

# SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

50 California Street • Suite 2600 • San Francisco, California 94111 • (415) 352-3600 • Fax: (415) 352-3606 • www.bcdc.ca.gov

February 25, 2011

**TO:** Design Review Board Members

**FROM:** Will Travis, Executive Director [415/352-3653 travis@bcdc.ca.gov]  
Jaime Michaels, Coastal Program Analyst [415/352-3613 jaimem@bcdc.ca.gov]

**SUBJECT: Hunters Point Shipyard Project, City and County of San Francisco;  
Second Pre-Application Review**  
(For Board consideration on March 7, 2011)

## Project Summary

**Project Sponsor:** San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRDA) and CP Development Co., LP

**Project Representatives:** Tiffany Bohee, SFRDA and Therese Brekke, CP Development Co., LP

**Project Site and Background.** The 882-acre (including submerged lands) project site is comprised of the Hunters Point Shipyard (shipyard) and an area located west of the 72-acre Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, which is outside of the Commission's jurisdiction, at the southern end of the City and County of San Francisco. India Basin is located to the north and the Bayview-Hunters Point district to the west. (Exhibit 1)

As proposed, the phased-construction of the overall project would result in 10,500 residential units, a replacement public housing facility, 885,000 square feet of retail space, 150,000 square feet of office space, 2,500,000 square feet of research and development (R&D) space, a 150,000-square-foot hotel, 100,000 square feet of community service area, a 10,000-square-foot performance center, a 225,000-square-foot artist's facility, a 68-foot-wide bridge at Yosemite Slough, approximately 337 acres of open and park space, and a replacement San Francisco 49ers football stadium. In addition, the project proponent would also install outfalls at three locations within the Commission's jurisdiction at the Candlestick site. (Exhibit 2) Two project alternatives—both involving demolition of the existing football stadium—would result, respectively, in: (1) less open space area (Exhibit 3), and (2) decreased residential and increased open space area (Exhibit 4). The proposed development area would occur mostly within the Commission's 100-foot shoreline band jurisdiction and involve fill in the Bay. Precise areas and quantities are not yet available.

The Commission's Design Review Board (DRB) reviewed the project in October 2009. The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was certified in June 2010. In summer 2010, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved the General Plan amendments required for project implementation. A Notice of Determination was filed in August 2010. Federal and state actions required for project implementation are not yet complete, including final remediation and clean-up of the shipyard, conveyance of the shipyard by the U.S. Navy to the SFRDA, land exchange agreements over parklands and tidelands, and an amendment to the *San Francisco Bay Plan* (Bay Plan) Map No. 5 to delete a port-priority use designation at the shipyard.



Making San Francisco Bay Better

**Existing Conditions.** The shipyard's existing buildings, dry docks, piers, wharves, and shoreline protection vary in condition with many facilities scheduled for demolition. The majority of the shipyard is closed to the public, and remains under the U.S. Navy's jurisdiction until completion of site remediation and clean-up. One area of the shipyard where remediation is complete has been conveyed to the SFRDA and developed for residential use. East-west oriented streets connecting to the shipyard include Palou Avenue/Crisp Road and Innes Avenue. Natural resources are limited due to the site's industrial character, however, two eelgrass beds and discrete patches of tidal salt marsh exist at the northern and southern shorelines. Tidal marsh areas do not support special-status species. The San Francisco Bay Trail terminates at the northern boundary of the shipyard and connects to the southern area of the Candlestick site. (Exhibits 5 and 6)

**Proposed Public Access and Improvements.** The project would be comprised of six distinct developed areas each with open space and public access components, including a continuous 7.0-mile Bay Trail (not including the planned 2.6-mile Bay Trail at the Candlestick site), as described below (Exhibit 7):

