

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 510, San Francisco, California 94105 tel 415 352 3600
State of California | Gavin Newsom – Governor | info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov

May 31, 2024

TO: Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415-352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Ashley Tomerlin, Senior Bay Dev. Analyst (415-352-3657; ashley.tomerlin@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Draft Summary of the March 11, 2024 Joint BCDC Design Review Board (DRB) and Port of San Francisco Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC) Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Meeting Procedure Review.** Design Review Board (DRB) Chair Jacinta McCann called the hybrid meeting to order on Zoom, at approximately 5:00 p.m.

a. **BCDC DRB Board Members.** Chair Jacinta McCann, Vice Chair Gary Strang, Bob Battalio, Patricia Fonseca Flores, Kristen Hall, and Stefan Pellegrini were present in person.

b. **Port WDAC Members.** Kathrin Moore; Laura Crescimano; Alma DuSolier; Jimmy Chan; Chris Wasney

c. **BCDC Staff.** Ashley Tomerlin, Yuriko Jewett, and Katharine Pan were present in person.

d. **Port Staff.** Dan Hodapp, Ryan Wassum, Luiz Barata, and David Beaupre were present in person.

e. **Project Proponents.**

Ferry Building and Plaza: Carl Cade, Jane Connors, and Chris Pearson, Hudson Pacific Partners; Lada Kocherovsky, Page & Turnbull; and Sarah Kuehl, EinwillerKuehl.

Briefing on the San Francisco Waterfront Coastal Flood Study Draft Plan: Luiz Barata, Port of San Francisco.

2. **Approval of DRB Meeting Summary for January 8, 2024.**

a. Gary Strang identified edits and updates for the January Meeting Summary.

3. **Staff Update.** Ashley Tomerlin provided updates on 1) the annual Form 700 Statement of Economic Interests has been emailed to Board members and is due Tuesday, April 2; and 2) the April DRB meeting is cancelled.

4. **Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda.** There was no public comment.



DRAFT DRB MEETING SUMMARY
March 11, 2024

5. **Ferry Building and Ferry Plaza Alterations (Second Review).** The Design Review Board and Port Waterfront Advisory Committee will hold their second pre-application review of the proposal by Hudson Pacific Properties to make exterior alterations to the San Francisco Ferry Building and Ferry Plaza at various locations along the ground floor and the building site.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Katharine Pan, BCDC and Dan Hodapp, Port provided staff introductions to the project site and context.

b. **Board Clarifying Questions following staff presentation.**

- (1) Kristen Hall asked whether the 1990 Embarcadero Permit contemplated permanent structures for the market/café zone. Staff responded that fixed structures are not explicitly mentioned in the permit.

c. **Project Presentation.** Carl Cade and Jane Connors, Hudson Pacific Partners (HPP); Lada Kocherovsky, Page & Turnbull; and Sarah Kuehl, EinwillerKuehl provided an overview of the project with a slide presentation. The presentation focused on existing site conditions, project objectives, and a description of the proposed project design.

d. **Board Clarifying Questions following project presentation.**

- (1) Stefan Pellegrini asked about the character relationship between the proposed Ferry Plaza lights and the street light fixtures located in Justin Herman Plaza. What is the height difference. The project team stated they looked at extending those light fixtures but went with something shorter that is more in proportion to the building and architecture.
- (2) Kristen Hall asked whether the seating on the wedge is associated with an indoor use. The project team stated the west side closest to the Embarcadero is public seating and the eastern side near the Ferry Plaza is to be a café use.
- (3) Kristen Hall requested more background for why the south arcade and former Market Bar outdoor space are not included and for clarification on whether the Boards are supposed to be reviewing it as part of this project. The project team stated there are existing lease obligations with Foodwise to use the space for storage and a teaching kitchen and yes, it should be reviewed as part of the ultimate project.
- (4) Patricia Fonseca Flores requested an explanation for the proposed limits of the new paving at the wedge. The project team stated the new paving is just a graphic in the driveway and stops at the Embarcadero Art Ribbon.
- (5) Gary Strang asked who the Ferry Plaza sign is intended to inform. The project team stated it is primarily for people arriving from the Embarcadero and going to the ferry gates. It was a highly desired element by the ferry operators and could play an important role in drawing people back into the plaza and identifying it as a public location.
- (6) Gary Strang requested the team identify the changes in the in the north arcade proposal from the last review. The project team stated the changes are more in operations, the physical design is roughly the same. It's envisioned as being open

and usable but they think by being able to enclose it in the evenings, it will be more attractive to site users. Operations will be more clear.

