous.

Mr. Chan asked about the treatment of the craneway piers – whether they will be rebuilt and if they have scars. One way to express the history of a site is in interpretation when the artifacts are gone. Due to the nature of this project, much of the historical artifacts are gone or buried. It is great that the three buildings will be kept. Given that the craneway piers

are the last visible vestige of this industrial heritage, he suggested leaving them there to show the rough life they had. It could be celebrated in a way that might be more visceral than a picture of one next to one with new pavement.

Mr.Chan further stated the site furnishings on those piers feel a little precious – the Amphitheatre seats, the chase lounges. There is a place for those along the waterfront in general. He suggested making these vestigial piers tougher and not so programmed. He stated, if there are historic pieces that can be saved, he would love to do that. He suggested the fishing bars would contribute to the roughness.

Accessibility and User Comfort:

(6) Are the proposed project elements, including the ramps and sloped walkways connecting the Bay Trail to lower-lying shoreline path and craneway piers, sufficient to provide for equivalent access among users of different physical abilities?

(7) Is the proposed public access of an adequate scale to provide for users' sense of comfort given the mass of the nearby buildings?

(8) Does the design provide for user comfort given the microclimate conditions at the site, in terms of sunlight and shadow, wind, etc.?

Ms. Alschuler stated the public access is broad and appropriate. She asked about the wind. Mr. Kennedy stated the buildings to the west of the site create a wind shadow but there will still be wind. That is one of the reasons trees are proposed in the Slipways Commons. Also, there is a network of passageways that will create pockets of calm, quiet areas, and other plantings and high-backed benches and other furnishings will help mitigate wind.

Circulation:

(9) Does the proposed project provide clear connections to the Bay from west to east and take advantage of local street networks to inform the shoreline site design?

(10) Does the design minimize the potential for conflicts among pedestrians and cyclists within the shoreline open space area, particularly at locations where pedestrian movement across the Bay Trail will be significant?

Ms.Moore stated running the Bay Trail on the north side of the street is a good idea and seems to address the concerns individuals had previously.

Sea Level Rise:

(11) Will the amount and types of physical public access facilities be sufficient to support the anticipated level of demand at such future time as the rising sea levels require the lower-lying access areas to be closed or removed?

(12) Are there alternative or preferable future adaptation responses to sea level rise that should be considered for this site?

Ms. Barton reiterated the comment about not making a decision for a condition that does not exist today. In other words, allow the outer edge to be lower and flood intermittently and eventually be inundated. That is a bold move rather than having it ready for 2150 now.

Ms. Gaffney stated that would imply that there is a different treatment for those areas in terms of the materiality and durability. Creating a hardscape that can be resilient to flooding for a longer period of time is part of the question that staff is looking for advice on – on ways to think about that as a strategy. Ms. Barton commented that the materials need to be able to withstand these conditions.

Ms. Maytum stated everything laid out in these documents is terrific and in the spirit of the D4D. She suggested seeing the detailed development – the execution of the design (further design development), the final material selection, and understanding the interpretation and the intersection of all those things would be helpful starting with Phase 1, which will set the stage for future phases.

Mr. Beaupre stated the Port needs to come back to the MR-P70 DAC for each of the phases within the total project, so the project will come back to the DAC, but it's unclear whether or not the DRB will be part of these future reviews.

Mr. Alschuler referenced the original parti diagram of the historic overlay on the new design of the site and how the interpretive and public art plans can reinforce this parti. Mr. Pellegrini stated this is a wonderful proposal but he felt a disconnect between the idea of the open spaces and the parti diagram, which is elegant, and how they originate in the historical use of the site and the historical interpretation opportunities map that is still general in nature. He stated he would like to see more about the interpretive elements and the design details to make a logical/narrative connection between the design parti and the physical design.

Mr. Leader referenced the historic interpretation that was part of the Alcatraz project presentation.

Ms. Moore asked to revisit the site and the historic core because the first seeds of the presentation begin there, and in response to Mr. Pellegrini's comment, stated this may be the way to find the common ground together with Mr. Kennedy presenting and Mr. Beaupre allowing everyone to revisit the site to help better understand Phase 1.

Mr. Beaupre stated he would be happy to organize a tour of the site.

Ms. Maytum asked when to anticipate a greater level of Phase 1 materiality and detail. Mr. Kennedy stated the project is in the schematic stage. A more detailed stage will begin in spring or summer, with design for development phase. Ms. Maytum suggested the site visit coincide with further development of Phase 1.

f. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** Ms. Alschuler briefly summarized the topics discussed.

g. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Beaupre stated it sounds like both Committees would like to understand more about how the interpretation and design come together. He suggested scheduling a site visit and following up with another meeting to discuss how the interpretation and the design come together.

