



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION/CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
 PUBLIC VISIONING WORKSHOP  
 FOR  
 CANDLESTICK POINT STATE RECREATION AREA ("SRA")  
 General Plan and Environmental Impact Report  
 Meeting Summary  
 Wednesday July 14, 2010  
 Southeast Community Facility  
 Alex L. Pitcher, Jr. Community Room  
 1800 Oakdale Avenue, San Francisco 94124  
 6:00 - 8:30 PM

The following is a summary of the second public workshop for the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area General Plan amendment, held on July 14, 2010, as per the attached agenda. Additional attachments include meeting handouts; graphic boards on the workshop purpose, agenda and foundational goals; existing conditions and opportunities and constraints diagrams; graphic boards on four alternative concepts and landscape typologies; the questionnaire on alternatives; and a summary of comments provided on the alternatives during the breakout session. The attached sign-in sheet lists workshop attendees.

| ITEM # | DESCRIPTION/SUMMARY (follows attached agenda)  |
|--------|--|
| 1      | <p>Sign-In and Open House</p> <p>Upon signing in, each person received a nametag with a colored dot and handouts, including the meeting agenda (available in Spanish and Chinese), a list of contact information, a questionnaire, and a comment form. After signing in, workshop attendees had the opportunity to review various graphic boards of the park's existing conditions, opportunities and constraints, and alternative concepts. State Parks and AECOM staff members were available to answer questions and listen to comments or other input on any of the information presented. The open house portion of the workshop lasted about 40 minutes. All materials presented at the workshop are attached.</p>   |
| 2      | <p>Welcome and Opening Remarks</p> <p>Following the open house and review of graphic boards, Kim Christensen from AECOM welcomed participants to the second public workshop for the updated Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (SRA) General Plan amendment. Kim provided an overview of the workshop's agenda and introduced Dan Ray, Chief of the Planning Division for State Parks. Dan noted that the process is being conducted in partnership with the City of San Francisco, involved in the adjacent Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan Project. State Parks is particularly proud of Candlestick Point SRA because it was California's first urban state park and is looking forward to planning future improvements for the park.</p> |

| ITEM # | DESCRIPTION/SUMMARY (follows attached agenda)  |
|--------|--|
| 3      | <p data-bbox="300 237 1044 268">Park Design Alternatives (Attached PowerPoint Presentation)</p> <p data-bbox="300 310 1433 447">Sarah Heard from AECOM presented an overview of the SRA's general planning process and the work conducted so far. Sarah provided information on the history of the SRA, public input received at the first workshop on January 30, 2010, and a brief discussion of some of the opportunities and constraints displayed during the open house.</p> <p data-bbox="300 489 1433 730">Megan Walker from AECOM then presented information on the development of four preliminary alternatives for the SRA, noting the workshop goal of gathering public input on the alternatives, as well as additional ideas. Megan explained the landscape typologies used to develop the alternatives – a mix of different types of general landscapes, paths, gathering areas and interpretive facilities. She then walked through each of the four alternatives, beginning with a general overview of the key elements specific to an alternative and progressing through each of the more detailed landscape typologies previously described.</p> <ul data-bbox="349 783 1433 1423" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative 1 – Existing General Plan implements the SRA's 1987 General Plan amendment and assumes no redevelopment or land exchange. Key program elements include a nature center, cultural center, café, motorized boat launch and group camping.</li> <li>• Alternative 2 – Collaboration and Culture creates a destinational draw through cultural programs and partnerships and assumes no redevelopment or land exchange. Key program elements include urban agriculture, an art walk/ribbon, and a cultural complex.</li> <li>• Alternative 3 – Nature in the City creates an urban refuge that highlights nature in the city and assumes that redevelopment occurs. Key program elements include increased habitat restoration; quiet, respite-based recreation; small gathering areas; a network of small trails; and a nature center.</li> <li>• Alternative 4 – Recreation by the Bay creates a vibrant recreational waterfront park that promotes healthy lifestyles and assumes that redevelopment occurs. Key program elements include flexible-use areas that can host events; active, group-focused areas; pockets of habitat restoration; and a concentrated path system with a promenade.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="300 1465 1360 1528">For more details on the landscape typologies and program elements associated with each alternative, please see the attached plans.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1570 1401 1675">Megan then explained the group exercises planned for the workshop, whose purpose was to facilitate discussion about each of the four preliminary alternatives and gather input from participants about specific program elements in each.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1717 1433 1917">A question and answer period followed the presentation. Topics discussed during this time included whether the general plan process has considered sea level rise. Megan noted that the planning team has considered this issue and will address it in greater detail with refinement of the alternatives. One participant emphasized the need to consider and analyze the effects of the vehicular bridge over Yosemite Slough proposed as part of the redevelopment. A question was asked about what would happen within the re-development project across the bay from the</p> |

