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Introduction to the Port

The Port and Its Responsibilities

Among their many good fortunes, San Franciscans can count the fact that nearly their entire waterfront is publicly-owned. More than seven miles of prime Bay frontage, stretching from the Hyde Street Pier to India Basin, are held in trust for the public, under the management of the Port of San Francisco. Public ownership of Port property arises from the fact that most of this land was Bay tidelands, filled by the State to provide docks, wharves and backlands to facilitate commerce in San Francisco’s natural harbor. These tidelands are impressed with a “public trust” on behalf of all the people of California. The Port, as trustee of these public lands, is required to promote maritime commerce, navigation and fisheries, as well as to protect natural resources and develop recreational facilities for public use.

Responsibility for these lands was transferred from the State to the City in 1968 through the Burton Act. As a condition of the transfer, the State required the City to create a Port Commission with complete authority to use, operate, manage and regulate the Port, and to take all actions necessary to fulfill its public trust responsibilities consistent with the Burton Act. Pursuant to the Burton Act, revenues generated by the Port are to be used only for Port purposes. The Port receives no operating subsidies from the City. Thus, although the Port is structured much like other City departments, it is unique in that it must further state-wide interests, and do so without monies from the City’s general fund. Moreover, the Port’s duties and constituents are extremely varied.

Unlike some ports which primarily manage shipping operations, the Port of San Francisco oversees a broad range of commercial, maritime and public activities that are integrated into the local, regional, national and international economy. In some locations, such as Fisherman’s Wharf, maritime activities (in this case commercial fishing) have become the background amenity for a thriving tourist economy. In other areas, the Port’s finger piers are used for maritime support services such as ship repair, tug and tow operations, a Foreign Trade Zone and warehousing. At the Ferry Building, commuter and recreational ferries serve Bay Area cities. And in the Southern Waterfront, traditional cargo shipping takes place at the Port’s container terminals. The port oversees this myriad of activities, balancing the often competing interests of maritime and commercial tenants, public trust responsibilities to the people of the State, and responsibilities to the people of San Francisco, whose waterfront it oversees. As history can best attest, this balancing act has not been easy.
Expansion and Consolidation of the Industrial Waterfront

From 1863 until 1968, the use and development of the Port of San Francisco was controlled by the State of California. A State Board of Harbor Commissioners (State Board), exempt from local control and backed by the vast financial resources of the State, guided the Port from infancy to its height of maritime activity during World War II. Many of the Port’s piers were constructed between 1912 and 1930, when break-bulk shipping flourished and countless vessels were serviced at Port facilities. During that time, the waterfront became dominated by industry, maritime operations and railroad terminals. In post-World War II years, however, demand for the type of facilities offered in San Francisco began to decline.

Completion of the Golden Gate and Bay Bridges in the late 1930s had already led to a dramatic reduction in the once thriving ferry boat industry, making many Port facilities on the Northern Waterfront obsolete. Technological innovations in the shipping industry, particularly the shift from break-bulk cargo to containerized cargo, further reduced demand for Port facilities. The rise of foreign competition in shipbuilding and ship repair dealt another blow to maritime activity at the Port. With the decline in these prime industries, maritime support activities also declined.

Evolution to Containerized Cargo

The State Board was slow to respond to the evolution from break-bulk to containerized cargo shipping. While San Francisco looked on, the Port of Oakland obtained federal grants to help convert its mud flats to modern container terminals. By 1965, the Port of Oakland’s total tonnage receipts equaled that of San Francisco. In 1994, the Port of Oakland was the 5th largest port in the U.S. in terms of cargo handled; the Port of San Francisco ranked 26th.