Approval of Draft Minutes for January 22, 2018, and January 29, 2018, Waterfront Design Advisory Committee Meetings. Dan Hodapp, Chair of the WDAC, stated the WDAC had two sets of minutes to adopt. He asked if there were any comments or changes to the minutes for the January 22, 2018, WDAC meeting. No comments or changes were made. Mr. Hodapp stated the minutes of January 22, 2018, were adopted as proposed.

Mr. Hodapp asked if there were any comments or changes to the minutes for the January 29, 2018, WDAC meeting.

Ms. Moore stated the Committee recommendation in the minutes is that the dwelling units facing Front Street require a grade separation from the street of only 12 inches. She stated the need for more clarification on that. If the units facing Front Street are accessible units, there cannot be a grade separation. However, the desire generally is at least a 36-inch elevation above grade for front-facing units, which take access directly from the street, in order to create the desired privacy for units adjacent to a public sidewalk. She stated there may not be a need to access the units from the outside if the building is not elevated. She suggested asking the architect for his interpretation of the design for this area.

Ms. Moore stated there is only a brief mention of materiality in the minutes. The public and the WDAC were favorable to changing the materials to brick. She suggested including that the WDAC would like to ensure a convincing use of the materials including the color variations, but the WDAC would also like to see appropriate detailing such as depths of grout, et cetera, in order for the use of that veneer to create expressive and varied façades.

Mr. Hodapp read a letter from WDAC member David Winslow, who was unable to be in attendance, saying something similar regarding the materials on the brick. Mr. Winslow asked that the recommendation that the brick coursing along with the detailing and sizing of window opens in particular sills, jams, and heads or the brick façades be detailed to ensure a convincing traditional use of the material.

Mr. Hodapp stated the recommendations will be included in the revised minutes. The minutes of January 29, 2018, were adopted as revised.

5. Pier 22.5 Fireboat Station; City and County of San Francisco (First Pre-Application Review). The Board and the WDAC jointly reviewed a proposal by the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), and Port of San Francisco (Port) to construct a new fireboat station at Piers 22.5 and 24, adjacent to the historic Fire Station 35 on the northeast San Francisco waterfront. The proposed project would include a two-story fireboat station on a steel float, an access ramp and gangway, and a public observation deck. Existing finger piers at the site would be demolished.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Rebecca Coates-Maldoon, Coastal Program Analyst, provided an overview of the project, accompanied by a slide presentation, and summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the project:

(1) Avoids and minimizes potential view impacts from the shoreline with respect to its orientation to the shoreline, building massing, proposed building materials, guide piles, and other design considerations, and preserves and enhances the view corridors to the Bay along the pedestrian promenade and Harrison Street, and otherwise maximizes views to the Bay

(2) Explores alternative designs to balance the operational and functional needs of the project with the Commission's mandate to protect and enhance the visual resources provided by the Bay

(3) Includes float and fireboat station designs that are sufficiently transparent and appropriate in terms of height, bulk, and location to minimize potential adverse impacts to Bay views, given the operational needs

(4) Includes a pier-supported public access deck that provides the best opportunity to enhance shoreline public access and enhance Bay views in the vicinity of the project site

(5) Avoids or reduces conflicts between the continued active use of the fire station on the marginal wharf and public access use of Herb Caen way

(6) Takes advantage of views to the Rincon Point Open Water Basin to the north of the site

(7) Incorporates unique and special amenities in the public observation area that will draw the public to the site, and incorporates forms of historical, cultural, and natural resource interpretive expression

(8) Includes fences around the historic firehouse that will minimize potential adverse impacts to Bay views, and creates a sense of public connection at the proposed public access space, while maintaining public safety

(9) Appropriately designs public access to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise

b. **Project Presentation.** Magdalena Ryor, Project Manager, SFPW, introduced the project team. She provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the project context, background, SFFD operational needs, project description, and milestone schedule.

Vito Vinoni, Senior Architect, SFPW, continued the slide presentation and discussed the project history, massing and orientation, and design criteria and development prior to the issuance of the RFP.

Alan Kawasaki, Project Architect, Shah Kawasaki Architects (SKA), continued the slide presentation and discussed the relative scale, existing site, site plan, floor plans, and perspectives.