| ITEM # | DESCRIPTION/SUMMARY (follows attached agenda)  |
|--------|--|
|        | <p>SRA on Parcel E. A Lennar representative at the meeting noted that this area was planned to be restored to grassland. A question followed about whether State Parks is communicating with Lennar to maximize the development of parks in the neighborhood. Donna responded that State Parks has worked closely with Lennar and the City of San Francisco to coordinate the update of the SRA's general plan with the redevelopment project. A question was asked about outreach to the nearby Asian population, many of whom use the Park regularly. Kim spoke about the outreach efforts and the bilingual materials that were sent out and posted. It was agreed that State Parks would be sure to add this group to the mailing list for future outreach. A question was asked about having a dog use area within the Park. Steve Musillami noted that while dogs on leash are permitted at the SRA, State Parks is not planning a dog use area since the redevelopment project will include ample opportunities for dog parks within other open space and park lands in the neighborhood.</p>   |
| 4      | <p>Design Review and Feedback</p> <p>Participants broke into four groups based on the assigned colored dot on their nametags. Each group rotated through four stations – one for each alternative – set up with large graphics (50" x 60") of the alternative plans. At each station, a facilitator from AECOM solicited feedback from workshop participants on the pros and cons of their respective alternative, including discussion of specific program elements, overall themes, and additional information that should be considered. A note-taker from AECOM accompanied each alternative station and recorded the major themes discussed in each group. Facilitators also helped participants add their comments via sticky-notes placed on the large alternative graphics. A fifth station, led by State Parks staff, was dedicated to "Special Topics", for workshop participants interested in discussing particular program elements not necessarily specific to one of the four alternatives. Participants spent about one hour reviewing and discussing the alternative concepts. The attached transcript includes the "sticky-note" comments and general notes taken on each alternative, as well as the Special Topics station. The alternative boards used during the discussion are also attached.</p> |
| 5      | <p>Group Summaries</p> <p>Participants reconvened as a large group, and facilitators from each of the four alternatives stations reported key themes that emerged from the group discussions. Comments for each included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative 1 – Existing General Plan: comments noted that this alternative worked in 1987, but is not interesting today and expressed the need for restoration, an improved fitness course, and performance arts.</li> <li>• Alternative 2 – Collaboration and Culture: comments emphasized that the alternative felt too programmed and that the park should have a natural feel, be kid-oriented, and not include a pedestrian bridge over Yosemite Slough. Participants also liked the expanded community garden and boat-building facility.</li> <li>• Alternative 3 – Nature in the City: comments emphasized the need for increased maintenance and public safety, adequate parking, creating a mosaic of natural habitats, and providing environmental and cultural history and education.</li> </ul>   |