During the past 25 years of local control, the Port of San Francisco has struggled to maintain a significant role as a shipping port. In 1969, the Port sold $20 million in bonds to finance the first LASH (lighter aboard ship) terminal on the West Coast at Pier 96 and improvements to break-bulk piers. Unfortunately, LASH technology proved to be an ineffective competitor to containerization. Meanwhile, the investment in break-bulk piers kept some of those facilities intact, but yielded little return. As a result, the percentage of Port operating revenue devoted to debt service grew substantially, further hindering the Port’s attempts to modernize. Although in 1971 the Port issued an additional $20 million in revenue bonds to build modern container terminals at Pier 94/96, San Francisco could never regain its preeminence over Oakland. Currently, the Port of San Francisco’s facilities are utilized at only a fraction of their capacity.
As discussed more completely in the Background Analysis for Water-Dependent Activities (Appendix A), shipping lines have dramatically reduced or ceased their shipping operations at the Port of San Francisco’s two container terminals. Because container terminal operators depend heavily on economies of scale to maintain profitability, the Port has been forced to consolidate its cargo shipping operations at Pier 94/96. The Port’s other container terminal at Pier 80 will remain available for future maritime operations. Nevertheless, with only a handful of shipping companies continuing to call, the Port of San Francisco’s future in intermodal container shipping is uncertain, despite aggressive efforts to lure shipping lines back with highly attractive business offers.

San Francisco’s peninsula location puts the City in a disadvantage compared to the Port of Oakland as it relates to cargo access. In addition, it takes longer to route San Francisco intermodal rail cargo to the main railhead located in the East Bay. In short, it is generally faster, and therefore cheaper, for carriers to pick up and deliver cargo in Oakland than in San Francisco. Second, shipping companies have expressed a strong desire to locate where two or more railroads provide connections to mid-west and eastern markets. San Francisco is served by only one railroad. Third, although 25 years ago most cargo exports were generated from the San Francisco side of the Bay, today most are generated on the east side of the Bay, and are exported from Oakland cargo terminals. Fourth, the Bay area as a whole faces competition from other west coast ports where demographic and geographic advantages allow faster intermodal connections to important local and midwest markets. Finally, public subsidies available to the Ports of Tacoma and Seattle have reduced costs at those ports and further eroded the market share of Bay Area ports.

Despite these disadvantages, the final chapter of San Francisco’s cargo shipping operations has yet to be written. Recent cargo forecasts predict over a four-fold increase in containerized cargo heading to and from the Bay Area between 1990 and 2020. Until recently, San Francisco might have been well-positioned to receive a significant share of this growth because regional forecasts had predicted that as Oakland facilities filled to capacity, other nearby ports would have the opportunity to capture expected “overflows” in cargo volume. However, although the Port has reserved ample property in the Southern Waterfront to increase its cargo operations exponentially, the federal government’s recent transfer of over 400 acres of the former Oakland Navy Supply Center to the Port of Oakland for expansion of cargo operations makes San Francisco’s property far less valuable for maritime expansion. The closure of other Bay Area military bases could have further negative consequences for the Port of San Francisco, should additional waterfront property become available for cargo shipping operations.
These changing conditions have required the Port to develop a new strategy for the Port’s cargo shipping industry. Eager to maintain its historic role in maritime trade, the Port is looking for new ways to market its cargo facilities (See Chapter 4, Southern Waterfront). For example, the Port is aggressively pursuing specialized cargoes, including break-bulk and project cargo, that do not rely heavily on intermodal ship to rail cargo transport and that can best utilize San Francisco’s unique facilities. The Port also may be well positioned to take advantage of a developing trend among large cargo carriers to own or control their own marine terminals, rather than sharing a terminal with other carriers. San Francisco is the only Bay Area port with the capacity in the next five years to offer long-term preferential assignments of container facilities. In addition, other technological advances could lead to more efficient use of terminal space, allowing smaller ports like San Francisco to attract high volume carriers.

Along with the Port’s cargo industry, the Port’s ship repair industry has also suffered from industry trends outside of the Port’s control. In the 1960s, ship repair businesses employed some 20,000 workers at over fifteen San Francisco ship building companies along the waterfront. In the 1980’s, the rise of foreign competition fueled by government subsidies, and the concurrent decline in U.S. subsidies of American ship building operations, caused a significant decrease in the number of ships serviced in the United States. More recently, one of the few remaining markets for the domestic ship repair industry, military contracts, has significantly diminished due to budget cuts and base closures. Today, the City’s two remaining full-service ship repair companies employ only 450 full time and 1,000 seasonal workers. While the Port is active in the City’s efforts to revitalize this industry, it is apparent that the industry will not, in the foreseeable future, command the workforce or the land area that it did in the 1960s.

