**Recommendation**

The Port Commission should be restructured to reflect more public interest. The Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors seek necessary changes in state law to allow a charter amendment to be submitted to the public for revision of the current five-member Port Commission appointed by the Mayor to a Port Commission with three mayoral appointees and two by the Board of Supervisors. We recommend that this change be put before the voters in 2015.

**Board of Supervisors**

Recommendation lodged with the City Attorney.

Once established, the Board of Supervisors will be well-prepared to undergo the Board of Supervisors' jurisdiction, replacing both Superintendents' approval in San Francisco's state representatives are the more appropriate officials to undertake this effort. Further, there is a process for how Port Commissioners are selected that goes through the Board of Supervisors, when the Mayor nominates a Commissioner, that nomination is subject to Board of Supervisors' approval and a public hearing is held by the Board of Supervisors Committee.

**DEPARTMENT DID NOT PROVIDE INTENT TO IMPLEMENT**

This recommendation is unnecessary and there appears to be no perceivable benefit. First, the Board of Supervisors already approves Mayoral appointments to the Port Commission. If Bay area, a Supervisor has the ability to re-appoint any Port Commission appointment. Second, state law would need to be revised for voters to even consider this recommendation. Such an effort would be an unproductive use of City lobbying efforts in Sacramento.

**Port of San Francisco**

Recommendation has been in practice since 2006

The recommendation already represents the Port's current practice. The Port does NOT have a policy of attempting to repair all existing piers and related structures. The Port initiated its 30-Year Capital Plan in 2006 and noted the goal of the 30-year Capital Plan is to provide a bank for pursuing public funding and public/private partnerships to address the Port's critical capital needs, and to prioritize spending based on public safety, fiscal responsibility, and the Port’s mission. The Port will identify facilities and closure piers that the Port may need to close. The Port will be authorized to close these facilities, thereby freeing monies for repair of more significant structures and create more open space.

**Recommendation in Practice**

The Port of San Francisco is actively pursuing growth in this area and should continue to engage public input and guidance to define the project objectives and priorities prior to soliciting development partners. Even in non-RFP situations, such as development of the Pier 30-32 and Seawall Lot 33, the Port actively engages the public in review of these variances. Where this is known before the Port solicits development partners, the Port does conduct public processes to directly address this need. The Pier 30-32 project planning efforts for Seawall Lot 33 and the Pier 70 waterfront (now designed specifically to engage public input and guidance to define the project objectives and priorities prior to soliciting development partners), even in non-RFP situations, such as the Golden State Warriors’ proposal for the Pier 30-32 & Seawall Lot 33, the public process made clear from the outset that such projects would require amendments to both the Port’s waterfront land use plan and to city zoning, in particular regarding project heights. Public comments and concerns regarding these amendment requirements received a high degree of public review and debate. For example, the Port actively engages the public in review of these variances. Where this is known before the Port solicits development partners, the Port does conduct public processes to directly address this need. On the Pier 30-32 project planning efforts for Seawall Lot 33 and the Pier 70 waterfront (now designed specifically to engage public input and guidance to define the project objectives and priorities prior to soliciting development partners), even in non-RFP situations, such as the Golden State Warriors’ proposal for the Pier 30-32 & Seawall Lot 33, the public process made clear from the outset that such projects would require amendments to both the Port’s waterfront land use plan and to city zoning, in particular regarding project heights. Public comments and concerns regarding these amendment requirements received a high degree of public review and debate.

**Recommendation in Practice**

The Port provides public notification and the CA C’s meetings follow all requirements, including the Brown Act, for public meetings. Opportunities for public input are provided through venues beyond the CAC, including during the Planning Department’s CEQA review process. During CEQA, facts and data are gathered to improve understanding of a project’s potential impacts on land, water, air, noise, historic resources, living creatures, aesthetics, and resources both cultural and natural. It is during this review that multiple iterations of the project are explored and vetted for public consideration through highly prescriptive and process-oriented regulations such that every public comment is considered and given a written response. We agree that public scrutiny is critical to the review process and that adherence to the City Plan and the City’s zoning laws are achieved through the ultimate project. While some variances should be limited to those which are determined to be necessary for a project that better meets public needs, variances are typically minor exceptions to existing law. As such, the need for these variances would not be assessed at issuance of the RFP and would likely only be identified after the project has developed in more detailed renderings.

**Planning Department**

DEPARTMENT DID NOT PROVIDE INTENT TO IMPLEMENT. Looks like recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable.

