

File No. 231191

Committee Item No. 7

Board Item No. 19

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation

Date: January 29, 2024

Board of Supervisors Meeting:

Date: February 6, 2024

Cmte Board

- Motion
- Resolution
- Ordinance - VERSION 2
- Legislative Digest - VERSION 2
- Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
- Youth Commission Report
- Introduction Form
- Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
- MOU
- Grant Information Form
- Grant Budget
- Subcontract Budget
- Contract / DRAFT Mills Act Agreement
- Form 126 – Ethics Commission
- Award Letter
- Application
- Public Correspondence

OTHER

- Referral FYI – November 22, 2023
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

Prepared by: John Carroll

Date: January 25, 2024

Prepared by: John Carroll

Date: February 2, 2024

Prepared by: _____

Date: _____

1 [Implementation of Gashouse Cove Project - Marina Yacht Harbor]

2

3 **Ordinance prohibiting the Recreation and Park Department and Planning Department**
4 **from performing environmental review of, or otherwise implementing, a project to clean**
5 **up and reconstruct the Marina Yacht Harbor in a manner that would extend the West**
6 **Harbor Marina by more than 150 feet from its current boundary.**

7 NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
8 **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
9 **Deletions to Codes** are in ~~*strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*~~.
10 **Board amendment additions** are in double-underlined Arial font.
11 **Board amendment deletions** are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
12 **Asterisks (* * * *)** indicate the omission of unchanged Code
13 subsections or parts of tables.

11

12 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

13

14 Section 1. Background and Findings.

15 (a) In 2021, the Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 93-21 to approve the
16 settlement (“Settlement”) of a lawsuit that the City filed against Pacific Gas and Electric
17 Company (“PG&E”) over the discovery of toxic chemical compounds at the East Harbor
18 Marina, which is also known as Gashouse Cove. The Settlement requires PG&E to fund a
19 project at the Marina Yacht Harbor, up to \$190 million, for the joint planning, outreach, design,
20 environmental review, permitting, construction, and completion of a project to remediate the
21 East Harbor and reconstruct the site.

22 (b) The Settlement does not approve a specific design for how the Marina Yacht
23 Harbor would be reconstructed. It identifies several “potential” design elements, and states
24 that these potential elements may change due to various factors, including, but not limited to
25 “cost, feasibility, permit requirements schedule, public outreach and environmental review.”

1 Likewise, Resolution No. 93-21 states that “the settlement does not obligate the City to
2 approve a project at the Site, and any decision regarding a potential project shall be subject to
3 environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act and further regulatory
4 and City approvals as required by law following completion of planning and design of plans for
5 the Site.”

6 (c) After approval of the Settlement, the Recreation and Park Department began to
7 perform public outreach on the project, including an option that would involve removing some
8 boat slips from the East Harbor Marina and adding slips in the West Harbor Marina to the
9 point that the eastern edge of the West Harbor Marina would extend far past its current
10 boundary. The Recreation and Park Commission held a public hearing on the matter on
11 October 19, 2023. The public testimony was overwhelmingly in favor of preserving the
12 existing recreational uses of the Marina Green, which include picnics and fishing and walks
13 along the waterfront, and strongly opposed to the idea of placing boats and other obstructions
14 across the entire West Harbor that would interfere with those uses. The Board of Supervisors
15 concurs, and, further, finds that pursuing such an option would needlessly divert attention and
16 resources away from more feasible, superior alternatives.

17 (d) Accordingly, and consistent with the Settlement, the Board of Supervisors finds that
18 it is necessary to focus on strategies to remediate and reconstruct the East Harbor Marina
19 that will not unduly expand the eastern boundary of the West Harbor Marina. The Board does
20 not intend by this ordinance or otherwise to delay or interfere with the remediation of the East
21 Harbor that would need to occur before the reconstruction.

22

23 Section 2. Implementation of Gashouse Cove Project.

24 (a) The Recreation and Park Department and Planning Department may not expend
25 any City funds, nor may the Recreation and Park Department authorize PG&E to use any of

1 the Settlement funds, to design, plan, perform environmental review of, or implement the
2 potential project described in the Settlement in a manner that would extend the eastern
3 boundary of the West Harbor Marina by more than approximately 150 feet from its current
4 location (not beyond the western edge of the wave organ). The Controller is hereby
5 prohibited from transferring budgeted appropriations for this purpose without prior approval by
6 ordinance.