**The Future of Ship Repair**

**Waterfront Land Use in Transition**

Technological innovations and market driven trends in maritime commerce and industry have significantly affected the use of Port land and facilities, and the location of Port activities. With the advent of containerization as the primary means of transporting cargo, and the decline in the breadth of the ship repair industry, the Port’s outdated break-bulk cargo, ship building and repair, and maritime support facilities have slowly been transformed to other uses. In keeping with City-wide trends, industrial maritime activities have diminished over time in the Northern Waterfront and are now concentrated in the Southern Waterfront because access to the interstate highway system is vital to the Port’s competitive position in cargo shipping. The Port’s cargo facilities rely heavily on truck access to and from Illinois and Third Streets, Cargo Way, I-280 and U.S. 101. The Port also is dependent on freight rail access which is available only south of China Basin.
Consolidation of the Port’s cargo operations in the Southern Waterfront has been further reinforced by recent changes in regulations affecting the Port’s ability to dredge around its facilities. Although the Port is a naturally deep harbor, some dredging is required to maintain channel and berth depths for deep draft ships. Because existing disposals sites for dredged materials are reaching capacity limits, and concerns over potential environmental impacts of dredging have restricted options for new disposal sites, the entire Bay Area faces severe dredging limitations. In response, dredging costs have soared and the Port of San Francisco has been forced to reduce the amount of its annual dredging, in part by relocating cargo shipping tenants and closing shipping terminals. Further consolidation of cargo operations at the container terminals in the Southern Waterfront, where there is deeper water and excess terminal capacity, will help to reduce the Port’s dredging requirements.

With the departure of industrial shipping operations, non-industrial maritime, commercial, residential and open space uses have proliferated on the Northern Waterfront, partly in response to City-wide demands. While non-industrial maritime activities have proven to be popular with residents and visitors alike (see Appendix A), the transition to other commercial and residential uses has not been without controversy, beginning long before the Port was transferred to local control.

The State’s early plans for redevelopment of the Northern Waterfront were, in hindsight, clearly out of step with local views on appropriate waterfront uses. First, the State Board rejected surface level transportation improvements to The Embarcadero, because of concern about traffic interference with now defunct breakbulk shipping piers. The elevated Embarcadero Freeway was constructed instead, presenting a barrier between San Franciscans and their beloved waterfront. Second, a plan generated by the State’s World Trade Center Authority and endorsed by the Governor called for construction of a 7-story building between Pier 1 and the Ferry Building, and a 30-story tower to replace the Ferry Building. Third, State Harbor Commissioner Cyril Magnin’s 1959 plan for an “Embarcadero City” envisioned filling in the Bay north of the Ferry Building to accommodate high-rise structures for non-maritime uses.
Unfortunately, the transition from state to local control of the waterfront did not curtail these overly ambitious efforts to develop the Port. When the City gained control of the Port in 1968, it assumed responsibility for $55 million in outstanding State general obligation bonds, and agreed to invest $100 million for harbor improvements. Extensive new commercial development was expected to generate the revenue required to support that level of investment. To this end, the Port proposed development of a 50-story U.S. Steel Office Building on fill between the Ferry Building and the Bay Bridge. In response to public outrage, the City Planning Commission adopted the Northern Waterfront Plan, imposing a 40-foot height limit on most Port property north of the Ferry Building.

While the city was still engaged in debate over height limits to the south, the State Attorney General’s Office dealt the fatal blow to the U.S. Steel Building proposal. In 1970, the State Attorney General’s office issued an opinion stating that they newly-formed San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) could not permit bay fill for non-water-oriented uses (e.g. offices), even if an equal amount of existing fill was removed. As a result, the Port’s plans for the U.S. Steel Building and an even more ambitious project, Ferry Port Plaza at Piers 1, 3, and 5, never left the drawing board.

The State ultimately recognized the Port’s inability to achieve extensive new development because of the State’s BCDC legislation, by reducing the Port’s investment obligations from $100 million to $25 million. This solution did not address the fact that, by this time, a great infusion of capital was needed to fully modernize the Port.