| ITEM # | DESCRIPTION/SUMMARY (follows attached agenda)   |
|--------|---|
|        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative 4 – Recreation by the Bay: comments focused on appropriate locations for non-motorized boating, concentrating multiple activities near each other, and providing adequate parking. Some felt this alternative was too urban in its appearance.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion at the Special Topics station focused on providing for bike use and other physical activity, wildlife corridors, and natural elements along trails.</p> <p>Notes recorded at stations for each of the four alternative and Special Topics are included in the attached summary of comments.</p>  |
| 6      | <p>Questionnaires</p> <p>Workshop participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire to provide input on their opinions of each of the four design alternatives. The questionnaire asked participants to rate each alternative as hot, lukewarm, or cold, keeping in mind the SRA’s foundational goals (related to recreational resources, natural resources, cultural resources, community resources, and interpretation/education) and included space for participants to give feedback about what they liked and disliked about each alternative. The questionnaire also asked participants to rank the four alternatives from 1 to 4, assigning 1 for the favorite alternative and 4 for the least favorite.</p> <p>Twenty-one participants turned in the questionnaire at the workshop. The following summarizes these responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative 1 – Existing General Plan received the fewest “hot” ratings (2) and the most “cold” ratings (8). Most comments focused on dislikes – particularly that the alternative is outdated and does not reflect the park’s context or user needs. Other comments expressed dissatisfaction with the proposed motorized boating, group camps, and café, as well as the lack of connectivity to Bayview Hill. Some respondents liked the restoration and nature center proposed for Yosemite Slough.</li> <li>Alternative 2 – Collaboration and Culture received the second fewest “hot” ratings (3) and “cold ratings” (5). Respondents liked the art and gateway elements, cultural gathering areas, and the expanded community garden. Dislikes focused on the amount of programming, which many felt took away from the natural experience and did not feel like a state park.</li> <li>Alternative 3 – Nature in the City received the most “hot” ratings (10) and the fewest “cold” ratings (2). Most comments liked the restoration of natural areas and felt that the alternative provided the appropriate amount of recreational programming. Respondents disliked the locations of the proposed boat and windsurf launches, noting that both lacked parking, as well as the vehicle bridge over Yosemite Slough. Some respondents felt additional recreation programs could be added to draw different types of park users.</li> <li>Alternative 4 – Recreation by the Bay received the second most “hot” ratings (8) and “cold” ratings (7). Respondents liked the focus on healthy recreation, play areas, splash park, and boat-in camping location. Dislikes included the location of the windsurf launch</li> </ul> |

| ITEM # | DESCRIPTION/SUMMARY (follows attached agenda)   |
|--------|---|
|        | <p>and the busy, overdeveloped feel of the park. Some respondents also expressed concerns about the water quality regarding swimming in the Bay.</p> <p>Of the participants who turned in the questionnaire at the workshop, fourteen ranked the alternatives, resulting in Alternative 3 as the favorite (7 votes), followed by Alternative 4 (5 votes). Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 both only received one vote each as the favorite alternative. Alternative 1 was also the least favorite (8 votes), followed by Alternative 4 (3 votes) and Alternative 3 (1 vote); no respondents chose Alternative 2 as the least favorite alternative.</p> <p>Participants were also provided the opportunity to mail in the questionnaire following the workshop. A copy of the questionnaire is attached. State Parks has created a survey from the questionnaire, which may be accessed on-line: <a href="http://www.parks.ca.gov/CandlestickGP">www.parks.ca.gov/CandlestickGP</a>.</p> |

Candlestick Point SRA  
Attachment to July 14, 2010 Meeting Summary (Workshop 2)

Public Comment Summary, July 26, 2010

The following is a summary of specific comments received from meeting participants at the second public workshop for the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area General Plan update. Comments received during the break-out sessions are categorized by each of four Alternatives. Comments received on "Special Topics" during the break-out sessions and during the general question and answer period before the break-out sessions are also included.

Alternative 1 – Existing General Plan: General Comments

- Status Quo – not interesting, ok for 1987
- Run frequently - lifestyle
- Improve fitness course
- Assume need more housing
  - o Landmine to gold mine
- Time can't stand still
  - o What to augment with housing?
- Important to keep park open
- What happens with connection if stadium is gone?
- 87 acres – SF Park and Recreation land
- LEJ – need restoration and native plants
  - o Don't lose effect, don't change too much
  - o Don't lose meaning of park
- Have center tell the story
- Include performance arts

Alternative 1: Map Comments

- No café
- Yosemite Slough improvements are shown incorrectly: Interpretive Center planned for east side of Yosemite Slough – off Griffith St.
- Add non-motorized boat dock in South Basin

Alternative 2 – Collaboration and Culture: General Comments

- State Parks should have natural feel
- Vehicular Bridge over Yosemite Slough is not necessary
  - o No cars
  - o Car bridge will disturb family gatherings and birds
- Don't make the park too busy/noisy
- Make the sculpture garden kid-oriented and use for ethnographic botany and interpretive learning activities
- Make sure everything is ADA accessible -