We agree that the waterfront is of critical importance to the City of San Francisco. We disagree that public input is limited and only includes members of the CA C. The Port provides public notification and the CA C’s meetings follow all requirements, including the Brown Act, for public meetings. Opportunities for early public input are provided through venues beyond the CA C, including during the Planning Department’s CEQA review process. During CEQA, facts and data are gathered to improve understanding of a project’s potential impacts on land, water, air, noise, historic resources, living creatures, aesthetics, and resources both cultural and natural. It is during this review that multiple iterations of the project are explored and vetted for public consideration through highly prescriptive and process-oriented regulations such that every public comment is considered and given a written response. We agree that public scrutiny is critical to the review process and that adherence to the City Plan and the City’s zoning laws are achieved through the ultimate project. While some variances should be limited to those which are determined to be necessary for a project that better meets public needs, variances are typically minor exceptions to existing law. As such, the need for these variances would not be assessed at issuance of the RFP and would likely only be identified after the project has developed in more detailed renderings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CGJ Year</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Department Required to Respond</th>
<th>2014 Recommendation Response</th>
<th>2014 Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>R4a: The Port should immediately begin an assessment and update of the Waterfront Land Use Plan, to be renamed the Waterfront Maritime and Land Use Plan to meet current and future requirements for Port development. This should be completed and adopted in a relatively short time span of one to two years.</td>
<td>Port of San Francisco</td>
<td>Recommendation is underway.</td>
<td>After the vacancies are filled, the Waterfront Land Use Plan is a living document that must be revised and adapted. On August 11, 2014, Port staff issued an initial report to the Port Commission and public that presents an assessment of projects, activities and public discourse over the 17 year life of the Waterfront Land Use Plan. It seeks to surface new ideas and concepts that might be woven into the Waterfront Land Use Plan. The Port staff analysis in this report grapples with the highest level set of issues, including uses of the port area, historic rehabilitation, open space, waterfront development, urban design, transportation, sea level rise and public process, including preliminary recommendations in each of these areas. These recommendations are offered to the public, the Port Commission, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor in the spirit of keeping the Waterfront Land Use Plan as relevant today as it was when it was adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>R4b: The Port should ensure that changes or variances to the existing Waterfront Land Use Plan or the City’s General Plan should have extensive public input before implementation.</td>
<td>Port of San Francisco</td>
<td>Recommendation has been in practice since 1997.</td>
<td>All Port development projects undergo a robust public review and vetting process, particularly those that require amendments to the Waterfront Land Use Plan and City General Plan. The current planning construct incorporates careful professional staff and other reviews of many issues to balance multiple public benefit and policy objectives, including land use density and compatibility, historic preservation, transportation, public open space, urban form and architectural design. This multi-layered review grows in response to articulated public values and the City’s changing economic needs and design goals over the years and is tailored to the issues and needs raised by particular projects. The multiple public hearings provide ample opportunity for public input to shape development projects. Any change to the City’s General Plan falls under the responsibility of the Planning Commission. Under existing law and practice the Commission demands that professional planning feed data and analysis to the Commission in a transparent and public process that provides holistic assessment of the proposed change and its potential effect on the City. Beginning with CEQA review, facts and data are gathered to improve understanding of a project’s potential impacts on land, water, air, noise, historic resources, living creatures, aesthetics, and resources both cultural and natural. Next, the Planning Department provides an interpretation of the data; evaluating the project against the City’s adopted policies. This professional analysis provides additional information for members of the public to respond to and evaluate for themselves whether the project meets planning goals and ensures that decisions are rooted both in adopted policies and contemporary best practices. Fully informed decision makers then can seek to mold the project that not only meets City laws and policies but also leverages public benefits to best meet the adopted vision for the waterfront.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>R4b: The Port should ensure that changes or variances to the existing Waterfront Land Use Plan or the City’s General Plan should have extensive public input before implementation.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Recommendation has been implemented.</td>
<td>The current planning construct incorporates careful professional staff and other reviews of many issues to balance multiple public benefit and policy objectives, including land use density and compatibility, historic preservation, transportation, public open space, urban form and architectural design. This multi-layered review grows in response to articulated public values and the City’s changing economic needs and design goals over the years and is tailored to the issues and needs raised by particular projects. The multiple public hearings provide ample opportunity for public input to shape development projects. Any change to the City’s General Plan falls under the responsibility of the Planning Commission. Under existing law and practice the Commission demands that professional planning feed data and analysis to the Commission in a transparent and public process that provides holistic assessment of the proposed change and its potential effect on the City. Beginning with CEQA review, facts and data are gathered to improve understanding of a project’s potential impacts on land, water, air, noise, historic resources, living creatures, aesthetics, and resources both cultural and natural. Next, the Planning Department provides an interpretation of the data; evaluating the project against the City’s adopted policies. This professional analysis provides additional information for members of the public to respond to and evaluate for themselves whether the project meets planning goals and ensures that decisions are rooted both in adopted policies and contemporary best practices. Fully informed decision makers then can seek to mold the project that not only meets City laws and policies but also leverages public benefits to best meet the adopted vision for the waterfront.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PORT RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES
The Port of SF Caught Between Public Trust

Recommendation

Department Required to Respond

Will not be implemented, not warranted

2014 Recommendation Response

Recommendation has been underway since 2012

PORT RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

2013-14

CGJ Year

and Private Dollars

vessels easier access to the City as a pilot program. This lobbying effort should be in conjunction with other U.S. passenger port destinations including those in Alaska, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington.

R6: The City should immediately begin lobbying for modifications to the Passenger Vessel Services Act of 1886 to allow foreign-flagged vessels easier access to the City as a pilot program. This lobbying effort should be in conjunction with other U.S. passenger port destinations including those in Alaska, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington.

Recommendation implemented

The Port was a founding member of the "Cruise America" coalition of U.S. West Coast Ports and other tourism interests who, in 1998, sought a legislative exception of the Passenger Vessel Services Act (PVSA). This effort gained support in Congress under the leadership of Senator John McCain (R-AZ), then chairman of the Commerce Science and Transportation Committee. Senator McCain led the legislative effort in congress by sponsoring the United States Cruise Tourism Act which would allow foreign-owning passenger ships to serve multiple destinations along U.S. Coasts while protecting U.S. based companies. This 1998 effort to modify the PVSA encountered fierce opposition from some segments of organized labor, including unions that represented employees of other foreign maritime tenants. While theoretically an exception to the PVSA would provide additional work for and based maritime unions, other unions representing seafaring workers found that granting exceptions or weakening the PVSA would irreparably harm the nation's shipbuilding and merchant marine industry. Ultimately the bill did not gain traction and the effort was shelved. Ironically, the cruise industry is not advocating any change to this law. Cruise lines, through their International Association, think that while a reformed PVSA might add some new U.S. ports to cruise itineraries, it would not be a significant

R5: SFMTA should incorporate current and future transit needs, taking into consideration not only increased capacity requirements from individual projects, but the cumulative effect of multiple projects added to existing passenger loads. SFMTA must address reliability and increased capacity that will be required for all modes of transportation, especially the T-Line and motor coach lines connecting to the Pier 70 site. The VETAG system should be maintained to operate at maximum efficiency.

Recommendation will not be implemented by Port. Recommendation is being analyzed by American Association of Port Authorities

2014 Recommendation Response

Recommendation was evaluated to move the current and planned transportation network (the transportation "pipeline") in the face of cumulative future development through 2000. The guiding principles of the Assessment have been "capacity, safety, reliability and flexibility," and were established by SFMTA in coordination with the Port, other city departments and regional transit providers, with oversight by community stakeholders. The Assessment was structured around three major development proposals on Port properties: the Warriors Arena at Piers 30-32 and SWL 330 (now relocated to non-Port property in Mission Bay), SWL 337 - the Giants Mission Rock, and Pier 70 (Forest City). The SFMTA and the Waterfront Transportation Assessment have worked closely with the Port, Environmental Planning and D6/6D to ensure that project transportation management plans were being conceived of in a framework of the comprehensive waterfront transportation network, along with growth anticipated through 2040. In light of the status of these major proposals, this work will be ongoing to infancy, and be informed, by the development proposals as they advance. Though no longer on Port property, the Warriors Arena in Mission Bay is the most active project that will impact the waterfront transportation network, and SFMTA continues to closely track and coordinate its transportation plans. The Waterfront Transportation Assessment is anticipated to continue into early 2015, and will not only help the city and SFMTA in evaluating, prioritizing, planning and funding for maximum efficiency.

R4: The City should immediately begin lobbying for passage of the "Cruise America" coalition legislation to permit non-U.S. flag cruise ships to operate where there is no large U.S. flag cruise ship in service.

A decision has been made that the Port and SFMTA have partnered with numerous cruise operators to develop special cruise itineraries for the Port that have generated large amounts of revenue.

