

SWL 351 PRE-SUBMITTAL MEETING
Questions and Answers
August 26, 2008

Q: Why were previous proposals for underground parking rejected?

The Port received an unsolicited proposal from San Francisco Waterfront Partners for a project in late 2006 that would combine the SWL351 site with the adjacent site (8 Washington) and include underground parking. As discussed on page 11 of the RFP, the Port has taken no action on the proposal. The Port's website includes related background documents and the record of informational presentations to the Port Commission regarding the unsolicited proposal.

Q: The RFP, Page 9 says that BOS endorsed nearby underground parking in 1996; why was that subsequently rejected?

In 2001, the Board of Supervisors transferred jurisdiction of the surface Blocks 202 and 203 to the Recreation and Park Department (Ordinance 101-01). The subsurface of the area was reserved to the Department of Public Works for potential development of a parking garage. The Port, working with the Department of Parking and Traffic, explored development of a public parking garage in the 2001-2002 time frame. On July 15, 2003, the Board of Supervisors transferred the subsurface of Assessor's Blocks 202 and 203 to jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department and prohibited building in the substructure of these sites (Ordinance 184-03).

Q: Can the required 90 parking spots include parking for the proposed project visitors and employees?

The public parking in the project will be used to meet all or a portion of the Port's commitment to provide 150 spaces to visitors to the Ferry Building. Please review the Port's parking agreement with Ferry Building Investors (Exhibit C) for the details on parking provision.

Parking needs for the uses in the proposed project would need to be considered separately from the commitment to Ferry Building Investors. As stated at page 32 of the RFP, respondents can submit an alternative parking arrangement that demonstrates that both sets of users can be served by the proposed parking in the project.

Q: Did Port do parking a survey for area?

A Parking Study for the Ferry Building area was developed in 2007. Although that study was not finalized, it and other available existing data and surveys about parking in the area, including the feasibility study for the Blocks 202 and 203 underground garage will be provide on the SWL 351 RFP website. Please note that parking conditions in the area have changed, since these surveys were completed prior to the closure of Pier 1/2. Registered RFP recipients will be notified when these materials are available.

Q: Hours required for parking? Daytime only?

Appendix C describes the Port's obligation to Ferry Building Investors for public parking.

Q: Does "as is" mean that all compromises must be made by Developer?

In general terms, "as-is" means all project costs and approvals are to be secured by the developer. See Page 2 of the RFP.

Q: The RFP describes existing sewer, 32 ft wide easement, 20 ft deep, what do you know about replacement or rerouting?

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) staff have advised the Port that the recent sewage leaks and emergency repairs have led the SFPUC to begin a conceptual design study for sewer systems upgrades in this area. That study has not yet commenced. Respondents should make their proposals assuming the existing sewer alignment with no permanent construction in Jackson Street right of way because of the sewer line and the require visual corridor as called for in the RFP

As soon as the Port receives the SFPUC's reports on the emergency repairs, it will make them available on the project website.

Q: Height limit?

SWL 351 is located in a City Height and Bulk district 84-E. Please review the City's planning code, but in general, the 84-E district requires height less than 65' at the street and allows heights to 84'. Proposals should not exceed City height restrictions.

The RFP guidelines for height are in Design Objective B.7:

“Propose a building height and massing that fits within the neighborhood context formed by the William Heath Davis Building of the Golden Gateway Center, the Golden Gateway Commons condominiums and the heights of the historic Piers 1 through Pier 5 bulkhead buildings. The perceived height of the building (including roof top fixtures) will be evaluated in considering neighborhood context.”

Q: Is it actually required to have retail/restaurant? Would a hotel be allowed?

The RFP requires restaurants or retail uses on the ground floor. These could as part of a hotel operation. Street oriented uses at ground level are required to activate the area.

Q: Further questions

We will be posting Q&A and sending by email to RFP holders. You can also ask questions by email or fax. Another pre-proposal meeting will be held on 9/11/2008 at 1:30 p.m.

ANSWERS TO OTHER QUESTIONS PROVIDED IN WRITING

Q: Where is the Port Building Code posted?

The link below has the Port's building code.

http://www.sfport.com/site/port_index.asp?id=69647

CORRECTION TO THE RFP

The link for the Port's form lease was incorrect in Appendix D. The correct link is below.

http://www.sfport.com/site/uploadedfiles/port/port_commission/Sample_Lease.pdf

The project website will be updated with appropriate links.