- Some program elements are more friendly than others
- Looks like an art museum rather than a park
  - Feels too organized, keep natural
- In this urban area, like to see nature as much as possible
- Animals will come back after the bridge is built – will return after temporarily away
- Add a pool with a swim area for exercising
- Skate park possible - not near shore though
- Make sure the Bay Trail is shown as Class 1 trail
- Like gates with picnic supplies
- Include traffic planning – it shouldn't be too much trouble
- Don't forget maintenance yard
  - Where will you put equipment, dumpsters, etc.?
  - Don't make mistake made at Mission Bay
- Connection to Bayview Hill is important
- Make Bay Trail Class 1 path
- Think about stormwater; need to separate combined sewers
  - Use swales to treat storm runoff (either in park or prior to discharge)
- Likes boat-in camping opportunity
- Look at motorized boat ramp at Pier 52 as an example
- Keep it natural
- Community garden plots can be expanded
- Likes grassland, natural area, places to walk and ride bike
  - Don't need buildings to interpret nature
  - Use signage and vista of marsh instead
- Likes paved bike trail for in-line skaters to use

#### Alternative 2: Map Comments

- Create pedestrian connections to:
  - Executive Park
  - Little Hollywood
  - Bayview Hill
- Trail at western edge (along Harney Way) shown incorrectly – should be paved
- What would gateway element be?
  - Gathering center?
  - Tower?
  - Solar panels?
- Pay more attention to crossing Harney Way if redevelopment does not happen
- Create connections to Bayview Hill
- Create a pedestrian bridge over Harney Way?
- Sculpture garden: "I like this"
- Very narrow area between fishing pier and windsurf launch in this alternative
  - Will land exchange occur even if no redevelopment?
- Create programs for kids?
  - Learning activities
  - Ethnobotany
- Include stormwater treatment even if no redevelopment

- Make sure Class 1 bike path for Bay Trail
- Move boat in camping to northeast edge of Point - no security in area shown on plan, too small an area?
- Create a beach for pulling up boats on northwest edge of Point
- Create an area for water-based exercise just offshore , north of Main Park area
- This feels not like a state park!
- Allow water to flow alongside boardwalk in the Main Park area?
- Make a larger beach area with less lawn to encourage swimming in the Main Park area
- Potential future habitat in restored wetland
- I don't like the community theater area
- Not enough parking
- Include a Skate park - near Donahue St?
- Need a pool since water isn't fit to swim in
- Make an ADA accessible picnic area south of the community garden
- I wouldn't want a bridge near the community garden
- Great idea: new park needs local provider of native plants!
- While wildlife will be displaced while bridge is under construction...after completion, wildlife will return. Animals like people migrate.
- No auto/truck bridge!
- Include a facility where you can rent equipment near Yosemite Slough
  - o Frisbees, other, kite?
- Restore habitat – better than building an art walk in a park!
- Too many activities? Feasibility of funding
  - o Include more nature
- Boat building interpretive facility: good idea, especially if youth oriented
- Upland restoration does not include oak woodland, freshwater or dune/beach habitats; they should be there
- Don't compromise the park's restoration or ecology
- No pedestrian crossing over Yosemite Slough! It is not needed
- I support a pedestrian bridge
- No pedestrian bridge
- Pedestrian bridge: NO!
  - o Precious wetlands, birds, fish
- Need a pedestrian bridge so you don't have the long walk around

### Alternative 3 – Nature in the City: General Comments

- An interpretive center is already planned for the east side of Yosemite Slough
- No bridge
- Include interpretive signage over the bridge
- Maintenance is important (weeds, etc.)
  - o Make sure that there are enough dumpsters, storage, etc.
- Feeling of safety is important
- Workout stations are great
- Tai Chi happening in the Lost Port area
- Create connections to Bayview Hill
- Add a dog park