The Board of Supervisors did not implement the Board of Supervisors Resolutions. In the appropriate MTC to be approved at an upcoming Board meeting. However, the Board of Supervisors encourages the Port to advocate and pursue any amendments or exceptions from the Passenger Vessel Services Act (PVSA) that could benefit the Port and the City. The Board will support the Port in this effort however it can.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Department Required to Respond</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>R7: The Port should consider alternatives to fund the costs of rehabilitating Piers 30-32. The sale of Seawall Lot 330 could supply a large portion of $68M needed to strengthen the substructure for light use. The Jury recommends that the Port actively investigate alternative light uses for Piers 30-32. In addition to general park usage, sports fields for soccer, tennis, basketball, or other sports could be provided. Temporary venues for entertainment companies such as Teatro ZinZanni, Cirque de Soleil, and Cavalia would also not require an extensive substructure. Although not light use, the Port might also consider placement of a major marine research institute to fully utilize the unique characteristics of this site.</td>
<td>Port of San Francisco</td>
<td>Recommendation is underway with anticipated conclusion by June 30, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structures atop Piers 30-32 were destroyed by fire in 1984. Since that time, the Port has continued to analyze alternatives to rehabilitate Piers 30-32, including both public and private investments. The Golden State Warriors proposal represented the 6th proposed rehabilitation since the 1980s. Subsequent to the decision of the GSW not to pursue Piers 30-32, Port staff has analyzed alternatives such as general park usage, sports fields, cruise berthing, etc. Such analysis is published more completely in an August 2014 Memorandum to the Port Commission. Any permanent change in use resulting in an increase in the volume of public users must consider major rehabilitation including a seismic upgrade. The total cost of a substructure rehabilitation including seismic strengthening will depend on the type and size of these improvements and is expected to be around $100 million. Temporary uses or events lasting 180 days or less are acceptable. However, they must consider structural load limits currently in place.

| 2013-14 | The Port of SF: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars | R8a. All major events at the Port, like the America’s Cup, must be approved by the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors. | Port of San Francisco | Recommendation was implemented previous to this finding. |

Indeed, all major events at the Port, like the 34th America’s Cup, are approved by the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The Port Commission held 39 separate hearings to publicly review, comment and vote on the activities of the 34th America’s Cup from March 2009 through September 2013. This included 16 informational presentations and 23 approval requests submitted for Port Commission consideration and action. Similarly, the Board of Supervisors also held 33 hearings to publicly review, comment and vote on activities of the 34th America’s Cup from April 2010 through October 2013. The hearings pertained to activities of the 34th America’s Cup including, but not limited to, the (1) Host and Venue Agreement, (2) Final Environmental Impact Report and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, (3) MOU with the Port, (4) America’s Cup Workforce Development Plan, (5) budget appropriation ordinances, and (6) Lease Disposition Agreement. Of these 31 hearings, 16 were hearings before the full Board of Supervisors and 15 were committee hearings including 12 before the Budget and Finance Committee and subject to review and report by the Budget Analyst to the Board of Supervisors.

| 2013-14 | The Port of SF: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars | R8a. All major events at the Port, like the America’s Cup, must be approved by the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors. | Board of Supervisors | Has been implemented |

“Major” is a subjective term, but if it is taken to mean an event similar to the 34th America’s Cup, this recommendation has been implemented. As the Port’s response notes, the America’s Cup was extensively vetted and approved by both the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Port of SF: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Department Required to Respond</th>
<th>2014 Recommendation Response</th>
<th>2014 Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>R8a. All major events at the Port, like the America's Cup, must be approved by the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors.</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Recommendation already implemented</td>
<td>The Port Commission held hearings to publicly review, comment, and vote on the activities of the 34th America's Cup that took place on or affected Port property. From March 2009 through September 2013, the Port Commission heard 39 separate items regarding activities of the 34th America’s Cup, including 16 informational presentations and 23 approval requests submitted for Port Commission consideration and action. Similarly, the Board of Supervisors also held hearings to publicly review, comment and vote on activities of the 34th America’s Cup. From April 2010 through October 2013, the Board of Supervisors held 31 hearings regarding activities of the 34th America’s Cup, including, but not limited to, (1) the Host and Venue Agreement, (2) Final Environmental Impact Report and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, (3) Memorandum of Understanding with the Port, (4) America’s Cup Workforce Development Plan, (5) budget appropriation ordinances, and (6) Lease Disposition Agreement. Of these 31 hearings, 16 were hearings before the full Board of Supervisors and 15 were committee hearings including 12 before the Budget and Finance Committee and subject to review and report by the Budget Analyst to the Board of Supervisors. Finally, the Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to approve the entire transaction three separate times: once in approving the Host and Venue Agreement in December 2010, once to approve the project after the completion of CEQA in March 2012, and again in September 2012 when the security arrangements that were first approved had to be restratuated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>R8b: Prior to approval, the City should require a validated cost proposal using fair market rental rates, revenue sharing with the Port, marquee billing for the City, full post-event accounting, and posting of all event financials on the Port website within one month after completion of the event. Said report shall include an itemization of:</td>
<td>Port of San Francisco</td>
<td>Recommendation was previously implemented. No current event pending at this time.</td>
<td>The analysis that Port staff provided to the Board of Supervisors for its initial approval of America’s Cup agreements was intended to provide a detailed quantitative and qualitative analysis of the prospective regatta as was known at the time. Port staff briefed the Port Commission on an ongoing basis as more facts of the regatta and the projected outcomes were known. In responding to future unique waterfront opportunities the public and the Port Commission should expect a thorough analysis of the opportunity and the expected impact on public use and enjoyment of the waterfront as well as operating and capital costs. With respect to marquee billing, the City and Port required the America’s Cup Event Authority to optimize the association of the City with the Event, recognizing the value and global reach of Event media coverage. The Port aggressively asserted its rights to accelerate part of the Cruise Terminal project schedule so that the “Port of San Francisco” sign atop it was installed prior to the start of racing and thus captured in international broadcast that aired repeatedly in 130 countries worldwide. Physical signage in camera shots is the most valuable form of advertising, as superimposed digital imagery must be removed prior to rebroadcast in most countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Department Required to Respond</td>
<td>2014 Recommendation - Responded</td>
<td>2014 Recommendation - Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF. Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>The Port should ensure ongoing community input be maintained until an acceptable compromise is reached on the final plans.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Should and should not be implemented!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF. Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>The Port should ensure ongoing community input be maintained until an acceptable compromise is reached on the final plans.</td>
<td>Recreation and Parks Department</td>
<td>The ongoing community input must be maintained, but it is the responsibility of the appointed and elected decision makers to determine the project that best meets public needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF. Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>The Port of SF. Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>Recreation and Parks Department</td>
<td>The Department of Public Works agrees with this recommendation especially that community input usually generates comments and ideas that benefit projects and ensures that final plan reflect community needs and concerns. The Department of Public Works worked closely with the Port in providing information and input on all matters related to Pier 70 Master Plan that are under Public Works jurisdiction. The Department of Public Works implemented a similar extensive outreach process for its projects and will continue to implement such a process in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF. Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>The Pier is to approach, the City should require a validated cost proposal using fair market rental rates, revenue sharing with the Port, an open bidding for the City, full post-event accounting, and posting of all event financials on the Port website within one month after completion of the event. Said report shall include an analysis of:</td>
<td>Recreation and Parks Department</td>
<td>The current recommendation should be implemented in that community input should be maintained. This recommendation should not be implemented in that it is the responsibility of the various duly appointed and elected decision makers to determine the project that best meets public needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When responding to future unique waterfront opportunities, the Port Commission, Board of Supervisors, and members of the public should expect a thorough analysis of the opportunity and the expected impact on public use and enjoyment of the waterfront as well as operating and capital costs.