- (7) Gary Strang requested further description on the railing specifications with the understanding to make room for the tents the barriers need to be flexible but in terms of serving alcohol, is the proposed railing height sufficient. The project team stated the railing element did change based on comments from Foodwise that it be movable yet formidable enough to do its job. The railing does not need to be higher for alcohol licensing needs; the space needs to be defined but there's no vertical requirement and they don't envision the railing being higher than what is shown.
- (8) Jacinta McCann clarified that the Ferry Building is open from 6a to 10p and asked whether the movable seating will be packed up at night. The project team stated yes. Jacinta McCann then asked whether the new exterior seating will have the same management? The project team stated yes.
- (9) Bob Battalio asked how the arcades were used in the original operations of the building and if it's consistent with the proposed use. The project team stated the building operations have evolved; the arcades were partially used as storage space with limited circulation. With latest renovation, they have been maintained for circulation. The north arcade hasn't been used for programming. Historically, there were ticket booths, and loading and unloading of freight. The first floor was freight processing. Since 2015, there have been the kiosks but those have limited kitchen spaces.
- (10) Bob Battalio asked whether ferry passengers use the ferry building for queuing in inclement weather. The project team stated the opportunity for interior queuing isn't changing with this project. They find that most people are timing their trips to go directly to their ferry so they will be maintaining clear interior circulation.
- (11) Kathrin Moore asked why signage standards for the future restaurants is not being discussed because signage is important to the perception of the public nature of the building. The project team stated they do not have a specific proposal or tenant at this time. They are open to framework directions from the boards and stated they feel the activation of the arcades will also serve to invite users. Port staff stated there are design guidelines for interior spaces at the Ferry Building and should this proposal move forward, the Port would ask the project team to expand those design guidelines for exterior applications to ensure consistent quality.
- (12) Kathrin Moore asked what possible tenants are envisioned for the new restaurants spaces that will complement what is already at the Ferry Building. The project team stated that as stewards of the building, there is careful curation and they will seek a tenant that adds value to the mix of tenants. They are always thinking about opportunities to bring in locals. Kathrin Moore responded that the devil is in the details and that creating private entrances may be perceived as privatizing the arcade. Arcades provide a weather protected gathering space and are an element of stitching the waterfront together, especially in inclement

weather. The project team stated they work closely with merchants, and many tenants have come up through Foodwise that are ready for brick-and-mortar opportunities. They have found on rainy days, people want to be in the nave and experience the warmth of the interior. If they were going to the arcades, there'd be more activity at the kiosks.

- (13) Kathrin Moore asked whether increases in the delivery and operations are accounted for when considering tenants. The project team stated they work closely with vendors, Port, and BCDC on a delivery schedule.
- (14) Kathrin Moore observed there are not back of house spaces in the diagrams and asked if interior spaces be used to accommodate that use. The project team stated the restaurant spaces are open concept kitchen, similar to Gotts today, and focusing on shorter menus.
- (15) Kathrin Moore asked for more description on how the canopy relates to the new glass walls when they're closed and questioned the usability and public benefit of the 6-foot circulation space. The project team stated that the interior circulation happens at the outer edge and tracks along the entire length of the arcade. There is enough space inside, 6 feet or so, that is provided for circulation. On the exterior, there is a 6-foot pathway between the canopy and the face of the building.
- (16) Alma DuSolier asked if the restaurants will continue to use the space when the market is happening and the barrier is pushed back; she observed that the space is shown as empty in the diagram and questioned if the space remains unusable by the public. The project team stated the restaurants furnishings would be stored elsewhere during market hours so that entire area would be used by the market. The layout has been coordinated with Foodwise and there are opportunities for double depth tents where needed. The design intent with inseting the glass barrier to the front of the building is so that it will read as open and airy similar to today. Inside the space, the table layout will happen when there is a tenant. Assume the tenant will want some more space on the interior. Would assume the restaurants will likely want more space for operations. And would be subject to fire code that will inform circulation spacing.
- (17) Jimmy Chan asked if the louvers be operational. The project team stated they are intended to provide shade, not weather protection. There will always be transparency.
- (18) Laura Crescimano asked if the café zones extend to the perimeter of the building or if the 6-foot circulation path is required. She further asked whether the public seating shown in the illustrations is required. Port Staff stated the 6-foot path is not required; that the allowable café zone extends 30 feet from the building and includes the area of the canopy structure and area with the benches. BCDC staff added that the only restriction on the café zones is to preserve 10-foot-wide passthroughs connecting to the building entrances. The seating shown is proposed as the public benefit related to the proposed enclosure of the outdoor dining and its requirement would be discussed during permitting.