1. **Northside Park.** Located at the shipyard's northern boundary, the proposed public area would provide passive and active recreational uses, such as basketball and tennis. The Bay Trail would run parallel to a landscaped buffer next to a rip-rap shoreline. As proposed, residential uses would be constructed outside of the Commission's jurisdiction yet near the proposed public area. (Exhibit 8) The proposed design does not currently include facilities to allow direct access to the Bay, but future improvements could include a kayak launch and/or a pile-supported cultural center/café, which would likely involve Bay fill. The existing site elevation would be raised, and the existing shoreline protection system (rip-rap) raised and moved inland to address a 36-inch rise in sea level. (Exhibits 9, 24, and 25)
2. **Waterfront Promenade North.** South of the proposed Northside Park, the Bay Trail would continue and the public area would include lawn areas and a partly landscaped pile-supported wharf with seating. Existing piers located at the northern end of this site would be retained for bird use. (Exhibit 10) As proposed, residential uses would be constructed outside of the Commission's jurisdiction but adjacent to the public area. The design does not currently include improvements to pilings supporting the wharf, which pre-dates the Commission. The existing wharf elevation would withstand the 100-year tide plus a 16-inch rise in sea level. (Exhibits 11, 24, and 25)
3. **Heritage Park.** Located south of the proposed Waterfront Promenade North, this area would be centered around the existing Drydocks 2 and 3, historical structures converted to museum and/or visitor center facilities, and the large pier located between the drydocks. The area would also include the Bay Trail and landscaping. At its northern end, shoreline revetment would be placed adjacent to an area planted with native vegetation. Residential and R&D uses would be constructed outside of the Commission's jurisdiction but adjacent to the public area. (Exhibit 12) The current design does not include improvements to the pier support structure, which pre-dates the Commission. To address a 36-inch sea level rise, the height of a proposed perimeter wall at the wharf would be increased as needed over time. (Exhibits 13, 24, and 25)
4. **Waterfront Promenade South.** The proposed area includes existing Drydock 4 and the existing North and South piers. Shoreline amenities would include a pedestrian promenade at an existing wharf (at the northern part of the site), a restroom, café, landscaping (including at the piers), and the Bay Trail. As proposed, R&D uses would be constructed outside of the Commission's jurisdiction, but adjacent to the public area. (Exhibit 14) The design does not currently include improvements to the wharf or pier pilings, which pre-date the Commission. The existing wharf elevation would withstand extreme tides plus a 36-inch

rise in sea level. Outside the wharf area, existing site elevations would be raised and storm drain systems installed. Further, the area landward of the wharf would be reserved for the construction of protective levees, if needed. (Exhibit 15, 24, and 25)

5. **Waterfront Recreation and Education Park / Re-Gunning Crane Pier Habitats.** The area would serve as a transition from an urbanized shoreline to a natural shoreline. The existing Re-Gunning Crane would remain in place and tidal marsh vegetation allowed to colonize around the crane's foundation. A trail located under the crane would allow visitor access to the edge of the Bay. An education center would be constructed at the shoreline along with landscaping and the Bay Trail. Existing piers located at the southern end of this site would be retained for bird use. (Exhibit 16) As proposed, the site would naturally adapt to rising sea levels (Exhibits 17, 24, and 25)
6. experience with native grasses, windbreak groves, and earthen landforms. Other proposed features would include picnic areas, overlooks, a visitor/interpretive center, and restrooms. Existing piers at the eastern edge of this site would be retained for bird use. (Exhibit 18) A barrier lagoon to provide nursery habitat for estuarine species and foraging and roosting shorebirds and waterfowl would be constructed at a site yet to be determined. (Exhibit 19) Freshwater and tidal wetland restoration sites are scheduled for construction by the Navy for which plans are not currently available. The Navy's plan for shoreline remediation involves raising existing elevations at the shoreline to create a berm, which would adapt to extreme high tides and a 36-inch rise in sea level. (Exhibits 20, 24, and 25)

**Traffic Circulation, Parking, and Proposed Bridge.** The project's street and circulation network would accommodate private vehicle, pedestrian, bicycle and public transit traffic. Street design would include short block sizes, crosswalks, traffic-calming measures, and wayfinding signage. Bicycle routes and public transit stops would be incorporated into the project design. The shipyard and the adjacent Bayview neighborhood would be connected via Ingalls Avenue and Palou Avenue/Crisp Road. (Exhibit 2) Parking would mostly serve residential, retail and stadium uses. As proposed, no designated public access parking would be provided.