During the initial approval of America’s Cup agreements, the Board of Supervisors was provided a detailed quantative and qualitative analysis of the prospective regatta as was known at the time by City staff. America’s Cup Organizing Committee engaged an outside economics firm to validate assumptions related to event-related revenues. Port staff briefed the Port Commission on an ongoing basis as more facts of the regatta and the projected outcomes were known. Furthermore, the Board of Supervisors Budget and Legislative Analyst performed a detailed analysis of the event costs before the approvals in 2010 and 2012. Both of these estimates proved to be well in excess of the costs that were actually incurred.

San Francisco received “marquee billing” while hosting the America’s Cup. The host agreement specifically noted the City’s desire for San Francisco exposure. The official logo included the words “San Francisco.” Most dramatically, the television broadcast of the event spectacularly showcased the City’s waterfront sensor to an international audience. When all America’s Cup costs were accounted for after the event, City staff provided another detailed presentation to the Board of Supervisors and the Budget and Legislative Analyst issued another report.

The recommendation to post online all event financials one month after the event will not be implemented. For example, one month after the America’s Cup was not enough time to complete “event financials” as the permits for the event required a number of post-event remediations and improvements.

The Port of SF. Caught Between Public Trust

The Department of Public Works recommends that a community input process be implemented in that ongoing community input should be maintained. This recommendation should be implemented in that ongoing community input should be maintained. This recommendation should not be included on the final plan.

The Port of SF. Caught Between Public Trust

The Port should ensure ongoing community input be maintained until an acceptable compromise is reached on the final plans.

The Port of San Francisco has been ongoing since 1997

The Port and developer will continue to solicit public input until final adoption of the project by the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The Port will continue to solicit feedback from the public throughout meetings of the Central Waterfront Advisory Group, as well as through items before the Port Commission, the Planning Commission, BCDC and ultimately the Board of Supervisors. The developer has implemented an extensive community outreach program since development rights were awarded in April 2011. Additionally, the developer has placed a measure before the San Francisco electorate for the November 2014 election seeking public approval of its proposed project height.

The Port of SF. Caught Between Public Trust

The recommendation to post online all event financials one month after the event will not be implemented. For example, one month after the America’s Cup was not enough time to complete “event financials” as the permits for the event required a number of post-event remediations and improvements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Department Required to Respond</th>
<th>CBO Recommendation Response</th>
<th>CBO Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF - Caught Between Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>The Jury neither supports nor opposes the development of Pier 70 but we strongly endorse the extensive public outreach and community input as part of the design and development process of the Pier 70 Master Plan.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Will not be implemented</td>
<td>The recommendation will not be implemented for all projects. This three-year process was appropriate for the large, 68 acre site of Pier 70 but may be excessive for most projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF - Caught Between Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>The Jury neither supports nor opposes the development of Pier 70 but we strongly endorse the extensive public outreach and community input as part of the design and development process of the Pier 70 Master Plan.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Implemented similar outreach process.</td>
<td>The Department of Public Works agrees with this recommendation. We work closely with the Port of San Francisco on many small and large projects and we collaborate on public outreach and coordination with all affected agencies. However, while every development opportunity must undergo thorough public review, not every project will require the steps that were conducted for the Pier 70 Preferred Master Plan. The Department of Public Works implemented a similar extensive outreach process for its projects, and will continue to implement such a process in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF - Caught Between Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>The Jury neither supports nor opposes the development of Pier 70 but we strongly endorse the extensive public outreach and community input as part of the design and development process of the Pier 70 Master Plan.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>This recommendation will not be implemented for all projects.</td>
<td>This three-year public outreach and community input process was needed to address the numerous conditions specific to the 68-acre site of Pier 70. While every development opportunity must undergo thorough public review, the input process for Pier 70 may be excessive for most projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF - Caught Between Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>The Jury recommends increased publicity and outreach so that an acceptable compromise can be reached on the scope of this development.</td>
<td>Port of San Francisco</td>
<td>Recommendation has been ongoing since 2007</td>
<td>The Port, City and the Mission Rock developer will continue an ongoing, robust public outreach program to advise and engage the community groups, neighborhood and merchants’ associations, and residents potentially affected by this project. Additionally, the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors will continue to hold public hearings on this project which can be viewed on SFgateTV at any time. Port staff will continue to publish staff memos regarding this project which are available to the public through the Port Commission secretary or on the Port’s website at <a href="http://sfport.com/News.aspx?app=20">http://sfport.com/News.aspx?app=20</a>. This project will also undergo environmental review per CEQA, which is a robust process open to the public. This project will also be submitted to the San Francisco electorate to review the project’s proposed building heights. The Port further expects that many media organizations will also continue to cover this project for the benefit of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF - Caught Between Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>The Jury recommends increased publicity and outreach so that an acceptable compromise can be reached on the scope of this development.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Did not implement</td>
<td>The Planning Department would like to reinforce the Port’s stated commitment to a continuing, robust outreach program. This project is not complete and the public can expect further outreach to community groups, neighborhood and merchants’ associations, and residents potentially affected by this project. Required public hearings will also occur for this project as well as our complete CEQA review. Each of these steps includes public review and comment as well as responses from the appropriate staff and final action by decision makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF - Caught Between Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>The Jury recommends that the Port Commission work with the Board of Supervisors to place a referendum before the voters that asks for approval to issue IFD Bonds. Such a referendum should specifically state the total amount of bonded indebtedness that the Port seeks to incur through IFD Bonds, the specific sources of funds for IFD Bond repayment, and the length of time required to discharge any IFD Bond debt.</td>
<td>Port of San Francisco</td>
<td>Recommendation will not be implemented since it is redundant</td>
<td>Under the Board of Supervisors’ policy enabling the Port to create an IFD tax increment district, expenditures are restricted to infrastructure improvements that have been approved in the Port’s 10-Year Capital Plan and have CEQA clearance. These processes, independently, include lengthy, thorough public review. Further, since IFDs cannot be formed until after CEQA is complete, this recommendation would essentially require two major public votes for these projects, separated by many years. IFD tax increment generates these projects that is not required to pay for new public infrastructure to support these neighborhoods is likely to be an important source of funding to address the Port’s seawall and projected sea level rise – again without raising taxes. Where taxpayers are being asked to pay for improvements to Port property through financing vehicles such as General Obligation Bonds – to pay for parks, for example – Port staff agree that voter approval is the right (and legally required) approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF - Caught Between Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>The Jury recommends that the Port Commission work with the Board of Supervisors to place a referendum before the voters that asks for approval to issue IFD Bonds. Such a referendum should specifically state the total amount of bonded indebtedness that the Port seeks to incur through IFD Bonds, the specific sources of funds for IFD Bond repayment, and the length of time required to discharge any IFD Bond debt.</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Did not implement</td>
<td>The Board of Supervisors has passed significant restrictions on how the Port manages IFD bonds, and we in processes that evolve extensive public outreach and voter approval would yield greater awareness, but is not necessary for us to determine the taxpayers’ interests are protected. Port IFDs are repaid via increment tax generated from Port property and do not increase taxes on voters. Other City agencies successfully issue similar bonds without voter approval, such as Municipal Transportation Agency revenue bonds. Bonds that do encompass taxpayers, as General Obligation bonds, rightly require voter approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF - Caught Between Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>The Jury recommends that the Port Commission work with the Board of Supervisors to place a referendum before the voters that asks for approval to issue IFD Bonds. Such a referendum should specifically state the total amount of bonded indebtedness that the Port seeks to incur through IFD Bonds, the specific sources of funds for IFD Bond repayment, and the length of time required to discharge any IFD Bond debt.</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Did not implement</td>
<td>The recommendation will not be implemented for all projects. This three-year process was appropriate for the large, 68 acre site of Pier 70 but may be excessive for most projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Port of SF. Caught Between Public and Private Dollars

