



**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION/CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE WORKSHOP**

FOR

CANDLESTICK POINT STATE RECREATION AREA ("SRA")

General Plan and Environmental Impact Report

Meeting Summary

Wednesday November 3, 2010

Southeast Community Facility

Alex L. Pitcher, Jr. Community Room

1800 Oakdale Avenue, San Francisco 94124

5:30 - 7:30 PM

The following is a summary of the second public workshop for the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area General Plan amendment, held on November 3, 2010, as per the attached agenda. Additional attachments include meeting handouts and graphic boards on the preferred alternative. The attached sign-in sheet lists workshop attendees.

ITEM #	DESCRIPTION/SUMMARY (follows attached agenda)
1	<p>Sign-In and Open House</p> <p>Participants were provided with comment cards and an agenda and were able to review the draft preferred alternative boards on display prior to the start of the meeting.</p>
2	<p>Welcome and Opening Remarks</p> <p>Donna Plunkett welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the format for the evening's agenda and then turned the meeting over to Roland Gaebert. He further welcomed everyone and thanked stakeholders for all their work in developing the plan for the SRA. He noted that without public involvement, the plan would not become a reality. He then turned the meeting over to Sarah who began the presentation.</p>
3	<p>Preferred Park Alternative (Attached PowerPoint Presentation)</p> <p>Sarah Heard from AECOM provided the introduction to the PowerPoint presentation by reiterating the general plan process, work accomplished to date, the SRA purpose and the foundational goals for the plan. She then provided an overview of the stakeholder comments, surveys and questionnaire results received during the planning process and utilized to develop the draft preferred alternative.</p> <p>Megan Walker then presented the draft preferred alternative and concept master plan for the SRA. She explained that the draft plan was a blending of ideas from the four draft alternatives, with a focus on nature- and water-based landscape types and public recreation. The draft preferred alternative shows landscape types and programming at a more general level, leaving State Parks the flexibility to develop more site-specific designs following the plan's approval. The draft concept master plan shows more detail and specific locations for different landscape</p>

ITEM #	DESCRIPTION/SUMMARY (follows attached agenda)
	<p>types and facilities. This more detailed plan will demonstrate how the general plan can be implemented in the future and will be an Appendix in the General Plan document. To further describe elements proposed in the concept master plan, the SRA was divided into four geographic areas: Yosemite Slough and the South Basin, Candlestick Meadows, The Heart of the Park and the Point, The Neck and Hermit’s Cove, and The Last Port. Megan provided an overview of each area with character images and site sections showing the elevations and relationships between the shoreline and adjacent development.</p> <p>Megan then opened the meeting to comments and questions, noting that State Parks will take comments on the draft preferred alternative for up to two weeks following the meeting. Information on the draft preferred alternative will be posted on the project website, and mail-in comments cards were available at the meeting. The following discussion summarizes comments from participants at the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comment was raised about toxicity related to hazardous materials in the soils near the SRA. It was noted that in the past, these issues have not always been brought to the public. A request was made to have all the studies conducted on hazardous materials and toxic soils in an around the SRA reviewed as part of the general plan to ensure its inclusion in the planning for the park. The commenter also noted that she was aware of “hot spots” near Jamestown Avenue and that in an earthquake, much of this area will liquefy and runoff into the Bay. State Parks noted that as part of the Yosemite Sough restoration, extensive hazardous material will be cleaned up with contaminated soils removed. A request was made to keep the public fully informed of all conditions related to toxic soils. • The next commenter asked for three issues to be addressed as part of the general plan: (1) that the final plan for the SRA be a place for people, animals and plants (2) that stormwater into the Bay be reduced and (3) that the project create new jobs for the neighborhood. The commenter also asked that three documents be reviewed further as part of the planning for the SRA: the Park Alternatives for Study prepared by ARC Ecology, a new policy adopted by the City of San Francisco on Environmental Justice, and follow-up related to economic stimulus as part of Proposition G. • The next commenter asked if the SRA boundary shown on the draft preferred alternative and concept master plan is consistent with SB792. The commenter also asked if the freshwater pond area in Candlestick Meadows created following the solid waste clean-up will remain as part of the future plan. It was noted that the freshwater pond would be considered as part of the detailed grading and drainage plan that will be developed in the next phase of development for this area. If the pond is a viable, functioning wetland and fits the design for the future use of this area, it will remain; however, that cannot be determined at this time. The commenter then asked about the narrow area of the SRA along the southwest corner of Yosemite Slough and whether this area will be increased. State Parks noted that widening this area would require additional land acquisition, and that at this time, purchasing additional land in this area is not possible. • An additional comment was made about the health of park users in areas of the SRA