(19) Chris Wasney asked if the restaurant spaces in the arcade will be heated/cooled. The project team stated that there will be some conditioning but most of the building is not conditioned. The interior shops are not conditioned, the enclosed spaces at the cornerstones can elect to include HVAC. The tenants will have to meet title 24 Energy Standards which would inform use of HVAC. Chris Wasney observed the details will be key, if those spaces are conditioned, there will be a large burden on the glass system. The duct system required for all the heating, cooling, and ventilation will impact the openness of the space.

(20) Chris Wasney asked where the storage will go with the future vision of the south arcade. The project team stated they are working with Foodwise, and that the south arcade project doesn't move forward without Foodwise.

(21) Chris Wasney - When were the north and south enclosed dining areas? ANS:

(22) Chris Wasney asked if the canopies are successful, is there thought that they'd be extended to the existing north and south outdoor dining areas at Gotts and the former Market Bar. The project team stated that is not currently anticipated.

e. **Public Comment.** There were seven public commentors on the project and seven public comment letters submitted to the Board that can be found at the end of this summary.

- (1) Joe Sanders, DC 16 Painters and Allied Trades and SF Resident. Take pride in restoring historic buildings such as this. Support this project and putting local trades persons to work.
- (2) Rudy Gonzalez, SF Building Trades Council. Rare to have development partners that aren't just corporate landlords. Have yet to see a partner like HPP, that really see themselves as stewards. The thought and care they've gone through for this project. This iconic feature is a part of labor history. Pleased to see a partner that is honoring a landmark. It's a tough time to be in commercial real estate and reactivating this part of the waterfront is really important, it sends a strong message and hope this stems into more development.
- (3) Christine Farren, Foodwise. We have been in good faith talks with HPP, grateful for the changes they have made. Excited to renegotiate for the South Arcade and looking forward to the future of the teaching kitchen, working with HPP on the common vision of a teaching kitchen that is core to the community programming. South arcade is not just storage, it is an active teaching space that brings people down to the waterfront. Working with HPP, thrilled with some of the changes and can accommodate the market layout to the new installations proposed tonight. Will steadfastly be fighting to keep the kitchen and feel that will be possible.
- (4) Katharine Petrin, SF Heritage. Appreciate being included in design discussions and have been following the project since its inception. Recognize progress but still opposed to the installation and changes to the City facing side. The principal façade should not be as impacted and there is flexibility and opportunity on the back façade. Still feel the arcades should remain open and publicly accessible public spaces. The façade is characterized by balance and symmetry, still unclear

on the treatments at the south arcade, if it doesn't come to pass, then the relationship of symmetry is even more off balance. Lower impact approaches with lighting could achieve some of those goals of activation. The Ferry Building is the City's architectural gem. Urge the most serious level of scrutiny for these changes.