2014-14
The Port of SF. Caught Between Public and Private Dollars
Finding 2: The waterfront is one of the most desirable areas in the City. Proposed projects receive only limited public input by Citizen Advisory Committees (CAC) whose members are selected by the Port. The Planning Department and Mayor's Office have a great deal of authority to influence the selection of development projects. Citizens at large are made aware of these projects only after the Port has published an RFP. The public is not made aware of possible alternate uses that may have been considered during the early stages of project planning.

Findings Response (Agree/Disagree)

[Board of Supervisors]
Partially disagree

The board of supervisors cannot speak to the specific level or nature of influence as it is not privy to all the interactions between the Mayor's Office and the Port, though the Mayor's Office does influence many activities at the Port and throughout the City. It is difficult to assess "monetarist public input" due, based on available evidence, the Board believes that the Port Commission has followed the same practices as every other City agency with respect to public comment, open meetings, etc. There are several other commissions that deal with land use decision and are appointed by the Mayor, including the Public Utilities Commission, Recreation and Parks Commission, Airport Commission, Fire Commission, and Municipal Transportation Agency Board. The Port, like any other Commission did its due diligence in trying to obtain public comment.

[Port of San Francisco] Partially disagree

The port has one of the most diverse maritime portfolios of any port on the West Coast. The Port also manages Foreign Trade Zone No. 3; covering 7 Bay Area counties. Additionally, the Port is home to 65+ acres of open space and park lands. On a Island-based, maritime use and open space/parkland activities account for 65% of the Port's asset portfolio while commercial real estate accounts for 35%. Maritime operations typically require large, low density footprints and are limited to ground level. Parks and open space areas also are limited to the ground level. By contrast commercial real estate operations are high density uses and can be implemented in multi-story facilities, such as the Ferry Building. As such, they generate a higher return per square foot than either maritime operations or parks and open space. Maritime activities often generate lower revenues than commercial real estate operations and logically would represent a smaller proportion of the Port's overall revenues. Open space and park activities do not generate any income and therefore are not captured in the Port's revenues. It is dangerous to measure the Port's value and contributions simply by a revenue basis. However, the Port agrees that Port facilities, especially Port terminals, be utilized for maritime purposes. To that end, the Port adapted its Maritime Industry Preservation Policy in 2011 which guides Port staff, tenants and developers in the importance of maintaining the Port's long-held maritime assets for current and future maritime activity in accordance with the City's long maritime history, the Port's core mission, the Public Trust doctrine and the Burton Act.

[Planning Department] Disagree partially

Recent activities at the Port have been strongly influenced by the Mayor's Office. These included the approval of the B & W Washington Street project, most aspects of the JWA American Cup/USA, a "legacies project" at Pier 32-42, and an underutilized cruise ship terminal at Pier 27. The Port Commission needed to find a way to clear a lot of political baggage in order to make the project happen. Planning Commission decisions require public input, but this process varies with land use decisions. Including Planning, Building Inspection, and Board of Permit Appeals, are not appointed solely by the mayor. Section 12 of the Burton Act specifies that all five Harbor Commissioners be appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board.

[2014 Findings Response Text]

