

Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association

Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting

November 15, 2007

At 117 Greenwich Street

“DRAFT”

The meeting began at 6:00 pm and was called to order by President Fred Allardyce.

Board members in attendance in addition to President Allardyce were, Diana Taylor, Debra Bleemer, Carol Parlette, Lee Radner, Bill Sauro, Bill Benkavitch, Felix Rodriguez, Morton Beebe and Member-in-Waiting, Jonathan Middlebrook.

Board members who were absent: Joe Wyman and Linda Schwartz.

1. The minutes of the last meeting on October 18, 2007 were approved as amended by unanimous vote.

2. Treasurers Report by Parlette was presented and she distributed Balance Sheets and Income Statements for the year-to-date period. Efforts at getting existing members to renew their memberships for 2008 were being received, and the Association had a net income \$688 for the current period.

3. The results of the Association’s First Neighborhood Party was discussed, and all agreed it was a very successful event, with many new potential members in attendance. Special thanks were given to Jan Holloway, Connie Hazel, Linda Schwartz and Joe Wyman for their considerable efforts at the event.

4. Committee Reports:

A. Community Planning/Advocacy for North Waterfront – Waterfront Committee Chairperson Taylor presented a detailed plan for developing a community-based vision for development in the BCNA area. (The text of her presentation appears in Appendix 1 of the minutes.) After considerable discussion, the Board agreed that the concept had considerable merit and sources for seed-money funding would be further investigated. Action: The action items was then proposal tabled until the next

Board meeting.

B. Taylor and Middlebrook then presented a series of issues taken from the Save The Bay/SF Tomorrow position statement opposing the Cruise Ship/Office Project proposed for Piers 27-31. (The text of their presentation appears in Appendix 2 of the minutes.) The Board discussed each issue and proposed modifications. Middlebrook will draft a letter [addressed to the Port Commission] that will provide a preliminary position of the BCNA Board on the Cruise Ship/Office Project development at Piers 27-31. The Board will make a final determination on the letter/position statement via email.

C. 8 Washington Street Condominium – Radner discussed a closed-door meeting that was reportedly held between Pacific Waterfront Partners, LLC and the Port Commission. The second public forum regarding neighborhood input held on November 14, 2007 was also discussed.

D. Other – Copies of the Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Exploratorium project at Pier 15 were distributed to interested Board members.

5. Existing & New Committee Activities for 2007

A. Membership Committee – Sauro presented the latest membership roster showing 39 renewals and three new members. Membership literature was distributed to all guests who attended the Nov. 14 party and it was hoped that a good percentage of those might become due-paying voting members of the BCNA. However, it was also noted that at future neighborhood get-togethers and parties, a log sheet with the name, address, phone and email addresses of all those attending should be maintained at the welcome table.

B. Newsletter Committee – Several Board members stated that the latest BCNA Newsletter was well written and laid designed out and the Board appreciated the efforts of newsletter author June Osterberg. Various scenarios of payment methods to Osterberg were then discussed. Parlette moved that the creation of a quarterly newsletter was important enough to warrant payments to Osterberg regardless of whether any new members are added to the rolls of the Association directly due to the newsletter. The proposal was approved unanimously by the Board.

C. Program and Social Event Committee – No discussion.

8. The next BCNA Board Meeting was scheduled for Thursday January 17, 2008.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Sauro

Secretary

APPENDIX 1

Date: November 15, 2007

To: BCNA Board

From: BCNA Waterfront Committee

Subject: Developing Community-based Waterfront Development

The BCNA Board approved in concept at the August meeting a proposal to develop a community-based vision for development along the Northern Waterfront. In order to move forward, we need seed funding to hire a part-time staff person or consultant. The members of the Waterfront Committee need staff assistance to write the project action plan and grant proposals as well as assistance to convene a NE Waterfront Blue Ribbon Committee.

Based on estimates in the attached concept paper, we need \$10-15,000 start up funds to engage an individual or to contract with one of the organizations described in the attached concept paper.

We now need to express our commitment to community-based development in our neighborhood, with money. So far we have pledges totaling \$2000 toward an estimated need for \$15,000+.

The \$15,000+ will buy us professional help in raising money, creating design proposals, and involving our neighbors.

We have all been generous with our time and ideas. Don't stop!

We now urge the BCNA Board, individually and collectively, also to contribute money to this signature BCNA effort.

PROPOSAL: Community Planning/Advocacy for North Waterfront

Goal: Develop a community-based vision for development along the Northern Waterfront and move beyond an adversarial relationship with the Port.

Organizational strategies—building relationships as we build community

1. Engage a diverse committee of civic, community and business leaders

- Attract diverse sources of funding and support
- Provide leadership for a community vision of development with high level of economic/financial/design feasibility built in.

2. Community-driven waterfront plan rather than developer-driven

- Use WLUP/WDAE as an important document but it is not a living thing anymore
- Engage people/community as experts rather than having the Port convene their show-and-tell style workshop
- Excite people around something positive; harder to sustain but likely to be more productive.

3. Focus on the positive and mobilize around a positive idea; some examples include:

- Host a community-planning process to create destinations, places, destination links within a section of the waterfront
- Hands-on field workshop using community to assess uses, activities, etc
- Define key community principles such as green-space connectedness, neighborhood-friendly retail, cross-generational recreation, etc.