- (5) Stan Hayes, Telegraph Hill Dwellers. The American Planning Association describes the Ferry Building as a famous city's most famous landmark. We acknowledge the changes that have been made in this proposed project and appreciate them. We continue to oppose the permanent enclosure and privatization of the arcades, the privatization of the public access areas, and the addition of canopy structures. We are concerned about the loss of public access space. The canopies will impair architecturally prized front façade of the Ferry Building. Inconsistent with public access policies that we operate under including the Bay Plan and the 1978 Design Guidelines. Concerned approval of the future expansion of the south arcade and café/market zone is premature and may pose a threat to the future viability of the farmer's market. Concerned that the Ferry Building is transforming from a marketplace to a restaurant destination. Preserve public access and ensure the legacy of the building stay intact.
- (6) Stewart Morton, SF Resident and member of the Preservation Committee, how can you imagine canopies in front of this gorgeous building. They're kind of cheesy. This is not what a historic building should happen to it. It's a shame. It's a very serious approach. How will a canopy effect the wind? Does Gott's function? Is it not a problem there? Will they want canopies?
- (7) Robert Harrer, Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (Online). BCNA supports the revised project. Feels the proposed project will improve visitor experiences and the attractiveness of the Ferry Building facility. It will enable the Ferry Building to remain competitive with other waterfront attraction sin the future. Appreciate the modifications made since the last review and with discussions with the Port and Foodwise. The project will expand the appeal of the facility, a better platform for vendors and tenants. Will expand the appeal of the Ferry Building and create a better platform. Believe the current proposal will broaden and improve the its future offerings. We note that the Port is working towards developing two other waterfront sites at Piers 30/32 and 38/40. Thus it is important the Ferry Building be given the support now to remain competitive relative to the other attractions in the future. Strongly urge approval for the HPP Project.

f. **Board Discussion.** The Board discussed how the project responds to the seven objectives for public access found in the Public Access Design Guidelines, provided feedback on the proposed public access improvements with respond to the Commission's policies on sea level rise and environmental justice and social equity, and addressed the staff questions listed below.

(1) **The seven objectives for public access are:**

- i. Make public access PUBLIC.

- ii. Make public access USABLE.
- iii. Provide, maintain, and enhance VISUAL ACCESS to the Bay and shoreline.
- iv. Maintain and enhance the VISUAL QUALITY of the Bay, shoreline, and adjacent developments.
- v. Provide CONNECTIONS to and CONTINUITY along the shoreline.
- vi. Take advantage of the BAY SETTING.
- vii. Ensure that public access is COMPATIBLE WITH WILDLIFE through siting, design, and management strategies.

(2) BCDC Staff have the following specific questions for the DRB's consideration:

- i. Do the proposed alterations reflect the civic nature of the Ferry Building and potential demands for public uses of the site? Is the civic nature of the Ferry Building and surrounding public spaces supported by the materiality and design of the proposed project?
- ii. Do the proposed alterations sufficiently maintain or enhance circulation and connectivity to and along the shoreline?
- iii. Do the proposed activation areas along the building frontages collectively and individually promote an inviting and usable public access environment at the Ferry Building and allow for adequate public circulation to site entrances and destinations?
- iv. In particular, would the proposal to place a café/market zone and public seating area in the South Promenade activate and improve the quality of the public access experience in balance with addressing the public access and circulation needs of the project area?
- v. Do the proposed elements support a cohesive, legible, and inviting public access program?

(3) Port Staff have the following specific questions for the WDAC's consideration:

- i. Do the proposed design enhancements reflect the historic and civic nature of the Ferry Building?
- ii. Do the proposed improvements enhance circulation and connectivity to and from the Ferry Building, the Embarcadero Promenade, and Ferry Plaza?
- iii. Do the proposed activation areas along the building frontages collectively and individually promote inviting and usable public spaces?
- iv. Would the proposal to place a café/market zone and public seating area in the South Promenade activate and improve the quality of the public space?
- v. Are the proposed canopy structures along the west side of the Building compatible with the historic district, and do they continue to allow appropriate views of the Building?
- vi. Do the proposed elements support a cohesive design?