We agree that the waterfront is of critical importance to the City of San Francisco. We disagree that public input is limited and only includes members of the CAC. The Port and the public have expended tremendous effort and investment to make this one of the most renowned waterfronts in the world, while still operating as a working port. The Port has a policy of attempting to repair all existing piers and related structures. The waterfront is one of the most desirable areas in the City. Proposed projects receive only limited public input by Citizen Advisory Committees (CAC) whose members are selected by the Port. The Planning Department and Mayor's Office have a great deal of authority to influence the selection of development projects. Citizens at large are made aware of these projects only after the Port has published an RFP. The public is not made aware of possible alternate uses that may have been considered during the early stages of project planning.
The overarching priority of the Waterfront Land Use Plan, and therefore the Port, is to reunite San Francisco with its waterfront. The success of the Port and its partners in meeting this priority is clear: more than 24 million people visited the waterfront in 2013 for employment, transportation, education, exploration, entertainment, recreation or simply to engage passively with the Bay. In the past 17 years, since adoption of the Waterfront Land Use Plan, the Port has realized more than $1.6 billion of investments from both public and private dollars. These investments have enhanced the quality of life for residents of the City and the greater Bay Area, as well as generated the City’s greater economic and environmental benefits. Specifically, the following improvements have been realized as a result of the Waterfront Land Use Plan and public input, creating more value for the citizens of San Francisco than at any other time in the past century: ~63 acres of waterfront open space, including 20 new parks; 19 prized Port historic resources have been fully or partially rehabilitated consistent with federal or local historic standards; to meet modern seismic standards allowing the public to enter and enjoy these resources, 7 landfill plans and elevations have been removed from the Bay (resulting in $4.3 million of new residential and commercial development); and 22 new acres of waterfront open space are being planned and constructed with the community for Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 70, to transform the Port’s central and southern waterfront. The Waterfront Land Use Plan anticipated the need for public-private development partners to improve Port facilities in addition to public funds. The Port’s 10-Year Capital Plan has advanced a more sophisticated understanding of Port capital needs that now supports a strategic approach to improve Port facilities. While the Port does strive to pursue projects that do not have to be validated, there is no stated priority for development. The development projects the Port has pursued have been effective means to repair Port properties and deliver public benefits, as well as Port revenue. All major development projects, whether or not the Office of Economic & Workforce Development has been involved, are thoroughly settled in public meetings over many years before they may be approved by the Port Commission, Planning Commission, BOS and Board of Supervisors. Multi-phase developments such as proposed for Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 70, undergo extra public planning process before soliciting development partners. In both cases, meetings were held to discuss the scale of adjacent development in Mission Bay and Dogpatch respectively and the potential for height increases. From the outset, the public knew that both of these projects would require amendments to the Waterfront Land Use Plan, City zoning and possibly other Planning Commission controls. The Port’s planning and community engagement efforts are planned specifically to meet community transparency. The priority of the Port for development is to create an income stream for capital improvements rather than a determination of how best to enhance the quality of life for the residents of the City. Port revitalization has been enhanced in the past by adherence to the Waterfront Land Use Plan. Developments have provided local business opportunities, mixed housing where appropriate, stronger public transit options, maintenance of height and bulk limits, and preservation of view corridors. Some uses, however, both current and proposed, of Port land do not conform to the Waterfront Land Use Plan. Zoning and height limits have been changed by the Planning Department and the Mayor’s Office. There is a lack of transparency in development proposals, particularly in regard to input from the Mayor’s Office and active involvement of former Mayoral staff advocating on behalf of developers, giving rise to concerns that an agreement had been reached prior to public input. The priority of the Port for development is to create an income stream for capital improvements rather than a determination of how best to enhance the quality of life for the residents of the City. Port revitalization has been enhanced in the past by adherence to the Waterfront Land Use Plan. Developments have provided local business opportunities, mixed housing where appropriate, stronger public transit options, maintenance of height and bulk limits, and preservation of view corridors. Some uses, however, both current and proposed, of Port land do not conform to the Waterfront Land Use Plan. Zoning and height limits have been changed by the Planning Department and the Mayor’s Office. There is a lack of transparency in development proposals, particularly in regard to input from the Mayor’s Office and active involvement of former Mayoral staff advocating on behalf of developers, giving rise to concerns that an agreement had been reached prior to public input. The priority of the Port for development is to create an income stream for capital improvements rather than a determination of how best to enhance the quality of life for the residents of the City. Port revitalization has been enhanced in the past by adherence to the Waterfront Land Use Plan. Developments have provided local business opportunities, mixed housing where appropriate, stronger public transit options, maintenance of height and bulk limits, and preservation of view corridors. Some uses, however, both current and proposed, of Port land do not conform to the Waterfront Land Use Plan. Zoning and height limits have been changed by the Planning Department and the Mayor’s Office. There is a lack of transparency in development proposals, particularly in regard to input from the Mayor’s Office and active involvement of former Mayoral staff advocating on behalf of developers, giving rise to concerns that an agreement had been reached prior to public input.
Since 2002, the Port has worked in close coordination with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority to improve waterfront access and transportation. The Port estimates that there is between $750,000 and $1 million economic benefit to the City from each docking. This includes ship provisioning, tourism, berthing fees and tugboats.

The Passenger Vessel Services Act of 1886, prohibits foreign-flagged passenger ships from calling on two U.S. ports without an intervening foreign port. This Act greatly restricts the use of the newly built Cruise Ship Terminal. The Port estimates that the terminal will be underutilized. Based on current usage, cruise ship clockings directly result in anywhere from $40 million to $50 million in economic benefit per year.

When it becomes operational, the Cruise Ship Terminal at Pier 27 is projected to be severely underutilized. This is because federal law, namely the Passenger Vessel Services Act of 1886, prohibits foreign-flagged passenger ships from calling on two U.S. ports without an intervening foreign port. This Act greatly restricts the use of the newly built Cruise Ship Terminal. The Port estimates that the terminal would increase from the current 50 visits per year to 150 visits if the Passenger Vessel Services Act of 1886 were amended or the Port received a waiver for a pilot program. It is also estimated that there is between $750,000 and $1 million economic benefit to the City from each docking. This includes ship provisioning, tourism, berthing fees and tugboats.

Embarcadero. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency master plan does not directly address development on Port lands.

Kaiser Disagree

SFMTA fully disagree with the statement that future growth along the waterfront will yield new demands on the transportation network. SFMTA fully disagrees with the statement that the transportation along the waterfront does not meet current needs and that SFMTA is not addressing development on Port lands. While the waterfront transportation network does address some experience service challenges, especially during the AM and PM peak periods, the SFMTA faces challenges that every day by serving thousands of trips by transit, bicycle, pedestrian, paratransit, taxi and auto. In planning for local transportation modes and parking throughout the waterfront transportation network, there is a very dense urban environment that has limited capacity on its streets, SFMTA transportation planners must strive to be as efficient and resourceful in the use of space as possible, resulting in coordinating actions such as allowing emergency vehicles to use the exclusive right-of-way on the Embarkado, redirecting traffic around cruise ship arrivals, or adding supplemental Muni services during large events. With regards to the statement "San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency master plan does not directly address development on Port lands", it is important to note that SFMTA does not, per se, maintain a "master plan" for the San Francisco transportation network. At standard practice, the Agency works internally with Agency divisions, and externally with city departments, the Port, regional transportation agencies (e.g. BART, Caltrans, WMATA), and community stakeholders to coordinate their transportation plans with planned growth throughout the city. These include the San Francisco General Plan, the San Francisco County Transportation Plan, and the Waterfront Land Use Plan, maintained respectively by the San Francisco Planning Department, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority and the Port. With regard to coordinating transportation planning with development on Port lands, over the past two years, the SFMTA has been working directly with the Port, other public agencies (e.g., Planning, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment, BART, Caltrans, WMATA), project sponsors and community stakeholders on the Waterfront Transportation Assessment (the "Assessment") to identify needs and develop concepts for transportation improvements that specifically focus on areas of future development on Port properties, including Seawall Lot 37 and Plot 70. Phase 1 of the Assessment was completed late in 2013, and resulted in several dozen transportation strategies that may be enbodied to supplement current services, to advance planned services, and to support the transportation demands of future developments on both city and Port properties. The referenced transportation strategies are located at: (http://www.sfmta.com/stay/currentprojects/31117_PassengerVesselServicesAct2014draft.pdf). Phase 2 of the Waterfront Transportation Assessment will take shape as Port property development proposals are refined over the next several years, and will begin to move "transportation strategies" into "transportation solutions" that will accompany those projects.

Mayor Agree in part, disagree in part

Agree that the Passenger Vessel Services Act of 1886 prohibits foreign-flagged passenger ships from calling on two U.S. ports without an intervening foreign port. Disagree that the terminal will be underutilized. Based on current usage, cruise ship clockings directly result in anywhere from $40 million to $50 million in economic benefit per year.