A proposed bridge across Yosemite Slough would link the shipyard to the Candlestick site. Bridge design is currently underway under the aegis of the California State Parks Foundation. To date, the conceptual design depicts a 68-foot-wide bridge with a 40-foot-wide roadway used for private vehicles twenty days per year for football game days, two 11-foot-wide public transit lanes, a 2-foot-wide median separating the roadway and transit lanes, and 2-foot-wide shoulders. The proposed height of the bridge would allow for kayak access underneath. Bridge design would allow for adaptation to a 55-inch sea level rise. If the existing stadium is not relocated, the proposed bridge width would be decreased to 41 feet. (Exhibit 21) A refined bridge design will be presented to the DRB at a later meeting.

**Views and Massing.** The proposed street and block pattern at the shipyard (and adjacent Candlestick development located mostly outside of the Commission's jurisdiction) extends the existing street grid thereby providing adjacent Bayview streets with terminating vistas of the Bay. As designed, proposed building heights range from 3-story townhomes, 4-story stacked flats, 6- to 10-story mid-rises, 17- to 24-floor highrises, and 32 to 42- floor taller highrises. Proposed towers would be located at key intersections. Bay views from Hilltop Park proposed for construction as part of the shipyard redevelopment would be preserved. At the adjacent Candlestick site, visual linkages would be achieved mostly through the perpendicular orientation of the streets to the shoreline. (Exhibits 22 and 23)

**San Francisco Bay Plan Policies.** The Bay Plan Public Access policies state, in part, that “a proposed fill project should increase public access to the Bay to the maximum extent feasible.” These policies also state that access should be designed—using the Commission’s *Public Access Design Guidelines* (Guidelines)—“to encourage diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline,” be conveniently located near parking, and permit barrier free access. Additionally, these policies state that “access should be sited, designed and managed to prevent significant adverse effects on wildlife.” The Bay Plan Recreation policies state partly that waterfront parks should include launch facilities for boats. The Bay Plan Appearance, Design and Scenic Views policies state in part that “maximum efforts should be made to provide, enhance, or preserve views of the Bay and shoreline, especially from public areas...” The Bay Plan Safety of Fills policies state in part that, “[t]o prevent damage from flooding, structures on fill or near the shoreline should have adequate flood protection including consideration of future relative sea level rise as determined by competent engineers.” Additionally, the policies state that, “[t]o minimize the potential hazard to Bay fill projects and bayside development from subsidence, all proposed development should be sufficiently high above the highest estimated tide level for the expected life of the project or sufficiently protected by levees....”

**Public Access Issues.** In October 2009, the DRB conducted its first review of the proposed shipyard project at a broader scale. The project currently under review includes more design detail about public improvements and access along and adjacent to the shoreline. (It should be noted that the current proposal does not include details about barrier free disabled access, and does not include designated public parking.)

The staff seeks the DRB’s input and advice about whether: (1) the proposed public improvements within the six distinct project areas facilitate diverse Bay-related activities and movement at the shoreline and to the Bay; (2) the proposed shoreline protection at these areas would preserve Bay views and access as sea level rises; and (3) the access is designed to prevent impacts on wildlife at specific areas proposed for habitat restoration.

- **Northside Park** (Exhibits 8 and 9): In this area, the Bay Trail would be located adjacent to a lawn/recreation area and a landscaped buffer at the top of a rip-rap shoreline. The proposal does not include direct access points to or over the Bay, although, design options to provide such opportunities (e.g., a pile-supported café or kayak launch) are under consideration.

*The Board should consider whether incorporating amenities to provide more immediate access to the Bay would diversify and enhance the site’s Bay-related activities.*

To address a future sea level rise of 36 inches at the site, the proposal involves extending the existing shoreline rip-rap into the landscaped buffer area immediately adjacent to the Bay Trail.

*The Board should also consider whether the placement of rip-rap in the landscaped buffer area would adversely affect the public experience and access to the Bay.*

- **Waterfront Promenade North** (Exhibits 10 and 11): The Bay Trail would weave around and between proposed landscaped areas and partly atop an existing wharf resurfaced to include a promenade. The wharf’s support structure is not currently proposed for improvement. Existing piers in the Bay (not connected to the shoreline area) would be retained solely for bird use. Housing is located adjacent to the public area. Bay-related activities at the site would, therefore, include walking, cycling, Bay and wildlife viewing, and resting.