g. Summary of Key Issues and Board Comments

(1) Overall Site Plan

- i. Board members expressed that public access areas that are not actively used by the public may not be maximizing the public benefit, and activation and improvements enhancing public access spaces are more compelling than square footage calculations.
- ii. Stefan Pellegrini expressed appreciation for the changes to the proposal since the last review but stated he was grappling with what is perceived as a loss of public access area and questioned if there is a loss of public space on the ground, is there a nexus for an enhancement or increase in public access somewhere else around the building. He observed that today, the front facade is not transparent or inviting, it's not a high-quality public space and the improvements would address those concerns but the public nature of the space remains questionable and it remains unclear what enhancements to the public access area are maximizing the public benefit.
- iii. Stefan Pellegrini stated the Boards should support the creation of spaces where the public can have a positive experience all along the façade of a building. He observed that the quality of the current building edges is not great, but if there is an active edge to walk along, it may be a more compelling location and he encouraged maximizing the spaces around the building where it feels great to walk along the edge. Stefan observed that putting people next to the building and highlighting entrances encourages transparency and the kind of pedestrian activity that is building-oriented.
- iv. Kristen Hall commended the project team on their engagement with tenants and the market and expressed support for maintaining the public seating related to the market hall where it had previously been proposed as the Bay Kitchens restaurant spaces. The site has a number of existing public access benefits including comfortable indoor and outdoor seating and restrooms. She observed that overall, this building has changed a lot over time and suggested we shouldn't be afraid of change to keep up with trends and land uses. Kristen expressed appreciation for an operator that wants to turn up the life as a destination and suggested activating the building with successful tenants could further support the smaller tenants.
- v. Patricia Fonseca Flores observed that the proposed design is flexible and reversible which lessens potential concerns. She expressed that it is difficult to assess the public benefit by quantifying the square footage conservation of public access.
- vi. Jacinta McCann concurred with the other Board members and observed that there is a constant evolution of how public spaces are used and a need to facilitate adaptability to market and use demands. She observed that what is appealing now, may cease being effective in a few years and another use may become more compelling. Jacinta expressed that evolution, viability, activation, and comfort are critical to public spaces but the detailing and wayfinding of this project needs refinement.

- vii. Alma DuSolier stated we need to support the vendors and the restaurants to reactivate the waterfront. She observed the proposed activations are a gamble; we have to test something, put it out there, see it in action, then evaluate and revisit. She questioned whether the changes will be successful but noted with the current condition, it is difficult to determine if the building is open or if you're in a space you should be. She observed that there are spaces around the building today that seem unfinished, temporary, or like the back of house and the publicness of those spaces is not readily understood.

(2) Embarcadero

Canopy

- i. Kristen Hall observed there is a hierarchy along the Embarcadero façade: the main entry, the end caps, and the arcades connecting them. By holding the glass behind the line of the columns, it allows the user to see the arcade and the depth of the facade but suggested the presence of the canopies changes the façade hierarchy because the arcade connections no longer recede. She stated the design should have a lighter touch and recede more, giving prominence to the main entrance and the end caps would better reflect the architectural character of the building.
- ii. Kristen Hall was supportive of the activation, stating that the use of the arcades as retail would bring life and light into the spaces. She observed it is a cold building so seeing the building full of people and light would be inviting; having spaces that are comfortable at night where you can see the life on the street is more in line with the design intent of the post-Embarcadero freeway life of the building. There has been a lot of effort given to make this part of the waterfront truly public and bringing more life to the ground floor and the street would help realize that vision.
- iii. Jacinta McCann expressed that she thought the canopy was a light touch structure and that she agreed with the commentary on the composition of the building façade and the idea of evolution over time.
- iv. Gary Strang stated that preservation of the building is essential, and reinvigoration of a building contributes to preservation. He observed the activation and preservation goals are at somewhat counter purposes and he supports the changes at the arcades if they are successful in activating the building.
- v. Kathrin Moore questioned whether the enhancements reflect the history of the building and observed it has gone through many changes and there is a responsibility to protect the civic nature of the building. She expressed little tolerance for the proposed changes on the Embarcadero façade but was very much in support of activating the building and public spaces. Kathrin observed the canopy is extremely static, so static that it changes the perceptions of the near and long views of the building; stating the canopy is too long and too massive. She observed that if the wisdom of the arcade is activation, the canopy wipes out that dynamic. There is opportunity to furnish the space in a different way.