Kaiser Partially Agree

Partial agreement that the Port of SF will add new transportation requirements. Transportation along the waterfront does not meet current needs. Portions of the Embarkado are closed during cruise ship arrivals and events at AT&T Park. Emergency vehicles sometimes use the light rail right-of-way to circumvent traffic even when there is no major activity on the Embarkado. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency master plan does not directly address development on Port lands.

Embarcadero. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency master plan does not directly address development on Port lands. However, certain transportation needs are not directly related to the Port and are thus developed in another plan. As such, portions of the Embarcadero are closed during cruise ship arrivals and events at AT&T Park. Emergency vehicles sometimes use the light rail right-of-way to circumvent traffic even when there is no major activity on the Embarkado. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency master plan does not directly address development on Port lands.

Kaiser Partially Agree

The Port of SF is further development along the waterfront will add new transportation requirements. Transportation along the waterfront does not meet current needs. Portions of the Embarkado are closed during cruise ship arrivals and events at AT&T Park. Emergency vehicles sometimes use the light rail right-of-way to circumvent traffic even when there is no major activity on the Embarkado. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency master plan does not directly address development on Port lands.

Embarcadero. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency master plan does not directly address development on Port lands. The Port of SF is further development along the waterfront will add new transportation requirements. Transportation along the waterfront does not meet current needs. Portions of the Embarkado are closed during cruise ship arrivals and events at AT&T Park. Emergency vehicles sometimes use the light rail right-of-way to circumvent traffic even when there is no major activity on the Embarkado. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency master plan does not directly address development on Port lands.

Kaiser Partially Agree

Partial agreement that the Port of SF is further development along the waterfront will add new transportation requirements. Transportation along the waterfront does not meet current needs. Portions of the Embarkado are closed during cruise ship arrivals and events at AT&T Park. Emergency vehicles sometimes use the light rail right-of-way to circumvent traffic even when there is no major activity on the Embarkado. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency master plan does not directly address development on Port lands.

Embarcadero. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency master plan does not directly address development on Port lands.
The Port of SF.Caught Between Public and Private Dollars

The Port Waterfront Land Use Plan designates Piers 30-32 and Seawall Lot 330 as a mixed use development opportunity site, and allows maritime, commercial, public assembly and entertainment and public open space uses at Piers 30-32, but a sports facility would have required an amendment to the Waterfront Land Use Plan, which includes for review and recommendation by the Board of Supervisors. The GSW proposal for Piers 30-32 was abandoned before BOS had concluded its review so whether the GSW project would have required an amendment to the San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan. The GSW proposal for Piers 30-32 was abandoned before BOS had completed its review and before the CAR reached any recommendation.

The Port of SF. Caught Between Public and Private Dollars

The 34th America’s Cup was a major monetary loss to the City’s taxpayers to the tune of about $6 million and a major loss to the Port of about $5.5 million in unreimbursed Port expenditures. The City and the Port subsidized the America’s Cup at taxpayers’ expense. The City received no direct revenue from the 34th America’s Cup event in the form of revenue sharing or venue rent. In negotiating event and/or development agreements at the waterfront, the City and Port does not seek to make a profit from the deal but is simply looking to recover its costs and break even.

Finding 8: The Port of SF. Caught Between Public and Private Dollars

The 34th America’s Cup was a major monetary loss to the City’s taxpayers to the tune of about $6 million and a major loss to the Port of about $5.5 million in unreimbursed Port expenditures. The City and the Port subsidized the America’s Cup at taxpayers’ expense. The City received no direct revenue from the 34th America’s Cup event in the form of revenue sharing or venue rent. In negotiating event and/or development agreements at the waterfront, the City and Port does not seek to make a profit from the deal but is simply looking to recover its costs and break even.

Finding 6: The Port of SF. Caught Between Public and Private Dollars

The City and the Port lost money on the 34th America’s Cup, but San Francisco experienced a net economic benefit. The Board of Supervisors will defer to the Port and the Civil Grand Jury on the 2013-14 America’s Cup event and/or development agreements at the waterfront, the City and Port does not seek to make a profit from the deal but is simply looking to recover its costs and break even.

Mayor Agree

The event operated at a profit when tax revenue and fundraising did not meet expectations, funding the 34th America’s Cup exceeded San Francisco’s lifetime and brought thousands of new jobs, led a legacy waterfront development opportunity, and allowed for waterfront, commercial, public assembly and entertainment and public open space uses at Piers 30-32. However, the City’s investment brought in $364 million in economic activity, created almost 2,900 jobs, and contributed almost $5.7 million in tax revenue to San Francisco. The City’s investment brought in more than 3,800 jobs, long-overdue legacy waterfront improvements, international visitor spending, and a boost to our regional economy. Overall, the events generated $550 million in economic activity, including new jobs, long-overdue legacy waterfront improvements, international visitor spending, and a boost to our regional economy.

Mayor Agree

While the event operated at a profit when tax revenue and fundraising did not meet expectations, funding the 34th America’s Cup exceeded San Francisco’s lifetime and brought thousands of new jobs, led a legacy waterfront development opportunity, and allowed for waterfront, commercial, public assembly and entertainment and public open space uses at Piers 30-32. However, the City’s investment brought in $364 million in economic activity, created almost 2,900 jobs, and contributed almost $5.7 million in tax revenue to San Francisco. The City’s investment brought in more than 3,800 jobs, long-overdue legacy waterfront improvements, international visitor spending, and a boost to our regional economy. Overall, the events generated $550 million in economic activity, including new jobs, long-overdue legacy waterfront improvements, international visitor spending, and a boost to our regional economy.

Mayor Agree

While the event operated at a profit when tax revenue and fundraising did not meet expectations, funding the 34th America’s Cup exceeded San Francisco’s lifetime and brought thousands of new jobs, led a legacy waterfront development opportunity, and allowed for waterfront, commercial, public assembly and entertainment and public open space uses at Piers 30-32. However, the City’s investment brought in $364 million in economic activity, created almost 2,900 jobs, and contributed almost $5.7 million in tax revenue to San Francisco. The City’s investment brought in more than 3,800 jobs, long-overdue legacy waterfront improvements, international visitor spending, and a boost to our regional economy. Overall, the events generated $550 million in economic activity, including new jobs, long-overdue legacy waterfront improvements, international visitor spending, and a boost to our regional economy. Overall, the events generated $550 million in economic activity, including new jobs, long-overdue legacy waterfront improvements, international visitor spending, and a boost to our regional economy.
The Port of SF. Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars

The Port does not have an official policy governing the process for proposed development projects. Many projects are moved ahead with minimal community input, often in the form of a quick review by the CAC and Planning Department then forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for final approval. The Pier 70 Master Plan was developed with significant community outreach to both the general public and affected neighborhood associations. The Plan represents a balance of community needs and the requirement of the developer to obtain a reasonable return on investment.

