



TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

Maria Ayerdi • Executive Director

**TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, May 13, 2008  
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts  
701 Mission Street  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room  
San Francisco, CA

Meeting #011

5:30 p.m.

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Jim Lazarus, Chair  
Karen Knowles-Pearce, Vice Chair  
Andrew Baglino  
Adrian Brandt  
Andrew Brooks  
Richard Brooks  
Michael Freeman  
Peter Hartman  
Adrienne Heim  
Michael Kiesling  
Shawn Leonard  
David Milton  
Jane Morrison  
Jul Lynn Parsons  
Norm Rolfe

Executive Director  
Maria Ayerdi

201 Mission St. #1960  
San Francisco, California 94105  
415-597-4620  
415-597-4615 fax

### **1. Welcome & Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Jim Lazarus, Chair, at 5:40 pm. A quorum was formed by 11 of the 15 voting members as follows: Jim Lazarus, Adrian Brandt, Andrew Brooks, Richard Brooks, Michael Freeman, Peter Hartman, Michael Kiesling, David Milton, Jane Morrison, Jul Lynn Parsons, and Norm Rolfe. Non-voting member Bob Beck was also present.

### **2. Approval of April 8, 2008 Meeting Minutes**

Adrian Brandt made a motion to approve the Draft Meeting Minutes for the April 8, 2008 meeting and the motion was seconded by Richard Brooks. A vote was called by voice and the motion was unanimously moved and carried.

### **3. Staff Report – Bob Beck**

Bob reminded the CAC members that the next TJPA Board of Directors meeting is this Thursday (May 15<sup>th</sup>). In this May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Pelli-Clarke-Pelli agreement will be brought before the TJPA Board of Directors for their consideration, a new Chair and Vice Chair will be elected, and the 2008 – 2009 Fiscal Budget will be presented as an informational item. Potentially, the day of the TJPA Board of Directors meetings may be changed from the third Thursday of the month to the second Thursday of the month. The TJPA expects to put the Temporary Terminal construction contract out to bid next month.

Chair Lazarus asked if there was any CAC member comment on this agenda item.

Michael Freeman commented that the Pelli-Clarke-Pelli maximum compensation amount of \$105,000,000 appears to be high and asked if this was the accurate figure. Bob Beck responded that it is the correct number, but that this is for both Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Chair Lazarus introduced new CAC member Michael Freeman and asked each member to introduce themselves.

Bob reminded the meeting attendees that the meeting was being captioned and requested that members assist the captioner by waiting to be recognized by the chair, speak clearly, not speak too quickly, and only one person to speak at a time (not talk over one another).

Chair Lazarus asked if there is any public comment on the staff report, and there was none.

### **4. Retail Consultant RFP – Bob Beck**

Bob Beck provided a PowerPoint presentation and gave a briefing on the current Request for Proposal (RFP) for a Retail Consultant. The retail strategy will be important because it will draw people into the center, activate it during non-commute hours, and will offset ongoing operating costs. The Transbay Transit Center will get the allocation of bridge tolls that are currently being received by Caltrans for the operation of the Transbay Terminal, but the balance of costs will be passed onto the transit agencies operating in the Transit Center. Retail revenues will help alleviate this. The objectives for retail include meeting the needs of the transit riders and of the neighborhood. The goal is that the retail will not be “just another mall”, but will make you know you are in San Francisco. The main retail opportunities are on the ground level, then the

concourse and there are minor opportunities in the park and other levels. The retail spaces proposed by Pelli-Clarke-Pelli were shown and discussed.

The duration of the retail contract is for 6 years which will carry us through construction to initial operation. A pre-proposal meeting is scheduled for this Friday (May 16<sup>th</sup>) and the question submission deadline is May 23<sup>rd</sup>. The TJPA hopes to bring the contract to the TJPA Board of Directors in July, but it may be August because of schedule dates.

Norm Rolfe commented that he has concerns about the elevated park open space and hopes that there is a concentration on retail to see what can be done to bring people to the park. Jim Lazarus, Jane Morrison and Peter Hartman agreed and Jim asked if all kinds of retail, including food, are being looked at for the park. Bob replied that all types of retail are being considered, and the recommendations will guide the infrastructure installed to support the various types of installations (example: power, ventilation, etc.).