- More outreach in this process
- Continue Green connection to India Basin Shoreline Park and Heron's Head
- Include low impact recreation
- Create a greenway across Hermit's Cove to Yosemite
- Include a floating dock
- Expand seasonal wetlands
- Create a mosaic of habitats
- Existing beach in the Main Park area is beautiful – don't change
  - o It's by the Bay and has a picnic area
- Inadequate parking – there shouldn't be less parking
- Make the park accessible by bus
- Windsurf launch is the only place for kayaks to go in and out
  - o Not very accessible by car
  - o People who will windsurf and kayak need closer parking
- This alternative needs environmental history information
- The more programming and State Park staff you have, the safer it is
- Restore habitat
- Illegal dumping and some crime at Yosemite slough
- Need commercial development to attract diversity - stands or concessions
- Job creation through park maintenance
- Create an educational garden with plants that are native to the area
- Keep the bridge
- Expand the native plant nursery
- Oak woodlands are not shown
- "Hang out" element in the existing main parking lot
- Look at Pier 6 for an example of boating parking
- Alternate to rip rap at Hermit's Cove (add oyster beds, etc.) – something to soften it
- The vehicle bridge over Yosemite Slough would result in:
  - o Contamination
  - o Noise
  - o High speeds
- 300 ft. depth minimum between shore and development needed for wildlife
- Park is the only place on the East side of San Francisco to enjoy the sunset with minimal disturbance
- Need stormwater treatment in the development, not just the park

### Alternative 3: Map Comments

- East peninsula a great spot for non-motorized boats to land and camp
  - o I second this point!
  - o Yes!
- Alternate to rip rap hard edge?
  - o Native oyster beds, eelgrass
- Windsurf launch: currently only place for kayakers/windsurfers – need parking/staging area
  - o Kayakers would do better in South Basin

- Include – concession/café, exercise loop, boat house/launch, picnic areas – but in a low impact manner
- Park needs major maintenance, not open enough
- Weeds are too high – feels scary
- Beautiful beach in the Main Park area – don't change
- Workout stations are wonderful but old
- Proposed boat launch is in the mud – people will get stuck and trample habitat
- Hang out element now in main parking lot
- Parking design is less accessible
  - o too much a development backyard
  - o inadequate for existing community
- Oak woodlands
- Not enough parking in the park with redevelopment
- No seasonal wetlands included in the alternative – this historic/rare habitat needs to be incorporated
  - o Expand existing wetland in undeveloped area instead of replacing it with anew picnic area
- Like this alternative – restore habitat!
- Prepare for sea level rise.
- Need Environmental Justice history
- Tell the story of 1<sup>st</sup> urban park
- Include history of the park, shipyard, Ohlone
- Need some commercial development as attraction to park – park needs to pay for itself
- Interpretation and cultural centers would produce jobs
  - o Trainings could be held at the beach
  - o Jobs are important
- Need onsite stormwater treatment in development and stormwater/sewer separation
- Need more programming and staff to increase safety
- Create a greenway from Hermit's Cove area to Yosemite Slough for better pedestrian access
- Tai Chi currently happening in the Last Port
- Seniors and walkers currently use the Last Port
- Connect Bayview Hill with Candlestick State Park
  - o Create a significant land bridge – green space – for pedestrians and wildlife
- Create connections to Bayview Hill from Last Port
- Beautiful beach at park's western end – don't change
- Want dog park
  - o An area where dogs could get in the water would be good!
- Create a boat launch in the South Basin (off Earl St) with parking, drop-off area, and rigging area
- Need 300' minimum between shore and development for wildlife
- This alternative is a misnomer – nature in the city is threatened by this alternative
- Continue green connection from Yosemite Slough to India Basin Shoreline Park and Heron's Head
- Please no bridge at all
- No bridge
- 50 MPH buses do not agree with nature concept

- No bridge – will result in:
  - o Contamination (from parcel E2)
  - o Noise/shading
  - o High speed – pedestrians and fast vehicles don't mix
- I believe the bridge would be useless and unnecessary because the residents north of the Slough use the street Jennings or Ingalls to access park
- Be aware that if a bridge is built, picnickers will hear buses every 5 minutes
- Bridge – displaced wildlife will come back after construction – animals migrate like people
- Pedestrian bridge cuts off slough view – it's a small distance to walk the Bay Trail
- Create an Ohlone ceremonial area near the picnic area north of Yosemite Slough
- An interpretive center is already planned north of Yosemite Slough
- Raise the trail some at interpretive signage spots on the west side of Yosemite Slough to overlook marsh
- Bridge is unsightly, destroys the view
- Park is the only place on SF's east side to be on the Bay/in solitude
- Let Yosemite Slough return to productive wetlands
- Make sure maintenance facilities have room for equipment storage, dumpsters/compost, storage
- Illegal dumping and some crime at head of Yosemite Slough
- Love idea of expanded native plant nursery and community garden
- Look at Pier 1 ½ for floating dock – consider surge, currents, storms
- Create a kids garden to learn about native plants and Ohlone uses