*The Board should consider whether additional site amenities (e.g., telescopes, shade structures, interpretive wildlife panels) would facilitate site use and enhance the proposed (or additional) Bay-related activities, and also whether the structural stability of the existing wharf would support the proposed public uses.*

The wharf's current height would withstand a sea level rise of 16 inches plus the 100-year tide. The construction of a wave berm immediately inland of the wharf and the use of an adjacent "adaptive management zone" located next to the Bay Trail are also proposed for adapting to increased sea levels.

*The Board should consider whether these adaptation measures would adversely affect public access.*

- **Heritage Park** (Exhibits 12 and 13): As proposed, the primary site activities would revolve around the presence of two existing drydocks and a large pier. Proposed educational/cultural/visitor facilities located in historic and new structures, and an outdoor event space would be primary activity areas. The site would also include a landscaped area next to the Bay with adjoining shoreline revetment.

*The Board should consider whether additional Bay-related activities (e.g., a boat launch or fishing facilities) would diversify and enhance the site's Bay-related activities, how the outdoor event area and proposed shoreline revetment would affect public access, and whether the structural stability of the pier would support increased public activity on the structure.*

A perimeter wall or berms would be constructed at the two drydocks and the pier to address a sea level rise of 36 inches.

*The Board should consider whether this adaptation strategy would adversely affect public access and possibly views of the Bay.*

- **Waterfront Promenade South** (Exhibits 14 and 15): The proposed improvements, including the Bay Trail adjacent to an existing wharf, landscaping (including at the existing North and South piers), a café, and a plaza adjacent to existing Drydock 4, would be located adjacent to a proposed R&D office area and in the vicinity of the proposed football stadium.

*The Board should consider whether other opportunities exist for enhancing Bay-related activities at the North and South piers (e.g., kayak launching or fishing facilities), whether other site amenities (e.g. shade structures, picnic benches, etc.) are warranted in light of the proximity of the stadium and offices, and whether the structural stability of the two piers would support increased public use.*

The existing wharf at the site is high enough to adapt to a 36-inch rise in sea level plus extreme tides. Additionally, space adjacent to the wharf would be reserved for the construction of a levee, if needed. It is possible that levee and wave barrier construction would affect the currently-proposed Bay Trail alignment.

*The Board should consider whether this adaptation strategy would ultimately adversely affect public access and possibly views of the Bay.*

- **Re-Gunning Crane Pier** (Exhibits 16 and 17): As proposed, the shoreline improvements located adjacent to multi-use fields would mostly focus on the historic crane, a pedestrian trail under the crane and a nearby educational center, anticipated tidal marsh colonization around the crane footings, and an existing pier located in the Bay for bird use. The Bay Trail would not extend into the crane area.

*The Board should consider whether the proposed uses provide a diverse set of Bay-related activities. Further, the Board should consider whether the proposed habitat area would be designed and managed to protect wildlife (at the crane area and the bird pier) from impacts associated with site visitors. The site would adapt naturally to future sea level rise, i.e., no immediate or future structural improvements are proposed.*

- **Grasslands Ecology Park** (Exhibits 18 to 20): A diverse range of Bay-related activities would occur at this 82-acre open space and park area, including the longest section of Bay Trail at the shipyard, landscaping and earthen landforms, an outdoor classroom and interpretive center, Bay overlooks, restrooms and other visitor-serving facilities. The proposal does not include the installation of piers or boat launch ramps along the shoreline. Additionally, three restoration sites are planned: a freshwater and tidal marsh by the Navy (for which specific design plans are not yet available) and a back barrier lagoon by the project proponents, whose specific location has not yet been selected.

*The Board should consider whether the proposed uses provide a diverse set of Bay-related activities and whether additional facilities should be incorporated to encourage use of the shoreline area and Bay for boating, fishing, and swimming. Further, the Board should consider whether the proposed habitat areas would be located, designed and managed to protect wildlife from impacts associated with site visitors.*

As part of its current remediation and clean-up activities, the Navy is designing a shoreline protection system for the site. The plan involves raising the existing elevation of the shoreline edge and, thus, creating a berm at a height which would adapt to extreme high tides plus a 36-inch rise in sea level. Public access would be accommodated on top of the berm. The project proponent would incorporate the Navy's shoreline design into its plans for the site.

*The Board should consider whether the adaptation strategy would affect public access to the Bay.*