7 (b) This ordinance shall not affect or impair the Settlement. The Recreation and Park
8 Department is directed to implement this ordinance in a manner that is consistent with the
9 Settlement. Further, this ordinance does not obligate the City to approve a project at the site,
10 and any decision regarding a potential project shall be subject to environmental review under
11 the California Environmental Quality Act and further regulatory and City approvals as required
12 by law following completion of planning and design of plans for the site.

13
14 Section 3. Effective Date.

15 This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs
16 when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not
17 sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the
18 Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

19
20 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
21 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

22 By: /s/
23 MANU PRADHAN
24 Deputy City Attorney

25
n:\legana\as2023\2400161\01732646.docx

REVISED LEGISLATIVE DIGEST
(Amended in Committee – January 29, 2024)

[Implementation of Gashouse Cove Project - Marina Yacht Harbor]

Ordinance prohibiting the Recreation and Park Department and Planning Department from performing environmental review of, or otherwise implementing, a project to clean up and reconstruct the Marina Yacht Harbor in a manner that would extend the West Harbor Marina by more than 150 feet from its current boundary.

Existing Law

The Recreation and Park Department (“RPD”) has jurisdiction over the Marina Yacht Harbor, which has both a West Harbor and an East Harbor. The Planning Department is responsible for performing environmental review on City projects.

Amendments to Current Law

The ordinance would prohibit RPD and the Planning Department from pursuing a project at Marina Yacht Harbor that would extend the eastern boundary of the West Harbor Marina by more than approximately 150 feet from its current location.

Background Information

The City filed a lawsuit against PG&E in 2001 over PG&E’s obligation to remediate pollution found in the East Harbor. In 2021, the City and PG&E entered into a legal settlement that requires PG&E to fund provide funding for a joint project with RPD for the planning, outreach, design, environmental review, permitting, and completion of the environmental remediation and reconstruction of the Marina Yacht Harbor. (Resolution No. 93-21.) The settlement did not approve a specific design for the project. This ordinance limits the expansion of the West Harbor Marina but also does not approve a specific design for the project. The next step under the settlement is for RPD and PG&E to seek environmental review of different design options for the potential project.

n:\legana\as2023\2400161\01716988.docx

MARINA YACHT HARBOR FEE ANALYSIS

Policy Analysis Report to Supervisor Peskin and Supervisor Safai

Presentation to:

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

January 29, 2024

Marina Yacht Harbor Budget FY 2023-24

Operating		
<i>Sources</i>	East Harbor Fees	675,000
	West Harbor Fees	2,600,000
	General Fund	592,921
	Permits	400,000
	Concessions	590,000
Total		4,857,921
<i>Uses</i>	Salaries & Fringe Benefits	1,750,780
	Overhead	681,195
	Debt Service	1,458,020
	Capital Transfer	420,879
	Non-Personnel Services	224,097
	Materials	112,000
	Services of Other Depts.	210,950
Total		4,857,921

Capital		
<i>Sources</i>	Dredging Fees	550,000
	Operating Revenue Transfer	420,879
	PG&E Settlement	11,000,000
Total		11,970,879
<i>Uses</i>	DBW Loan Reserve	77,300
	Dredging	550,000
	Audits	5,579
	E. Harbor Remediation	11,000,000
	Facilities Maintenance*	338,000
Total		11,970,879

General Fund

- General Fund subsidy covers operating revenue shortfall
- Structural maintenance is variable year-to-year
- Any revenue adjustment must be able to cover the combined subsidy and capital maintenance transfer

In FY 2022-23, General Fund support to the Marina Yacht Harbor totaled \$956,077

Regional Harbor Comparisons

Slip Size	Marina Rate Per Foot	Median Rate Per Foot	Average Rate Per Foot
25'	\$18.36	\$9.96	\$10.79
30'	18.62	10.26	11.15
35'	18.62	10.93	12.25
40'	22.58	12.20	13.12
45'	22.58	12.08	13.24
50'	23.09	13.75	15.33
55'	23.09	13.75	13.44
60'	23.09	13.87	15.2
70'	23.58	17.37	17.53
80'	23.58	15.19	16.42
90'	23.58	-	-
100'	23.58	-	-