Richard Brooks asked what the time period is to come up with a retail plan. Bob replied that the first year should parallel the Pelli design and that at the end of 15 months they want to have an outline strategy. There has been a wide variance in the square feet (60,000 – 200,000) of retail which various analysis have recommended. There will be lots of “up front” work to get the retail space balance right.

Adrian Brandt asked if there will be flexibility in the amount of retail space if expansion is desired later. Bob said there is “some” flexibility, but that the space has been looked at and the shell of the overall space will have to be monitored.

Michael Kiesling mentioned that retail should be included in the secure waiting area for High Speed Rail. Bob replied that this need will probably be identified.

Chair Lazarus asked if the public had any comment on this item and there was none.

#### **5. Transit Center District Planning Process – Josh Switzky**

Josh Switzky of the San Francisco Planning Department provided a PowerPoint presentation titled Public Workshop #2: Initial Findings and Proposals. He advised that the full presentation is on their website and that the address for the website will be provided at the end of the presentation.

A large number of consultants have been involved in this effort. The focus has been on the area bounded by Market Street / Main Street / Folsom Street / Third Street area which overlap Zone 2 of the Redevelopment Area. Objectives focus on the City’s physical form, land use in the downtown core, and generating revenue to support the Transbay Transit Center.

Forecasts for regional, citywide and downtown growth for the next 25 years from 2007 – 2035 were analyzed. Two growth projection models (Baseline - an average of Moody’s and REMI, and Smart Growth from the Association of Bay Area Governments) were compared and discussed. The need for office space vs. housing in the area and citywide was analyzed, and it was found that there would not be an unmet housing need, but there will be a shortage of office space. The Transbay Redevelopment Plan and Rincon Hill area will provide approximately 7,000 housing units. In the District Plan effort, the Planning Department is considering limiting the amount of non-commercial use zoning and prioritizing commercial space to meet the office space goals. The overall goal ratio in new construction would be 70% office and 30% non-office. Comparisons were made between San Francisco where 80% of people take transit to work and the rest of the bay area.

Jane Morrison asked what percent of the housing would be affordable and Mr. Switzky replied that 35% (1,200 units) in the redevelopment area will be affordable.

Peter Hartman commented that land use is an important consideration and that a hotel would compliment the office space, provides customers for retail, activate the area and seems like it would be a natural fit.

David Milton asked what percent of the floors in the Hines building are to be used for office space. Jim Lazarus replied all of them. Bob Beck commented that the final mix of uses in the tower will be determined in the environmental process, but it does not appear the developer would be required to add additional uses unless they chose.

Adrian Brandt asked how do you project the future mix and how does that drive the tower use. Mr. Switzky replied that they evaluate what is allowed in the area under current policy and assume a certain mix and development subject to these controls. The guidelines target a general land use mix for the area as a whole rather than mandating specific mixes on particular sites. Adrian said that he believes it will be important for a hotel to be close to the Transit Center.

Jul Parsons asked if the proposed land use will be revisited down the road. Josh replied that it will be refined over the next three months and they plan to make their final recommendation at the end of the summer.

Mr. Switzky continued his presentation with a discussion of urban form factors and that they had looked at three areas: aesthetics including urban form principles, skyline, and a view analysis; shadows; and historic resources reflecting the districts character. He reviewed the 1972 and 1985 plans. In the 1985 plan, the building height limit was set at 550 feet. Under the current effort, they are evaluating the form of the skyline which is a uniform 'plateau' south of Market Street and are looking to create a focal area around the Transit Center with the Transit Tower being the tallest and most prominent building in the downtown core. The Transit Tower will be framed by other buildings whose heights will provide the "mound" shape to rise up to the Transit tower and then descend on the other side with buildings with heights of 100 – 200 feet lower than the Transit Tower. The New Montgomery Street – 2<sup>nd</sup> Street area would have lower heights as it is a historic area.

A 3-D analysis and modeling was done. Several possible scenarios of what the skyline transition would look like from various view locations were shown and discussed including the various options of spacing and grouping of the various buildings. The transition was shown using 850 feet, 1,000 feet, and 1,200 feet from the Twin Peaks, Dolores Park, Alamo Square, Bay/Treasure Island and Potrero Hill view points. It was felt that the skyline proportions would be best if the Transit Tower was approximately 1,000 feet.