#### Alternative 4 – Recreation by the Bay: General Comments

- Stormwater treatment – a chance to tell a story
- Provide multiple boat launches
- Move windsurfer launch closer to “exercise loop”
- Bay Trail – make sure Class 1
- Bay water trail – good
- Alternative 4 is too urban in its appearance
- Connect Bayview Hill to park
- Concentrate boating at beach – make a good family spot like Shoonmaker Point in Sausalito
- Concentrate activities together
  - o Swim, boathouse, beach, concessions
- Not enough parking shown in the park
- Amphitheater/music – do not mix with wildlife
- Add Bocce Ball
- Look at small park at 24<sup>th</sup> Street and York Street: interactive art/water for kids – idea for here or any alternative
- Exercise loop – great

#### Alternative 4: Map Comments

- Like landing beach, boat-in camping

- Kite launch needed to be downwind (east) of windsurf
- Best wind is offshore of existing windsurf circle
- Launch direction is north to south on southern shoreline
- Wind not good for windsurfing west of Hermit's Cove
- Create connections to Bayview Hill
- The launch-land angle off the eastern peninsula to the north should be clear for kites
- Create a swimming pool at the proposed swim beach and near parking
- Good boating for kids north of the proposed swim beach - concentrate boating social hub here
- Undeveloped area:
  - o Keep natural
  - o Build on good work done
  - o Build on Bayview biodiversity
- Bay Trail should be Class 1
- Amphitheater and wildlife don't mix
- This plan will destroy the native plant restoration that youth have done in undeveloped area
- Like multiple boat launch/nodes – great for kids
- Hate bridge
- Include onsite storage at proposed boat house
- No car/truck bridge!
- Be aware that if the bridge is built, people in park will be subjected to noisy, fast BRT buses going over every 5 minutes!!
- Noise of amphitheater carries to disturb the birds!
- Please don't even think of a bridge
- Community loses jobs
- Where is the community garden?
- Where are the bike racks?
- Killing the work LEJ put into the park
- Native plants??
- Need more restoration
- I don't like the idea of getting rid of the community garden
- Too much going on! Not natural
- LEJ took time out to make the park beautiful and natural...this is too much building
- Hate all the active landscape areas

### Special Topics

- Bike use (get kids out on bikes!)
  - o Likes recreation concepts from Alt. #4 but related to "nature in the city" (Alt. #3) for open space; bikes allowed in developed areas (major paths) and have some "passive" (natural) bike trails as well
  - o Do have some "No Bikes" areas
  - o Have some packed-earth trails for bikes
  - o Don't have bikes limited to paved paths
- Nature in the City

- Develop nature corridors along trails (can include interpretive signs or not)
- Include physical activity events/planning
  - Running/walking/cycling
  - Include High School events (x-country)
  - Design physical activity into development
- Build a small bike park for kids
  - Let them have an area – won't need to use rest of park for "active" riding
- Consider some sort of swimming facility with park – pool or in a bay with an on-shore facility
- Create wildlife corridors north and south along bay shoreline – connect with other park/open space areas
- Create a hiking trail and wildlife corridor up to Bayview Hill

#### General Q&A

- Is sea level rise included?
  - Yes, aware of it.
- Is the bridge part of the EIR scope?
  - A little piece is in park - please consider it for analysis
- What will happen to the mudflat on the other side of Yosemite Slough (Hunters Point)?
  - The area will be grasslands and is not in the park
- Are State Parks and the City/Lennar communicating to maximize parks?
  - Yes, communicating.
- What are your outreach efforts to include Asian community/users?
  - Newsletter in Spanish and Chinese
  - Translators tonight
- Major complex across from park?
  - Yes.
- Designation for dogs within park?
  - Not yet - please provide feedback tonight. Not typically part of state park.