Leah Olson, Marine Structural Engineer, Liftech Consultants, the Project Engineers, continued the slide presentation and discussed sea level rise and the Bay fill analysis.

c. **Board Questions.** Following the presentation, the Board and WDAC asked a series of questions:

Ms. McCann asked for additional details on the existing SFFD 35 building. Ms. Ryor stated the existing historic Fire Station 35 is not part of this project.

Ms. Maytum asked about the height requirements for the first level of the new building. A project proponent stated the minimum clearance on the inside lower floor is 14 feet. Watercraft are brought in on trailers by the use of an overhead hoist.

Ms. Maytum asked for clarification about sea level rise heights on the presentation slides. Ms. Olson stated the 9.8 is the 100-year flood level.

Ms. Maytum further asked about the existing building at sea level rise. Ms. Olson stated it will be under water. The access ramp and gangway at the new facility will be designed so they can be easily disconnected and reattached with sea level rise.

Ms. Maytum asked if the decision not to include the preservation or adaptation of the historic structure is definitive. A project proponent stated that is the current project. Sea level rise could not be addressed for the existing building. It is suitable for housing the existing fire engine.

Ms. Maytum asked if the historic building has been seismically reviewed or upgraded. A project proponent stated there was some strengthening done in 2010 for existing operations to continue safely, but it has not been retrofitted.

Ms. Crescimano asked for further detail about the height clearances. A project proponent stated there is a 14-foot by 14-foot clearance, the floor elevation at the second floor is at 17 feet, there is another 13 feet to the roof structure, and from the roof structure to the top of the parapet is 4 feet for a total height of 34 feet. The tallest piece of mechanical equipment is at 36 feet.

Mr. Pellegrini asked how the fence will look different from the drawings. Mr. Kawasaki stated it is currently being designed. He showed the existing location and where it will be moved to on the presentation slides to afford greater public accessibility.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about areas that are accessible to the public. He stated his understanding that the space in front of the existing firehouse along the ribbon and the new plaza are open to the public. He asked if there are any portions of the existing firehouse or the new building where members of the public can reach. Mr. Kawasaki stated members of the public are only allowed past the gates when escorted by fire personnel. There is a conference room and a watch room on the lower floor where members of the public can meet someone. The second floor can be reached by an elevator but not many members of the public are expected to go up to the living quarters. Occasionally, there may be a tour, but it is not generally open to the public.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the position of the floating dock relative to the existing firehouse. Mr. Kawasaki stated the sloping ramp for the dock needed to be accessible and adaptable to sea level rise.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the 92-foot plane is the minimum length to arrive at the required slope. Ms. Olson stated the minimum length for a gangway is 80 feet for accessibility. The access ramp is slightly longer than that to address accessibility standards.

Mr. Pellegrini asked to what extent the boats alongside the floating dock are optimized by their positioning in the water because the boats are moored much closer to the southern edge than before. Mr. Vinoni stated the three fire boats and watercraft go along the two long sides. There is no anticipation that they would be along the other side. He pointed to the locations on the presentation slide.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the boats back into their position on the southern side. Anthony Rivera, Assistant Deputy Chief, SFFD, stated the boats back out. The presentation slide is an artist's rendering. Usually the boat that will be responding will be on the southern part of the float. Traditionally, all fire apparatus points out to get to their destination much quicker, but, in reality, most of the boats are pointed in because there is a lot of silt that comes up when the propellers start up.

Ms. Alschuler asked how the public observation point location was chosen. Mr. Kawasaki stated it is placed as close as possible to view operations.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the fencing materials. Mr. Kawasaki stated the current chain link fencing will be replaced on both sides.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the project proponents considered a one-story float. Mr. Kawasaki stated the area for the turning of the ambulance and the adjacency of support from maritime takes up a lot of area. What was left over was the green and the mechanical spaces. Everything could not fit on the lower floor or the float would be too large.

Ms. Maytum asked about the uses inside the historic building on the second floor besides the apparatus. Mr. Vinoni stated the ground floor will be the turnout room for firefighting gear and the second floor will be for storage and fitness.

Ms. Maytum asked about the square footage of the historic building. Mr. Vinoni stated it is approximately 4,000 feet total.

d. **Public Hearing.** Ms. Gaffney read comments submitted by Howard Wang, Architect, Central Waterfront Advisory Group, which were included in the meeting packet (Attached to the minutes).

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board and WDAC members responded to questions from the staff report:

Visual Impacts:

(1) Has the fireboat structure been sited and designed to avoid and minimize potential view impacts from the shoreline with respect to its orientation to the shoreline, building massing, proposed building materials, guide piles, and other design considerations? Conversely, does the proposed design preserve and enhance the view corridors to the Bay along the pedestrian promenade and Harrison Street, and otherwise maximize views to the Bay?