Although a full qualitative shadow analysis will be done in the future, consultants have done some work regarding shadow issues and looked at key open spaces to be protected. They identified some key open space areas of concern, but have also found that the shadows move swiftly and last no longer than 15 to 45 minutes, they are intermittent and do not affect all parks at the same time, and shadows from a structure that is far away is not the same as from one close by. The early findings regarding several parks were outlined. Based on these findings and other factors, the Planning Department is considering limiting the Transit Tower to 1,000 feet and shifting it from the west side of the site to the east side of the site. They also suggested that the small piece of land at 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Howard Street be used as open space. The Planning

Department is also considering the substantial amount of new open space that will be created under the program.

A historic survey was completed of the New Montgomery-Second Street Conservation District which also identified potential district expansion areas. Other urban design issues such as “how it will feel to walk around the district” will be delved into during future workshops. A wind analysis will be done shortly, but preliminary testing indicates that there will not be significant wind issues.

The Planning Department’s objective is to balance the goals with public values. The current 1,000 foot height limit for the Transit Tower excludes possible ornamental forms that may exceed the height limit provided it does not create additional shadow impacts.

David Milton asked if the Hines dollar commitment will hold regardless of the zoning height. Bob Beck replied that the commitment would vary with the area of the approved building, but there is some flexibility in volume vs. height, and the developer may be able to recapture some space by adjusting the tapering of the building.

Mr. Switzky advised they will be looking at streets and open spaces and will concentrate on pedestrian circulation.

**This slide show presentation can be viewed on the internet at <http://transitcenter.sfplanning.org>.**

Michael Kiesling commented that he does not like the 2<sup>nd</sup> and Howard park plan and thinks it would be better to put up a building with a grand stairway. Josh will bring back the idea of facades from historic buildings with the open space.

## **6. Public Comment**

Chair Lazarus invited public comment.

Jennifer Clary stated that she was surprised that a shadow study has not been done for South Park and other open spaces south of the Transit Center. Josh replied that those open spaces are not covered under the shadow ordinance, but, because they are south of the proposed towers they will not be shadowed by the tower. Ms. Clary asked if additional seismic analysis would be done before they decide on the building height and is the Planning Department doing a comprehensive seismic study. Josh advised that the Planning Department does not do these types of studies. Andrew Brooks suggested that it was the Department of Building Inspection responsibility and not the Planning Department.

Jane Morrison, speaking on behalf of San Francisco Tomorrow, said that San Francisco Tomorrow is concerned about earthquakes and what the plans are regarding it; feels that a park on top of a building is not as beneficial as open space at street level; and wants to make sure that the train extension is built.

Chair Lazarus invited comments from both TJPA CAC members as well as the public. Andrew Brooks asked when will the Planning Department recommendations be adopted and Josh said they anticipate final adoption to be in the fall of 2009. Andrew Brooks asked if there will be enough money in the budget to complete it and Josh replied “yes.” David Milton asked if the information presented will be the recommendation of the Planning Department. Josh answered that it represents their initial proposal, but they will refine the recommendations as they have workshops and things change. He said he will probably return to the CAC to talk about it again in the future.

Richard Brooks asked if it would be possible to get a credential for access to the APTA Rail Conference for TJPA CAC members. Bob Beck did not know, but would find out.

**(Note: We were unable to secure passes for CAC members)**

Norm Rolfe asked if the pros and cons of selling verses leasing land development rights for the Transit Tower had been considered and if an economic analysis had been done. Bob advised that the competition proposals had included both a ground lease and a purchase option and that the proposals had differed economically. Each of the teams expressed significant reservations about the ground lease option, especially where condominiums were being proposed for sale within the Tower. .

#### **7. Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled on Tuesday, June 10, 2008.

#### **8. Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by Jane Morrison and seconded by Richard Brooks. A vote was called by voice and the motion was unanimously moved and carried. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Lazarus at 7:25 p.m.

The Ethics Commission of the City and County of San Francisco has asked us to remind individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Admin. Code Sections 16.520 - 16.534] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 1390 Market Street, Suite 801, San Francisco, CA 94102, telephone (415) 554-9510, fax (415) 554-8757 and web site: [sfgov.org/ethics](http://sfgov.org/ethics).