- vi. Kathrin Moore expressed concern that the ground plane changes happening three times a week create an element of too much activity and haste that diminish the perception of a strong public space. The necessary changes to the ground plane undermine the public perception of the space: it is not constant enough.
- vii. Jimmy Chan stated the idea of the canopies isn't offensive; if done right, they can accentuate the architecture with the integration of modern structures with the historic architecture and could help light up the elevation of the building. He observed that it is hard to tell from the level of detail provided how the canopy would be perceived from across the street and questioned if it would be as dominant as the illustrations suggest.
- viii. Laura Crescimano stated she has reservations with the canopies, noting 115-feet is long, and questioned if it be reduced. She expressed concern over gestures that seem to be intended to maintain publicness when not really being public like the space between the two outdoor dining areas. Laura observed that the canopy is privatizing, it creates a controlled perimeter, and expressed concern over the details and footings, and whether it should be a continuous length or broken down.
- ix. Chris Wasney stated the 2002 project was controversial but turned out to be the right move and that a café seems like a low-cost barrier to entry to participate in the restaurant spaces. He observed the arcades ceased being useful for circulation when they were cut off with the end caps and that they are currently privatized by the kiosks. He stated he supports the enclosure of the arcades – it restores the spatial nature of the arcade but is concerned what the reality will look like with duct work and all the back of house operations, observing no one wants to watch exhibition dish washing. Chris stated the canopy must be minimal and the details for the structure are essential: making the structural elements as thin as possible so that it can visually recede, canopy lighting should be completely concealed sources and avoid market lights.

Climate

- x. Jacinta McCann observed the proposed space can get very hot during summer and the canopy would provide much needed shade.
- xi. Kristen Hall questioned whether the climate could be addressed with umbrellas but stated she didn't feel strongly about it.
- xii. Gary expressed the climatic modification of shade and radiant heaters are good for user comfort and questioned whether there would be roll down wind protection from the canopy.
- xiii. Alma DuSolier questioned whether the shade canopy is necessary for the space to be successful, observing that Gott's dining area does not provide shade.
- xiv. Laura Crescimano suggested the canopy is more about lighting and heat than providing shade.

Circulation

- xv. Alma DuSolier observed that the 6-foot-wide pathway between the canopy and arcade seems tight for public circulation and it is unclear if it is perceived as something the public can walk through. She suggested exploring maintaining 6 feet inside the arcade and 6 feet outside to allow for in/out public circulation. Alma suggested that when the glass is open, there would be a sense of interior public circulation, similar to today and emphasized the importance of successful circulation. She observed that the space of this parallel axis is perceived as a pass through and should feel more public as opposed to Gott's where the perception is the space is inaccessible unless someone is buying a burger.
- xvi. Kathrin Moore questioned whether the quality of pathway is public enough, observing the hidden space behind the canopy and barriers may not be legible as public.

Furnishings

- xvii. Alma DuSolier also observed that the benches that are proposed to be in front of the dining area as a kind of delineator and public benefit, that even though they are allowing physical public access, they may project an image of the area not being as public as it could be. She questioned if the benches are necessary in the context of the perception of this area as a flexible space and if they make the dining area feel more private than it should be.
- xviii. Laura Crescimano stated she would like to see additional seating in other areas because there is a need for public seating.

(3) South Wedge

Programming

- i. Many Board members expressed support for the activation, observing that the space is currently underutilized.
- ii. Kristen Hall stated activation of the Wedge is a fantastic idea, that more places to sit outside, especially when it's sunny, is highly desirable and this space would provide that. BCDC Staff are understanding this statement to be in support of the public seating on the South Wedge.
- iii. Kathrin Moore expressed support of the proposal on the south façade and observed that it would likely activate the space but stated the delineation, design choices, and details can be elevated and certain aspects could be improved upon. She appreciates the dynamic of what's proposed on the South Wedge.
- iv. Alma DuSolier observed that the South Wedge on non-market days feels like an empty market space so having something more regularly occupied acts as an anchor that draws people in and demonstrates that people can use the space and it will feel more inviting and less like the back of house. Seeing that people are always there, that is helpful. She observed that the proposed outdoor dining area makes sense because the space is already narrower here

and a detour around the space would be less impactful than if it were to be closer to the Embarcadero promenade.