The pattern of misguided development expectations being quashed by regulatory revelations has been repeated several times in the Port’s history. For example, a controversial proposal in the mid-1980s for residential condominiums on Pier 45 was abandoned when the State ruled residential uses invalid under the public trust. Also, although BCDC had approved non-maritime office use on Piers 1 and 3 in its Special Area Plan, a 1986 informal Attorney’s General Opinion ruled that substantial structural reinforcement of a pier (work necessary for any significant new development on a pier and, increasingly, for ongoing maintenance of existing facilities) should be considered new bay fill and, therefore, the new use must be water-oriented (precluding non-maritime offices). In 1988, a proposal for an office and health club development on Seawall Lot 321 failed, in part because the State Lands Commission ruled private health clubs impermissible under the public trust, and set stringent standards to ensure that office developments were primarily for maritime-related uses. Most recently, a proposal for a Sailing Center with a hotel on Piers 24 and 26, although permitted by BCDC and State Lands regulations, was defeated by San Francisco voters with the passage of Proposition H in 1990.

Clearly, the Port has not been effective in its past efforts to provide new activities along the waterfront and generate revenues to subsidize its maritime operations and provide public amenities desired by the citizens of San Francisco. This Plan is intended to alter the course of history at the Port.
Financial Impacts of Land Use Trends

More than fifteen years ago, then Assembly Speaker Leo T. McCarthy, in a letter to the Members of the Assembly Local Government Committee, stated that the “terms of the Port’s transfer from State to City ownership were inequitable and financially unsound.” Assemblyman McCarthy pointed out that, “at the time of the transfer..., neither party conducted an economic analysis of the condition of the Port and the effect of the transfer.”

Many conditions were identified in 1978 as factors in the Port’s financial decline. Most notably, the property the Port received was in great disrepair. Twenty-three of the piers transferred were virtually unusable for maritime purposes because of their poor physical condition. The estimated cost of removing the unusable piers was between $10 and $20 million. Those piers that were structurally sound had only marginal value because the containerization of cargo shipping was rendering finger piers obsolete. Further, the proceeds of the State bonds for which the Port had assumed debt service already had been spent for facilities (such as the LASH terminal) which, in view of apparent changes in maritime technology, should not have been built at all. And as noted above, a prior State decision not to pursue federal grants weakened San Francisco’s competitive position in comparison to Oakland, where public reinvestments in port facilities was underway.

In an attempt to mitigate this inequity, Assemblyman McCarthy sponsored legislation that would have required the State to reassume financial responsibility for most of the outstanding general obligation bonds that the Port had been burdened with under the transfer legislation. The bill failed, and the problems identified in Assemblyman McCarthy’s letter were never addressed.

The Port’s Unique Financial Framework

This precarious financial inheritance has been difficult for the Port to overcome, in part because of the unique financial and budgetary framework within which the Port operates. Under the Burton Act, revenues generated by the Port are held in a special fund to be used only for Port purposes. The Port does not receive subsidies from the City, and reimburses the City for any services provided by general fund departments. The Port’s ability to fund Port operations, maintain Port property and provide public access and open space improvements therefore depends almost solely on its ability to generate revenues from the use of properties under its stewardship.
While many California ports have similar self-sufficient arrangements with their respective municipalities, most other American ports receive subsidies for capital programs or have outright taxing powers. For example, the Port of Seattle, which competes directly with San Francisco, is subsidized by general tax revenues. The availability of such assistance to competing ports puts the Port of San Francisco, with its aging infrastructure, in an unfavorable competitive position.

Over the past five years, the Port’s income from its cargo operations significantly decreased because of the departure of major shipping customers. In fiscal year 1994/95, cargo revenue was only $4.6 million, or 14.3% of the Port’s total operating revenue of $32.2 million. In the fiscal year 1995/96 budget, cargo revenues are expected to decline to $1.8 million, approximately 5.5% of the Port’s total revenues of $32.6 million.

In fiscal year 1994/95, revenue from the Port’s non-cargo operations, including wharfage and dockage from passenger ships, ship repair, power, fishing, and visiting ships, and rental payments from commercial tenants, ship repair firms, fishing companies, parking stalls, and parking meters, was $27.6 million or 85.7% of the Port’s total revenue.

The Port’s total operating revenues increased only 5.5% from fiscal year 1988/89 to fiscal year 1994/95. Given this flat revenue history, the Port has been forced to reduce controllable expenses in its operating budget (e.g. personnel, facilities maintenance, equipment, etc.) These budget constraints make it extremely difficult for the Port to add new programs, improve current services or maintain its property, much less provide publicly-desired waterfront improvements.