Funding

Funding is required for part-time staff or consultants to write grants and develop the project plan. Two models include a staff model or a consulting model.

Staff model: Hire a part-time coordinator, exec. director, or development consultant.

- Example: part-time project director
- Write grants and development proposals for political or organizational approaches

- Salary or consulting fee: \$100/hr., full-time approx. \$7500/mo., min. 6mo commitment.

Consultant model: Contract with consulting groups or individual consultants

- Local consulting group: EDAW (www.edaw.com , Jacinta McCann has worked with a

Mission Bay project and now FishWharf CBD is paying them for a bike path/parking/traffic project). An organization such as EDAW conducts an assessment, develops a plan/design, and prepares a report and/or presentation.

- Local community planning org: Collaborative San Francisco (www.collaborative-sf.org, founded by Bay Area Working Group and Neighborhood Assemblies Network) is dedicated to bring together multiple stakeholders toward shared visioning and planning processes. Jennifer Clary (SF Tomorrow President) is one of the principals of CSF.

- Project for the Public Spaces (www.pps.org) has levels of organizational support for

community-based planning; has worked with San Diego waterfront project and El Camino Real roadway project in San Mateo. New initiative with a focus on “What makes a great waterfront”.

- PPS approach: 3 levels of consultation involving community action (workshops, site

evaluation), plan/design review, site-specific conceptual development plans, and/or

the implementation of a demonstration project. Costs range from \$15,000 to

\$100,000 depending on the level of consultation support.

- PPS Executive Director, Fred Kent has indicated an interest in assisting with finding

funding sources. Alan Jacobs, former SF Planning Director, is on PPS Board.

- Potential funding sources: NE San Francisco Conservancy; SF Foundation; local donors from BCNA, FOGG, THD, Citizens to Save the Waterfront; PPS sources; others?

APPENDIX 2

Date: November 8, 2007

To: Board of BCNA

From: Waterfront Committee

Subject: BCNA response and action regarding Save The Bay/SF Tomorrow letter to Port Commission opposing Cruise Ship/Office Project at Piers 27-31

Two respected organizations, Save the Bay and SF Tomorrow, have jointly taken a formal position against the Shorenstein/Farallon office development at Piers 27-31 and the Port's decision to construct a new cruise terminal at Pier 27. It was suggested that the BCNA Board "sign on" in support of the letter sent to the Port Commission (10/19/07). The Board referred to the Waterfront Committee the review of the STB/SFT letter and requested that we make a recommendation for Board action.

In their letter, STB and SFT make a number of arguments against the SF Piers LLC Pier 27-31 project. Your Waterfront Committee has reviewed their letter and the issues they raise. If consensus can be achieved among the BCNA Board, we will draft a letter to the Port Commission. In order for the BCNA Board to take a position on the proposed development (or parts of the development), we suggest using the STB/SFT arguments for your consideration and discussion at next week's Board meeting:

1. We agree with and support that part of "Inconsistency with Port's RFP" that says the current SF Piers LLC proposal does not develop active, public recreation sites, as envisioned in the Port's RFP.

2A. We do NOT support STB/SFT's apparent objection to a cruise ship terminal on the North East waterfront. Properly designed with multiple uses, such a facility is a genuine maritime use of Port property.

2B. We remain neutral on the Port's plan to develop Pier 27 as a Cruise Ship Terminal until an RFP and/or EIR studies are available.

3. We support STB/SFT's argument in the "Inconsistency with Waterfront Special Area Plan" section referring to the non-compliance with the BCDC approved plan for a 2-acre NE Wharf Plaza to promote public access.

4. While we do think that there is reason to remove some waterfront Port property from the public trust, we generally support the STB/SFT argument in "Significant Non-Public Trust Uses."

5. We are less concerned with office space per se than we are concerned with the scale of the proposed office development: too large, too high, and too private for over-water development on the public's waterfront.

6. We support 40' absolute waterfront height limits, as in historic district regulations (although it is unclear whether City Planning Codes would apply and extend the total height to 50-56' to allow for mechanicals .

7A. We are neutral on STB/SFT's Pier 32 Cruise ship terminal argument—it takes us out of our legal depth.

7B. We support requiring the Port to formally evaluate the underlying rationale and entitlements related to cruise terminal development at Piers 30-32. There is only so much capacity in the infrastructure along the waterfront and to leave projects on the table that are not realistic will undermine the ability of other projects to move forward.

We support the updating of the Waterfront Land Use Plan, especially as it relates to the identification of pier removal.

a. As stated in the STB/SFT letter: "If the current economics of pier reinforcement for certain priority uses make renovation inefficient for some Port structures previously viewed as assets, then an updated Waterfront Plan should identify for removal piers that are now known to be liabilities, and the Port should focus redevelopment efforts on those piers where reinforcement is practical and cost-effective."

b. Joe Wyman: This is a huge issue that the Port's Engineering Department has complete control over. The problems with the substructure undermine the ability of simple on-going uses such as vessel operations. The Port's response to crumbling infrastructure has been to do visual surveys and give facilities a "yellow" or "red" tag restricting the uses on the Pier even more. The Port should be challenged as the substructure question given the escalating construction costs of making even remedial repairs. One only needs to look at how Shorenstein is using the substructure question to see how a sophisticated developer can play the game.