(2) Are there alternative designs that should be explored to balance the operational and functional needs of the project with the Commission's mandate to protect and enhance the visual resources provided by the Bay?

(3) Are the proposed improvements, including the float and new fireboat station, sufficiently transparent and appropriate in terms of height, bulk, and location to minimize potential adverse impacts to Bay views, given the operational needs?

Ms. Maytum stated this is a tough problem because of the requirements of the fire station design. The project site is an iconic part of the working waterfront. It reflects the value and importance of the work of the fire station and adds to the experience of the waterfront. It is an exciting design opportunity. The historic building cannot be separated from the new building. There is an opportunity to investigate how the spaces in that (historic) building might take some of the pressure off the new building. The two buildings should be looked at in concert.

Ms. Maytum stated the materiality of the new building and differentiating the contemporary from the historic is a correct approach, but it would be beneficial to explore what could be done for the fenestration, proportioning, and materiality. The board-form base seems incongruous. Bringing over the terracotta coloration treatment of the screen wall was unclear at the two ends. The south side of the waterfront (north elevation) is the most closed (least amount of fenestration/openings) and the most visible as a foreground to the bridge beyond. She suggested looking at what is happening behind that wall and looking for opportunities to provide more transparency and openness about what is happening inside the building so it does not look like a bunker. Rather than hiding it in strips and tiny slits, she suggested looking at functions that are on the other side and opening up and making that side more transparent and descriptive of the important work that is going on inside. The north elevation is the most solid and could be made more of a composition of the activities that are happening and also a proportional composition that is a contemporary reinterpretation of the rhythm that happens on the pier buildings and extruded industrial shed, taking the proportion of the existing industrial buildings rather than the opposite.

Ms. Moore agreed that the connection with the historic building may require more investigation. While it is not part of the project, there needs to be an understanding of the ultimate mechanics of the two buildings working together. They need to communicate with each other, not just by saying to use terracotta. There is something on a deeper level that

needs to be addressed or understood. The point then would be materiality. The building is small, yet, in its unique technology, there is not another floating building anywhere in the United States which does this kind of thing. It can show its technology, but it may have to lean towards a more subtle, industrial waterfront vernacular that this design does not have. It does not yet have the materials needed. Materiality goes into the expression of massing. Like the Exploratorium, these buildings across the street look down on it. At this moment, a simple extruded shape may allow something slightly different. It is about material, connection to historic, and somehow making the floating structure visible because watching fire operations operating over water in a floating structure is part of the fun. There are three or four elements that are of public interest that should be resolved in a playful way. There has never been anything like this. This building adds an element by which this could become a major waterfront attractor.

Ms. Maytum added it also provides a great education moment for the public about sea level rise.

Ms. McCann referred to Exhibit 13, the Site Plan. She commended the project proponents on the work done to date. It is a great start. She agreed that the steel float is innovative. Everyone speaks about floating buildings in the Resilient by Design Challenge, but here is one that will happen. It is an exciting and important move. She stated the total composition – the historic landmark building, the new steel float and building – will be beautiful, but she suggested looking closely at where the fencing is and how much might be opened up. Something can be created along the Embarcadero in relation to the historic firehouse, which could ultimately be much more successful based on how the fencing is organized. She asked the project proponents to look at how the fencing will be composed and how much of that could be opened up, even though the historic structure is not part of the project. Once down that ramp, everything is secured, so the question is how much of the securing of the facilities along the edge of the Embarcadero might be moved onto the floating steel platform to provide as much public access as possible around the historic landmark, which is an important, beautiful building.

Mr. Hodapp commented on sections of the Design and Access Element of the Port's Waterfront Land Use Plan that apply to the proposed project as follows:

(a) The Historic Preservation section states the existing building is not part of the project but noted that it is being drawn in a little.

(b) The Pier Shape section states any extensions beyond existing pier shapes should visually complement the linear, rectangular form of the historic finger piers. He stated the building is following that direction in the Design and Access Element.

(c) The Linear Form section states to architecturally emphasize the length and linearity of the piers. He stated earlier versions placed the structures perpendicularly or set sideways to it. The decision to place it behind where it is and bring out that shape is consistent with the Design and Access Element.

(d) The Industrial Maritime Character section states the architectural character of pier development should respect, but not mimic, the historic industrial/maritime character. He stated it is looking at the materiality that is used and seeing how that expresses an industrial character. Board-formed concrete is a functional material for the base of the building, but the metal siding does not do well. He asked if the metal siding expresses an industrial character to get along with the shed behind it, which is Pier 26, and the other sheds in the area.