ITEM #	DESCRIPTION/SUMMARY (follows attached agenda)
	<p>with contaminated soils. Heron’s Head Park was mentioned as an example. David Beaupre from the Port of San Francisco noted that this area had been fully tested and studied prior to areas being opened for public use. He noted that these studies are available for public review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A question asked about integration with the proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard (CP-HPS) development project, and it was suggested to overlay the project’s latest so that the SRA’s general plan will reflect the future neighborhood and be integrated into the urban fabric. State Parks noted that the SRA plans do reflect the current redevelopment street grid, blocks, parks and open spaces. • A comment was raised about the amount of earth moving proposed under the SRA’s draft preferred alternative and the measures that will be taken to ensure protection of plants and wildlife. State Parks noted that the general plan will set forth goals and guidelines to be followed during plan implementation to ensure protection of site resources. Another related comment noted the amount of vegetation that will be removed. The commenter asked about measures to protect as much of the existing native vegetation as possible and asked that future native plantings include plants propagated from the local native plant seeds and be area-specific natives and not just from regional genotypes. • A comment was raised about how the increase in future visitors will affect local wildlife. State Parks noted that the general plan will need to address the issue. • A comment was raised about providing access for kayakers closer to the shoreline. State Parks noted that the area proposed for kayak launching will be studied further to ensure provision of parking and/or a drop-off area near the launch. • A commenter asked about the zoning of the proposed new CP-HPS development that will take place adjacent to the SRA. State Parks noted that this is a mixed-use development determined during planning for the CP-HPS project and is not under the control of State Parks. • It was noted that outreach to the non-motorized boating community has been good, and the commenter asked if similar outreach occurred to anglers and swimmers. State Parks noted that these other stakeholders have also been contacted and that their input has led to the development of many of the proposed program elements, in tandem with site conditions. • A concern was raised about developing the Point for campsites and whether this is the best use of this site, as camping would detract from the area as a respite for all park users. State Parks responded that the proposal for camping at the Point is for a small number of sites (6-8) and would not require a large development footprint, instead providing flat, usable areas that would also serve day users. • A participant asked if the amphitheatre would have amplification. State Parks noted that this area is proposed for small events but that even these require some sort of

ITEM #	DESCRIPTION/SUMMARY (follows attached agenda)
	<p>amplification in order to be functional.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The final question during this segment of the meeting asked about the level of sea level rise and time frame planned for. State Parks noted that is currently considering 36" of sea level rise over 50 years; however, further study is required to develop a balanced strategy for dealing with future changes from sea level rise. Currently, the draft preferred alternative proposed filling certain areas with extremely low elevations and armoring areas of the shoreline in some way. However, the final general plan will allow for a variety of tools to deal with sea level rise over time.
4	<p>Plan Enhancements</p> <p>Following the public comment period, meeting participants broke out into groups to review the SRA area-specific designs further. Four stations with enlargements of the draft preferred alternative by geographic area provided opportunities to review the plans in greater detail. Meeting attendees circulated around the room and discussed their comments and questions with State Parks and AECOM staff at each station. The following discussion captures key points from each of the four stations.</p> <p><i>Yosemite Slough and South Basin</i></p> <p>Comments expressed an overemphasis on human use and the need to reserve space for wildlife. Specific suggestions included raising portions of the Bay Trail over habitat, limiting access to portions of Yosemite Slough, creating natural buffers to deter people from the shoreline, and reducing the amount of mowed grassland.</p> <p><i>Candlestick Meadows</i></p> <p>Most comments expressed an interest in focusing on wildlife habitat through native plantings, preserving the existing freshwater wetland, and creating new tidal wetlands. Some expressed concerns that the mowed grasslands and amplified music from the amphitheater would disturb wildlife. Several comments recommended creating natural berms, fences, and transition areas with vegetation rather than land shaping. While several participants suggested limiting visitor use in some areas, others expressed an interest encouraging public access while creating a natural feel to transition from the urban surroundings.</p> <p><i>Heart of the Park and The Point</i></p> <p>Several comments focused on non-motorized boating, specifically recommendations to shorten the pier and relocate it to deeper water, and expressed interest in boat-in camping. Other comments noted that the proposed amphitheater would be suitable for small lectures and viewing the Bay, while large concerts and wildlife safety resulting from crowds were concerns.</p> <p><i>The Neck and Last Port</i></p> <p>Several comments expressed interest in not having mowed, irrigated lawns in the Last Port, noting that the area currently has native plants and good birding opportunities. Recommended alternatives included scrubby grasslands more consistent with a natural park and logs for picnicking and sitting. Other comments focused on litter management, suggesting regular trash pick-up, wildlife-proof trashcans and recycling bins on all piers. Additional comments included interest in connecting to the proposed Executive Park plan and Bayview Hill and focusing swimming in the more protected Heart of the Park instead of the pier proposed for the Neck.</p>