In addition to ongoing operational costs, the Port also faces a Capital Plan which it cannot fully fund, and which is burdened with many mandated, non-revenue producing projects; an over $20 million backlog of deferred maintenance which continues to accumulate; expected increases in dredging and environmental costs; and increase demand for the Port to support many declining maritime industries through increased marketing and subsidies. The Port does not receive any tax revenues or other funds from the City and thus is not able to provide new services, more maintenance or new public projects unless it continues to generate surpluses.

In addition, the Port’s environmental risk exposure is a particular financial concern today. While the Port’s risk is typical of other property owners that have, for over a century, hosted a mix of industrial businesses dominated by transportation and warehousing activities, it is a cause for concern because of the exceedingly high cost of remediation. Contaminated fill, underground tank leaks, and asbestos are presumed to exist in some areas, requiring the Port to develop specific programs to address hazardous materials. New requirements for cleanup of designated toxic hot spots are currently being considered by the State Water Resources Control Board. Future costs for this program are uncertain.
It is clear from the backlog of capital and required maintenance projects that the Port has not been able to produce enough revenue to sustain its current operations. The Port has developed an aggressive new financial strategy to control expenditures while seeking ways to enhance revenues from new and existing lines of business. This realistic Waterfront Land Use Plan which helps balance revenue producing and non-revenue producing projects, resulting in greater cash flow, will help the Port enter the next century as an economically viable public agency, capable of providing San Franciscans and Californians with the waterfront they deserve.

The Opportunity For a New Land Use Strategy

In the 25 years since the Port was transferred to local control, several land use plans for the San Francisco waterfront have been adopted by both the City and BCDC. Many of the changes called for in these plans have been accomplished or are well underway, including the demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway; removal of dilapidated piers and replacement with the Promenade between Mission and Folsom Streets; construction of the Waterfront Transportation Project improvements on The Embarcadero; construction of the Pier 7 recreation and fishing pier; renovation of the historic Roundhouse Building on the Northern Waterfront; and implementation of the Rincon Point-South Beach Redevelopment Plan. Notably absent from this list, however, are commercial development projects implementing plans for the economic revitalization of Port finger piers. Thus, the Port has not had access to the economic resources necessary to sustain its operations.

Twenty years have passed since the last comprehensive planning effort was completed for the San Francisco waterfront. Although many elements of the existing plans, policies, regulations and financial objectives are worthy of retention, a new approach is required to halt the continuing deterioration of Port property and to revive the debilitated state of Port finances.

This waterfront planning process has been designed to forge a consensus among the citizens of San Francisco and affected government agencies on the appropriate balance between maritime and non-maritime activities, public access and open spaces at the Port. The Advisory Board concluded early in the process that, in the light of the Port’s financial needs and the economic benefits it brings to the City and the region, the Plan should allow the Port to maintain a sound and diverse economic and fiscal structure, while continuing to provide for the Port’s maritime industries and other public trust uses, including public access and open space and other public benefit projects. The time is right for such a crucial mission. Some may lament the consolidation of cargo shipping operations in the Southern Waterfront, preferring to spread the

Redevelopment near the South Beach Harbor
remnants of the rough and tumble waterfront of bygone years along the entire waterfront. Most, recognizing
the inherent conflict between the new neighborhoods which have emerged adjacent to the shore and the in-
dustrial warehousing, trucking and rail operations upon which modern cargo operations depend, would prefer
a new combination of maritime and non-maritime operations on the Northern Waterfront, to complement the
vibrant new neighborhoods of South Beach, Rincon Hill and Golden Gateway, among others. This transition
would provide new opportunities for accommodating and expanding the Port’s other maritime industries, such
as fishing, passenger cruises, ferry and excursion boats, recreational boating and water activities, and historic
ship and ceremonial berthing, particularly along the Northern Waterfront. While most of these industries
cannot be expected to generate sufficient revenues to cover the costs of new facilities (see Appendix A), their
future contributions to San Francisco’s maritime character can nonetheless be assured if they are interspersed
with other revenue-generating uses on the waterfront. For example, by most accounts, the condition of the
City’s cruise terminal is a civic embarrassment. Many cruise passengers and officials consider the terminal
drab, unattractive and uninviting. The narrow width of the pier prevents efficient ship servicing and passenger
flow. Like many of the Port’s maritime industries, the cruise industry cannot alone bear the costs of required
capital improvements. However, if the cost of terminal improvements was balanced with a mix of other
revenue-generating uses in the same project or area, San Franciscans would benefit from access to new
waterfront attractions, and would take comfort in knowing that visitors would be welcomed in a facility
worthy of San Francisco.