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION/CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

PUBLIC WORKSHOP ON PRELIMINARY PARK DESIGN ALTERNATIVES  
FOR  
CANDLESTICK POINT STATE RECREATION AREA ("SRA")  
General Plan and Environmental Impact Report  
AGENDA

Wednesday, July 14, 2010  
Southeast Community Facility  
Alex L. Pitcher, Jr. Community Room  
1800 Oakdale Avenue, San Francisco 94124  
6:00 - 8:30 PM

6:00-6:40 pm Sign-In and Open House (refreshments will be served)

- Pick-up and review design alternative questionnaire
- Review display boards of:
  - Unit Purpose and Foundational Goals
  - Opportunities and Constraints
  - Landscape Types
  - Park Design Alternative

*(Staff will be available for individual discussions/questions during this time)*

6:40-6:45 Welcome and Opening Remarks

6:45-7:10 pm Park Design Alternatives (presentation)

- Overview of general planning process
- Progress since Public Workshop 1
- Four conceptual park design alternatives
- Question and answer

7:10-8:10 pm Design Review and Feedback

- Group break-out sessions (one for each alternative – rotate every 15 minutes)
- Complete design alternative questionnaire

*(Additional staff will be available for questions/feedback on specific topics during this time)*

8:10-8:30 pm Group Summaries and Next Steps

- Share group ideas with others
- Finalize and turn in design alternative questionnaire
- Next steps /Selection of preferred alternative

General information and meeting summary at  
<http://www.parks.ca.gov/CandlestickGP>



**CANDLESTICK POINT STATE RECREATION AREA  
General Plan and Environmental Impact Report**

---

**Key Contact Information**

**Website**

<http://www.parks.ca.gov/CandlestickGP>

**State Parks**

Steven Musillami  
California Department of Parks and Recreation  
P. O. Box 942896, Room 1404-27  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 653-6501  
Email: [smusi@parks.ca.gov](mailto:smusi@parks.ca.gov)

**City of San Francisco**

Tiffany Bohee  
San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce  
Development  
City Hall, Room 448  
1 Carlton Goodlet Place  
San Francisco, California 94102

Phone: 415-554-6162  
Email: [tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org](mailto:tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org)

---





CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION/CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
 PRELIMINARY DESIGN ALTERNATIVES PUBLIC WORKSHOP - July 14, 2010  
 CANDLESTICK POINT STATE RECREATION AREA  
 General Plan and Environmental Impact Report

| NAME & AFFILIATION                             | ADDRESS           | PHONE NUMBER       | E-MAIL                               |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Isaac Bowers<br>Bowers for Supervisor 2010     | 120A Texas St.    | (415) 685-3859     | isaac@isaacbowers.com                |
| Cecille Caterson<br>California State Parks Fdn |                   |                    | cecille@calparks.org                 |
| Wells Lawson                                   |                   |                    | wells.lawson@<br>sfgov.org           |
| Debi J. Muise                                  | 1032A Gilman Ave. | (415) 684-<br>6667 | musedeborah@<br>yahoo.com            |
| <del>Dr. J. Hummel</del>                       | 50 Phelan Ave SF  | (415) 706-9260     | <del>Dr. J. Hummel@</del><br>aol.com |
| PAM HEMPHILL                                   |                   | 415 824-2346       | PAM.HEMPHILL@GMAIL.COM               |
|  |                   |                    |                                      |
|  |                   |                    |                                      |
|  |                   |                    |                                      |



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION/CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
 PRELIMINARY DESIGN ALTERNATIVES PUBLIC WORKSHOP - July 14, 2010  
 CANDLESTICK POINT STATE RECREATION AREA  
 General Plan and Environmental Impact Report