- v. Jacinta McCann observed that the Wedge is a flex zone where there is not a clear definition of pedestrian/vehicle spaces but pedestrian circulation can be accommodated in the rest of the space to facilitate the benefits of the outdoor seating .
- vi. Kristen Hall observed that the bump outs at the Gotts and Market Bar dining areas create a soft occupiable edge around the building. What makes great public space is offering different ways to use it, and providing soft, occupiable edges around the building, clarifying circulation patterns, opening up spaces where there are circulation eddies and giving gracious enough space to entryways is a way of structuring building use that is more legible. That soft edge will help this area not read as the back of house anymore. The space is still navigable, you can cut the corner and weave between the tables, and the space is generous enough to accommodate the seating area and circulation.
- vii. Stefan expressed support for continuing the activation on the Wedge, stating that having that publicly accessible space around the building, similar to the condition of what is shown in the images where there is a pathway between the actual restaurant space and the edge of the building that allows people to walk next to the building is important and should not be exclusive to the restaurant. He observed that on the east side of the Wedge, it's a small enough space that it doesn't seem like a big deal for pedestrians to move around the dining area.
- viii. Laura Crescimano observed that ADA requirements may inform the need for edging that is more controlled than what is currently shown along the vehicle route and stated that detailing will be important. If the site is able to remain fluid between pedestrian and vehicular zones, the proposed seems acceptable, but stated it may not be appropriate to require people to cross over the driveway to the pedestrian route and then back if the pedestrian and vehicular zones are distinct.

Wayfinding

- ix. Patrica Fonseca Flores observed that the Wedge has potential to be an inviting space that welcomes people to the site, to stay on the Wedge, as well as directing people to the building and into the plaza but questioned whether the paving graphic and cues are legible enough to passersby on the Embarcadero. The wayfinding elements may only be visible if you're right in front of them and Patricia suggested exploring opportunities that extend beyond what is shown, possibly to the curb line, to create cues that are not currently in the design.
- x. Gary Strang commented that the overhead Ferry Plaza sign may be more of a barrier than an invitation, and stated he preferred the way the cornerstone is designed at ground level. He expressed concern with the image showing the Ferry Plaza sign, the cornerstone, and the sign on the building, questioning whether it is redundant messaging and observing residents and commuters

will find their way. Gary stated that if the overhead sign is necessary, it must be as carefully detailed as the canopy to avoid it becoming another obstruction. He observed the design needs further development with attention to the quality of how the sign structure meets the ground and the base and footing necessary to withstand vehicles.

- xi. Jacinta McCann observed the proposal for the South Wedge is a positive enhancement and suggested the wayfinding would be useful here because not everyone knows where to go but agreed with Gary that the detailing needs refinement.
- xii. Alma DuSolier questioned whether the Ferry Plaza sign would provide sufficient distinction for vehicles and create enough separation for the traffic to allow for the temporary barriers to be removed. She stated the design should be approached carefully so it feels integrated and pedestrian-friendly, while providing the necessary barriers from cars where needed.
- xiii. Jimmy Chan stated he was not sure how he felt about the ferry sign but sometimes the only way to orient oneself is to look up and when it is crowded, the sign would be visible.
- xiv. Laura Crescimano observed that it seems counterintuitive to have the graphic on the vehicular drive rather than the pedestrian space but appreciates that's where it's most visible for driving foot traffic. She reiterated the comment about the devil being in the details and suggested the graphic account for the utility and crosswalk insertions that may otherwise break up the graphic, exploring elegant ways to resolve those interruptions. Laura stated it feels strange to maintain a circulation pattern that doesn't relate to the actual usage and the circulation. She stated this proposal seems like a first move and observed this may be the moment to think about opportunities to clean up what's important in the public access area and relieve pinch points.

(4) Plaza

- i. There was consensus amongst the Board members that the addition of lighting on the plaza is reasonable and makes sense to help activate the underutilized Ferry Plaza.

(5) Summary

- i. Conceptually, the Board supports the activations but stated the implementation details will be key to ensuring the publicness of the spaces is maintained.
- ii. The addition of lighting on the Ferry Plaza is a positive enhancement.
- iii. Activation of the South Wedge with seating is a positive enhancement, but the devil is in the details and the considerations raised by the Boards should inform the design.
- iv. The Boards generally support Foodwise's vision of long-term use of the South Arcade and the teaching kitchen. Board members suggested the South Arcade be excluded from this review and use observation of the North Arcade experiment to inform any future proposal for the South Arcade. Any future project should be light touch and respect the symmetry of the façade.

- v. There was general consensus that having restaurant uses that activate the North Arcade is positive; cleaning up what is there currently is a good thing and can enhance the public access. The Boards stated the lighting is a good move and important to the activation of the North Arcade. The Boards observed that there may be operational complications and challenges that could have implications on the perception of publicness. The details of public movement need to have a thoughtful approach. Consensus on the design of the canopy remains unresolved and needs further exploration including studies on breaking up the massing, ensuring the character and lightness of the canopy won't impact the historic building, and public circulation in the colonnade being worked through with a potential tenant.