The success of this mixed-use approach to revitalizing outdated waterfronts has been proven
throughout North America. One can travel to Vancouver’s Granville Island, Baltimore’s Inner Harbor or
Portland’s River Place and experience a full range of maritime and commercial activities which reunite
residents with their respective waterfronts.

Current possibilities for a successful revitalization of the San Francisco waterfront have been greatly
enhanced by the recent, massive infusion of government funds for waterfront transportation improvements.
After more than 10 years of careful planning, a series of new Waterfront Transportation Projects (WTPs) are
underway to pave the way for the revitalization of the Port. Originally, the WTPs were conceived as a single
transportation project, primarily on Port property, which assumed the continued operation of the Embarcadero
Freeway. In 1989, the Loma Prieta earthquake severely damaged the Freeway, and its subsequent demoli-
tion provided an exciting new opportunity to redesign the mid-Embarcadero segment of the WTPs between
Folsom and Broadway and reconnect the City with its waterfront. While this redesign effort is underway, the
City is proceeding with construction of the north and south segments of the projects.
When completed, the WTPs will provide an integrated system of major roadway, pedestrian, landscaping, historic signage and public art improvements from the intersection of The Embarcadero and North Point Street on the north to the intersection of Sixth and King Streets on the south. Additional improvements include: 1) the MUNI Metro Turnback Project, providing more efficient turnaround of MUNI Metro trains via an underground tunnel which will surface on The Embarcadero near Folsom Street (completed); 2) a MUNI Metro light rail service from the Embarcadero station to the Cal Train station (completed) and, eventually, to Mission Bay; and 3) a new MUNI historic street car line (the F-Line) running in the Embarcadero median from the Ferry Building to Fisherman’s Wharf.

These improvements balance the transportation needs of the City’s residents, visitors and workers with the needs of the Port’s continuing maritime operations along The Embarcadero. Equally important, the resulting beautification of The Embarcadero will set the stage for a waterfront renaissance while the Port and the citizenry of San Francisco face the challenge of reshaping the edge of this great City. The visions embodied in this Waterfront Land Use Plan provide a place for most everything San Franciscans desire. With open minds, constructive criticism and cooperative spirit, San Franciscans will implement this blueprint for action that will be a credit to this generation of San Franciscans for years to come.
INTRODUCTION TO THE PORT

The Land Use Planning Process and Timeline

In November 1990, the San Francisco voters adopted Proposition H which required preparation of a comprehensive waterfront land use plan with maximum feasible public input, and provided minimum requirements for its contents. Pending completion of the plan, Proposition H also placed a moratorium on non-maritime development on the Port’s piers and within 100 feet of the shoreline. (The full text of Proposition H is provided in Appendix B.)

To ensure a comprehensive planning process covering the wide diversity of Port interests, the Port Commission extended the scope of the planning area to include all Port properties and created the Waterfront Plan Advisory Board to prepare and recommend a plan for Port Commission adoption. Twenty-seven Advisory Board members were appointed based on recommendations from the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor, as well as through a general solicitation of interested citizens, maritime industry representatives, Port tenants, labor unions, neighborhood organizations, architects, urban planners and other professionals. The Board held public meetings twice monthly from mid-1991 to mid-1994.

Water-dependent activities were the focus of Phase I of the planning process. During the 18 month review process, the Advisory Board studied the Port’s history, regulations and financial status and determined the land use needs of existing and potential water-dependent activities.