Ms. Crescimano agreed with the previous comments, particularly related to the fence line and replicating on the north what is being done on the south to make it more public and thinking about it from the site line. She stated she understands the functional use of the concrete but the concrete is treated the same way as the metal panels, which is part of why it is reading in a contradictory way. It needs to embrace the industrial technology seen in the float. She suggested that the building have a lightness to relate to that float. That would be some things to think about in choosing both the material and how it is detailed.

Mr. Leader stated the first floor is for public and working functions and the second floor is the living area. He suggested that the first floor be all glass to improve the public friendliness of it.

Ms. Alschuler agreed. It is a fantastic location along the Bay for the public to enjoy. She stated she loves the idea of making the historic building more accessible at the same time. She stated there may be something to do to help the visibility for individuals trying to see the Bay. Individuals love to see the fire boats, but maybe there is something that can be done on the other side, as well. There is a deck and narrow walkway along the north side of the building. She suggested something that mitigates the loss of the view.

Ms. McCann asked if the aluminum overhead doors are transparent. Mr. Kawasaki stated they are glass.

Physical Public Access:

(4) Does the proposed pier-supported public access deck provide the best opportunity to enhance shoreline public access and enhance Bay views in the vicinity of the project site, or are there additions and/or alternative improvements and locations that should be considered?

(5) Are there opportunities to avoid or reduce conflicts between the continued active use of the fire station on the marginal wharf and public access use of Herb Caen way?

(6) Does the proposed public access take advantage of views to the Rincon Point Open Water Basin to the north of the site?

(7) Does the proposed public observation area incorporate unique and special amenities that will draw the public to the site? Are there additional opportunities to increase this draw through incorporating more forms of historical, cultural, and natural resource interpretive expression?

(8) Do the proposed fences around the historic firehouse minimize potential adverse impacts to Bay views, and create a sense of public connection at the proposed public access space, while maintaining public safety?

Ms. Alschuler stated featuring the boats is fantastic and will bring the public to the water's edge. She suggested increasing the view on the far side (north side).

Ms. Barton asked if this is considered a place of refuge in an evacuation situation. Mr. Vinoni stated it is not a place for the community to go for refuge.

Sea Level Rise:

(9) How could the public access for this project be appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise?

Ms. Gaffney stated this site was mentioned as one of the low points in the Army Corps Sea Wall discussions. She asked how this essential facility connects back in the event that the Sea Wall fails during a seismic event or is flooded. Ms. Olson stated the new structure will be isolated from the Sea Wall. She pointed out features and locations on the presentation slides. New piles will also be put in for the pier. The piles will be designed to take seismic loading. A plate can be laid from the Embarcadero over to the pier to use for ambulances or fire fighters.

Mr. Kawasaki added it is an essential service facility. In accordance with the Essential Service Act, the building has to be able to operate. The catastrophic thing would be the Embarcadero sloughing off, leaving no Sea Wall but an island. There would be a fire station, water, debris, and no access to it except by water. He stated there is an emergency generator with 72 hours' worth of fuel to maintain communications and electricity. HVAC and plumbing would be unavailable, but it can still operate as a place from which the fire fighters and pilots can go out and respond. He stated the need for the Fire Department to have an emergency plan that says what to do to service this floating island in an emergency.

f. **Applicant Response.** The project proponents responded positively to the Board's and WDAC's suggestions and stated the design team will take the comments into consideration and will come up with an improved design.

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board and the WDAC made the following summary and conclusions:

- (1) Further explore the treatment of the façades and the materials.
- (2) Take the pressure off the new building by using portions of the existing building.
- (3) Materiality that differentiates the new building from the historic building.
- (4) There were questions about the types of materials, such as the use of the metal panels, the colors, and the board-form concrete.

(5) Open the façade, particularly on the north side to allow public to see in and through building.

(6) A clearer sense of what is happening inside the building.

(7) Questions on the floating nature of the building, its technology, and services it is providing to tell its own story more dramatically.

(8) Make it educational inside the facility like the Exploratorium.

(9) Make the historic building more graciously treated and publicly visible and accessible -- Move fences back as much as possible.

(10) Think about designing it to take on the idea of the lightness of the float, barely touching.

(11) Make the upper roof form softer, at least an oval expression, such as the Exploratorium roof.

(12) The need for individuals on the other side of the Embarcadero to look down on it.

The Board and WDAC members asked to see this project again.

6. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:00 p.m.