| NAME & AFFILIATION                   | ADDRESS                              | PHONE NUMBER | E-MAIL   |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| JOEL & MARY McCLURE<br>PARK VISITORS | 10 BRIDGEVIEW DR.<br>S.F., CA. 94124 | 415-648-0572 | JOELMARYM@AOL.COM                              |
| Dave Gould                           | Petaluma                             |              | dgould@parks.ca.gov                            |
| GLENN HARDWARD                       | 17 STILLMAN ST                       | 415/512-9497 | Glenn.Hardward@va.gov<br>Glenn.Hardward@va.gov |
| FRANK BINNEY                         | P.O. BOX 258<br>WOODACRE, CA         | 415/488-1200 | INFO@FRANKBINNEY.COM                           |
| Fala Satek Alice Griffith            | 1020 Fitzgerald Ave                  | 415/671-0205 | FalaSatek@jyph.com                             |
| Brittany Brandon (EJ)<br>SFBA        | 146 Cameron way                      | 415-623-8804 |  |
| Sergey Menshikov                     | 1145 BAYTHE ST<br>FOSTER CITY, CA    | 415-938-7204 | ya@sergem.net                                  |
| BO BARNER Bay Access                 | 199 Winchuk Dr 94066                 | 415 334-4077 | bob03@astound.net                              |
| Lila Hussain                         | One S. VANNESS                       | 415-749-2131 | lila.hussain@sf.gov.org                        |





CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION/CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
 PRELIMINARY DESIGN ALTERNATIVES PUBLIC WORKSHOP - July 14, 2010  
 CANDLESTICK POINT STATE RECREATION AREA  
 General Plan and Environmental Impact Report

| NAME & AFFILIATION  | ADDRESS  | PHONE NUMBER         | E-MAIL                                      |
|---------------------|--|----------------------|---|
| Ann Meneguzzi       | 1150 Carroll Ave<br>SF 94124                             | 415-<br>822-3798     | ameneg@parks.ca.gov                         |
| Matt Brennan<br>PWA | 550 Keary St Ste 900<br>SF 94108                         | 415 262<br>2359      | M.brennan@pwa-hd.com                        |
| Kora Tang           | 28 Blythdale Ave<br>SF CA 94134                          | (415) 469-9231       | Tang.Kora@yahoo.com<br><del>Kora.Tang</del> |
| Margo Bors          | 785 Carolina St.<br>SF 94107                             |                      | McBors@<br>Comcast.net                      |
| Honda Shaffer       | 1407 On list   |                      | →   |
| Joe Peters          | Universal Paragon Corp<br>150 Exec Blvd.<br>SF, CA 94134 | 415-468-6676<br>x104 | jpeters@<br>universalparagoncorp.com        |
| DAVID BEAUPRE       | Pier 1<br>SF CA 94110                                    | 415-274-<br>0539     | david-beaupre@<br>sf-park.com               |
| Steve Moss          | 2145 18th Street 94107                                   | 415 648 9578         | stevemoss.net                               |
| Lola Whittle        | 2929 Griffith St   | 415 647-3728         | lola@recenter.org                           |



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION/CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
 PRELIMINARY DESIGN ALTERNATIVES PUBLIC WORKSHOP - July 14, 2010  
 CANDLESTICK POINT STATE RECREATION AREA  
 General Plan and Environmental Impact Report

| NAME & AFFILIATION                     | ADDRESS                                   | PHONE NUMBER   | E-MAIL                           |
|--|---|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Ernie Moises<br>CALIFORNIA STATE PARKS | 1150 Carroll Avenue<br>SF, CA 94124       | (415) 671-0140 | EMOISES@ATT.NET                  |
| Malena Osborn<br>LES                   | 59 Hare Street                            | (415) 261-2838 | malisterlove@tmail.com           |
| MARY WILLIAMS                          | 612 OUBARD ST                             | 415 468 0657   | MWILLIAMS 94<br>@earthlink.net   |
| Mike McGowz                            | ARC Ecology 4634 Third 94124              |                |                                  |
| Tony Kelly                             | 250 Cannuccia #6                          | 94107          | TONYKELLY@ASTOUND.NET            |
| Jason Hart                             | 96 Mitchell canyon rd<br>clayton CA 94517 | 925 837 2710   | jharte@parks.ca.gov              |
| HAL BEILAN                             | 205 MIRAMAR<br>S.F. 94112                 | 415-469-9865   | HBEILAN@YAHOO.COM                |
| M.C. Walker                            | 11 Margaret Ave<br>SF 94112               | 415-337-7867   | Walker @ Walker<br>Law Firm. com |
| Willie Andrews                         | 1750 Newcomb Ave                          | 415 641 8689   |                                  |