The Design Review Board stated the project does not need to return but requested the south arcade be removed from the current description and potentially come back for future review if resolution of details needs to be reviewed.

h. **Project Proponent Response.** The project team thanked the Board and Committee and stated they look forward to working with staff to resolve the Boards' concerns.

6. **San Francisco Waterfront Coastal Flood Study Draft Plan (Briefing).** The Design Review Board and Port Waterfront Advisory Committee will receive a briefing from the Port of San Francisco on the Draft Plan for the San Francisco Waterfront Flood Study, which was released for public comment at the end of January. The draft plan addresses coastal flood risk and effects of sea level rise for the 7.5 miles of waterfront within the Port of San Francisco's jurisdiction from Aquatic Park to Heron's Head Park.

a. **Project Presentation.** Luiz Barata, Port of San Francisco provided an overview of the study with a slide presentation.

b. **Public Comment.** There was no public comment on the item.

c. **Board Discussion.** The Board discussed how the project responds to the seven objectives for public access found in the Public Access Design Guidelines, provided feedback on the proposed strategies with regard to the Commission's policies on sea level rise and environmental justice and social equity.

d. **Summary of Key Issues and Board Comments**

- (1) Bob Battalio observed there should be opportunity to realign the shoreline and have some natural areas serve as buffers and transitions. There is a little green edging in the southern waterfront but there is opportunity to introduce more in the central waterfront. The problem with natural infrastructure is that it takes space and this project is limited to edge conditions; it would be nice to draw the improvements inland where feasible rather than being resigned to the existing shoreline. He stated the project should be reviewed by the ECRB, that there are people on that Board who would have more valuable input.
- (2) Kathrin Moore urged staff to comment heavily on the design element as that isn't typically a priority for Army Corp projects. She also recommended staff value every the fabulously appointed shoreline and aspects of Port property,

stating this has potential to be a great urban design project. Bob Battalio added that good design won't happen unless people push it and have vision.

- (3) Alma DuSolier said she was encouraged by all the benefits being considered and interested in how they will be applied to the proposed solutions.
- (4) Kathrin Moore requested more information on how this project is integrating into other regional projects. Port Staff stated people are concerned in areas south of Herons Head but this project is limited by the geography of Port property. Those areas outside Port property have other mitigation measures and agency representatives. There is a need for more coordination.
- (5) Kristen Hall asked if this Study was informed by the Resilient by Design projects. Port Staff stated Islais Creek was included and the Resilient by Design effort informed some strategies, including more retreat areas. Staff observed that with equity components, retreat in that area is not recommended because of the equity impacts on community and jobs, loss of affordable light industrial spaces. There are still some areas for possible retreat but it takes a lot of space and has economic impacts.
- (6) Kristen Hall stated it would be sad to have all these walls and levees along the waterfront, that could cut off all the public access that everyone has been working toward. She observed that in New Orleans, the connection to the water is confusing because much of the city isn't visually oriented towards the water and encouraged staff to explore changing the shape of the shoreline, revisiting the intent of policies, the no more fill vision was in reaction to a moment of time and it's an important conversation to be having at the Commission.
- (7) Laura Crecimano encouraged monitoring in between the actions. Monitoring starts after initial improvement, then using findings to inform subsequent actions. She suggested to move away from dates and rely on water levels to inform actions.
- (8) Gary Strang questioned the City is committing to ongoing pumping and levees and asked if the money be spent on retreat. Port Staff stated they are all engineering solutions that could possibly be funded where it's found to be in the federal interest.
- (9) Stefan Pellegrini asked what the Board's role is in reviewing this plan moving forward and requested more information on how the Port is working with the City on issues of adjacency and land constraints. Port Staff stated they view BCDC as a partner. Presented to a group from BCDC, working to get coordination between the City agencies. Moving forward, Port will keep coming back to you for those milestones and receive comments.

The Design Review Board stated they want to continue to receive updates on the project as it develops.

7. **Meeting Adjournment.** Board Member Strang moved to adjourn the meeting. Board Member Battalio seconded the motion. The meeting concluded at 9:13 p.m.