Water-dependent activities, those which require access to water in order to function, include cargo shipping, ship repair, passenger cruises, ferry and excursion boats, recreational boating and water activities,

Land Use Planning Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start-Up and Orientation</th>
<th>Phase I: Water-Dependent (Maritime) Uses</th>
<th>Phase II: Non-Maritime Land Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1990</strong></td>
<td><strong>1991</strong></td>
<td><strong>1992</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>November-July 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition H requires preparation of waterfront land use plan for the Port’s piers and properties nearest the shore.</td>
<td>Port Commission extends scope of planning area to include all Port properties; creates 27 member Waterfront Plan Advisory Board to recommend plan for Port Commission review and adoption.</td>
<td>Board holds 17 public meetings to receive non-maritime land use suggestions from public, receive briefings from industry experts, study interrelationships of possible land uses with adjacent neighborhoods, and determine financial and economic feasibility of land uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1991</strong></td>
<td><strong>1992</strong></td>
<td><strong>1993</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>January-October</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Commission extends scope of planning area to include all Port properties; creates 27 member Waterfront Plan Advisory Board to recommend plan for Port Commission review and adoption.</td>
<td>Advisory Board holds 26 public meetings, including intensive, industry-by-industry evaluations, to analyze future needs of Port’s water-dependent (maritime) industries; Advisory Board reserves approximately two-thirds of Port’s property to meet these needs.</td>
<td>Port publishes Options for Change to focus public attention and debate on non-maritime land use options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase I: Water-Dependent (Maritime) Uses</td>
<td>October-February 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1992</strong></td>
<td>Advisory Board holds 12 public hearings on Options for Change; Port hosts workshops to evaluate urban design and development feasibility of land uses discussed in Options for Change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The land use requirements of these industries were determined after intensive, industry-by-industry evaluations and public workshops. At the conclusion of Phase I in the fall of 1992, the Advisory Board tentatively reserved approximately two-thirds of the Port’s properties to meet the future needs of water-dependent activities, pending further review of those needs in the final phase of the planning process.

In Phase II of the planning process, the Advisory Board evaluated other activities that are not necessarily water-dependent, such as public access and open space, mixed-use commercial development, museums, residence, and warehousing. The Advisory Board held public workshops and meetings over the course of more than a year to receive input from citizens, real estate and design professionals, and experts in transportation, historic preservation, environmental restoration and other relevant disciplines on the feasibility and desirability of these new waterfront activities. Focus meetings also were held on specific sections of the waterfront to study the interrelationship of possible new waterfront activities with activities on neighboring properties. At the conclusion of this lengthy review, possible land uses were identified for the sites not previously reserved for water-dependent activities in Phase I. These possible uses were outlined in Options for Change, a report published for public review and the subject of public meetings from the fall of 1993 through the spring of 1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase III: Draft Plan</th>
<th>Environmental Review/Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1994</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February-May</strong></td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Board holds 3 public hearings to discuss integration of Phase I and Phase II findings into proposed Draft Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Plan issued for public and Advisory Board review; Advisory Board holds 3 public hearings on Draft Plan and votes overwhelmingly to approve Draft Plan, with revisions.</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Board presents Draft Plan recommendations to Port Commission at public hearing.</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port staff issues revised Draft Plan, highlighting proposed revisions for public and Port Commission review; Port Commission public hearing on Revised Draft Plan.</td>
<td>The Waterfront Land Use Plan was approved by the Port Commission following certification of the Environmental Impact Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Environmental Review public scoping meeting on issues that should be studied in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR); Port Commission public hearing on Revised Draft Plan.</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1995</strong></td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Board and Port Commission public hearings on Revised Draft Plan. Port Commission endorses Revised Draft Plan for purposes of analyzing it in EIR.</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1996</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port signs a Draft Concept Agreement with BCDC and Save San Francisco Bay Association regarding BCDC amendments to implement the Waterfront Land Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1997</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Waterfront Land Use Plan was approved by the Port Commission following certification of the Environmental Impact Report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1998</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City approved amendments to the San Francisco General Plan and Planning Code to enable implementation of projects under the Waterfront Land Use Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCDC approved amendments to the Bay Plan, San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan, and Total Design Plan (Piers 7-24). Port approved conforming amendments to the Waterfront Land Use Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Advisory Board presented its proposed Draft Waterfront Land Use Plan to the Port Commission in 1994 integrating its preliminary findings made in Phase I and Phase II of the planning process. Following numerous public hearings regarding the Plan’s policies and certification of a final Environmental Impact Report on the Draft Waterfront Land Use Plan in January 1997, the Port Commission approved a final Waterfront Land Use Plan in June 1997. Subsequent implementing amendments to the San Francisco General Plan and Planning Code were approved by the San Francisco Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in 1997 and 1998. Amendments to BCDC plans and corresponding Waterfront Land Use Plan amendments were approved in 2000, to establish consistent City, Port and BCDC policies for the waterfront.