Finding 5: The Pier 70 Master Plan was developed with significant community outreach to both the general public and affected neighborhood associations. The Plan represents a balance of community needs and the requirement of the developer to obtain a reasonable return on investment.

Partially Agree

Although the development of Pier 48 and Seawall Lot 337, also known as Mission Rock, began in 2007, there has been insufficient information and involvement for Project Predevelopment Process: Since selection of the Mission Rock development team Port staff has collaborated with the developer on public outreach efforts. In addition, many written comments were received and considered through the Port's website and public meetings. Summary of all public comments were included in the record for the Port Commission's consideration when awarding the development opportunity to Mission Rock. Project Predevelopment Process: Since selection of the Mission Rock development team Port staff has collaborated with the developer on public outreach efforts.

Finding 10: Although the development of Pier 48 and Seawall Lot 337 also known as Mission Rock, began in 2007, there has been insufficient information and involvement for Project Predevelopment Process: Since selection of the Mission Rock development team Port staff has collaborated with the developer on public outreach efforts.

Agree in part

The Port, City and the developer have visited the following community groups with detailed Project briefings:

- Opportunity to Mission Rock
- Project Predevelopment Process: Since selection of the Mission Rock development team Port staff has collaborated with the developer on public outreach efforts.

Partially Disagree

The Port does not have an official policy governing the process for proposed development projects. Many projects are moved ahead with minimal community input, often in the form of a quick review by the CAC and Planning Department then forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for final approval. The Pier 70 Master Plan was developed with significant community outreach to both the general public and affected neighborhood associations. The Plan represents a balance of community needs and the requirement of the developer to obtain a reasonable return on investment.

Finding 5: The Pier 70 Master Plan was developed with significant community outreach to both the general public and affected neighborhood associations. The Plan represents a balance of community needs and the requirement of the developer to obtain a reasonable return on investment.

Partially Agree

Although the development of Pier 48 and Seawall Lot 337, also known as Mission Rock, began in 2007, there has been insufficient information and involvement for Project Predevelopment Process: Since selection of the Mission Rock development team Port staff has collaborated with the developer on public outreach efforts. In addition, many written comments were received and considered through the Port's website and public meetings. Summary of all public comments were included in the record for the Port Commission's consideration when awarding the development opportunity to Mission Rock. Project Predevelopment Process: Since selection of the Mission Rock development team Port staff has collaborated with the developer on public outreach efforts.

Finding 10: Although the development of Pier 48 and Seawall Lot 337 also known as Mission Rock, began in 2007, there has been insufficient information and involvement for Project Predevelopment Process: Since selection of the Mission Rock development team Port staff has collaborated with the developer on public outreach efforts.

Agree in part

The Port, City and the developer have visited the following community groups with detailed Project briefings:

- Opportunity to Mission Rock
- Project Predevelopment Process: Since selection of the Mission Rock development team Port staff has collaborated with the developer on public outreach efforts.

Partially Disagree

Finding 5: The Pier 70 Master Plan was developed with significant community outreach to both the general public and affected neighborhood associations. The Plan represents a balance of community needs and the requirement of the developer to obtain a reasonable return on investment.

Partially Agree

Although the development of Pier 48 and Seawall Lot 337, also known as Mission Rock, began in 2007, there has been insufficient information and involvement for Project Predevelopment Process: Since selection of the Mission Rock development team Port staff has collaborated with the developer on public outreach efforts. In addition, many written comments were received and considered through the Port's website and public meetings. Summary of all public comments were included in the record for the Port Commission's consideration when awarding the development opportunity to Mission Rock. Project Predevelopment Process: Since selection of the Mission Rock development team Port staff has collaborated with the developer on public outreach efforts.

Finding 10: Although the development of Pier 48 and Seawall Lot 337 also known as Mission Rock, began in 2007, there has been insufficient information and involvement for Project Predevelopment Process: Since selection of the Mission Rock development team Port staff has collaborated with the developer on public outreach efforts.

Agree in part

The Port, City and the developer have visited the following community groups with detailed Project briefings:

- Opportunity to Mission Rock
- Project Predevelopment Process: Since selection of the Mission Rock development team Port staff has collaborated with the developer on public outreach efforts.

Partially Disagree

Partially Agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Department Required to Respond</th>
<th>2014 Finding Response (Agree/Disagree)</th>
<th>2014 Finding Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>Finding 10: Although the development of Pier 48 and Seawall Lot 337, also known as Mission Rock, began in 2007, there has been insufficient information and involvement for community groups, neighborhood and merchants’ associations, and residents potentially affected by this project.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Again, we disagree with the statement that many projects move ahead with minimal community input. The Planning Department agrees with the Port’s statement that all development projects undergo a robust public review and vetting process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>Finding 11: Although State Law does not require voter approval for the issuance of Port IFD Bonds, voter approval yields greater public awareness of the costs of proposed Port developments.</td>
<td>Port of San Francisco</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>State Law allows the formation of Infrastructure Financing Districts on Port property to enable funding of new infrastructure and the uniquely high costs of developing the waterfront. Property tax increment financing is a standard form of publicly financing for publicly-owned improvements. In most states that use this form of financing, voter approval is not required, because IFDs do not increase taxes. Instead, they leverage planned private investment in order to produce higher property taxes without increasing the tax rate. IFDs on Port property can fund improvements to address sea level rise, to remediate historic contamination of Port property, to stabilize and fix the seawall, and to rehabilitate historic resources. Pursuant to the adopted Board of Supervisors policy for Port property, the Board may form IFDs on Port property to address capital needs identified in the Port’s 10-Year Capital Plan, which is developed through the City’s formal capital planning process— itself a very public process. Port IFDs are repaid through new property tax increment generated from Port property. In most cases, without the use of IFD tax increment, many areas of the Port are too expensive to redevelop and thus no new taxes would be generated. Major planned Port development at Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 70 already faces a requirement for a public vote to establish required height. Since IFDs cannot be formed until after CEQA is complete, the Civil Grand Jury’s recommendation would essentially require two major public votes for these projects, separated by many years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>The Port of SF: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars</td>
<td>Finding 11: Although State Law does not require voter approval for the issuance of Port IFD Bonds, voter approval yields greater public awareness of the costs of proposed Port developments.</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Partially disagree</td>
<td>Voter approval would yield greater awareness, but is neither required by law nor necessary to ensure the taxpayers’ interests are protected. Port Infrastructure Financing Districts (IFDs) are repaid via incremental tax generated from Port property and do not increase taxes on voters. Other City agencies successfully issue similar bonds without voter approval, such as Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) revenue bonds. Bonds that do encumber taxpayers, such as General Obligation bonds, rightly require voter approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>