- 2023 Harbormasters' Regional Survey
- West Harbor charges the highest slip rates in the Bay
- Amenities offered largely reflects regional harbors

Fees for the West Harbor in 2023 as reported by the Marina Harbormaster

Viabile Options for an Independent Marina

Evaluation Criteria

- Must generate robust fiscal impact
- Must be feasible to implement
- Must produce reliable revenue

- Use FY 2024-25 budget as a baseline
- Assume flat increase of 3 percent increase in expenditures and revenues year-to-year

Harbor Fees to Increase 31%

Expenditures	FY 2024-25	Change (%)	FY 2025-26
Marina Fund Budgeted Expenditures	\$5,040,654	3	\$5,191,874
Structural Maintenance	285,000	3	293,550
Total	\$5,325,654		\$5,485,424
Revenue	FY 2024-25	Change (%)	FY 2025-26
General Fund (Subsidy)	\$645,954	-100	\$0
General Fund (Supplemental)	285,000	-100	0
Permits	412,000	3	424,360
East & West Harbor Fees	3,375,000	31.42	4,435,425
Concessions	607,700	3	625,931
Total	\$5,325,654		\$5,485,716

- Capture revenue from surplus demand at the Marina Yacht Harbor
- Reliable revenue from low turnover

Implement Paid Public Parking

Expenditures	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27
Marina Fund Budgeted Expenditures	\$5,040,654	\$5,191,874	\$5,347,630
Structural Maintenance	285,000	293,550	302,357
Total	\$5,325,654	\$5,485,424	\$5,649,987
Revenue	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27
General Fund (Total)	\$930,954	\$0	\$0
Fees, Permits, Concessions	4,394,700	4,526,541	4,662,337
Parking Net Income	46,605	789,080	812,752
Total	\$5,372,259	\$5,315,621	\$5,475,089
<i>Marina Net Income</i>	46,605	(169,803)	(174,898)

- ❑ Projections based on 2019 MTA feasibility analysis
- ❑ Park code must be amended by Board
- ❑ Berthing fees may be increased by **5%** to break even

Gashouse Cove Remediation

Cost	Estimate	Cost-Sharing (PGE% & RPD%)
Pre-Construction	\$3,523,000	91-9
CEQA/Regulatory Compliance	4,450,000	91-9
Public Fuel Dock	2,289,000	91-9
East Harbor Remediation	67,961,000	91-9
East Harbor Renovation, Public Access, and Recreational Amenities	23,897,000	91-9
West Harbor Breakwater and Marina Improvements	27,880,000	91-9
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$130,000,000</i>	
Contingency	\$30,000,000	91-9
Excess Contingency	\$30,000,000	50-50
Total	\$190,000,000	

- Project components detailed in the FSA are not binding
- BLA evaluated four scenarios in the context of the FSA and the proposed ordinance to prohibit the West Harbor expansion

Scenario 1: Status Quo

	FY 2030	FY 2031	FY 2032	FY 2033	FY 2034	FY 2035	FY 2036
<u>Expenditures</u>							
Operating	5,843,499	6,018,804	6,199,369	6,385,350	6,576,910	6,774,217	6,977,444
Structural Maintenance	330,393	340,305	350,514	361,029	371,860	383,016	394,507
Total Expenditures	6,173,893	6,359,109	6,549,883	6,746,379	6,948,771	7,157,234	7,371,951
<u>Revenue</u>							
Permits	477,621	491,950	506,708	521,909	537,567	553,694	570,304
East Harbor Fees	782,510	805,985	830,165	855,070	880,722	907,144	934,358
West Harbor Fees	3,130,040	3,223,941	3,320,659	3,420,279	3,522,888	3,628,574	3,737,431
Concessions	704,491	725,626	747,394	769,816	792,911	816,698	841,199
Total Revenues	5,094,662	5,247,502	5,404,927	5,567,074	5,734,087	5,906,109	6,083,293
Marina Net Income	(1,079,231)	(1,111,608)	(1,144,956)	(1,179,305)	(1,214,684)	(1,251,124)	(1,288,658)
<i>Fee Increase Necessary to Cover Shortfall</i>	27.6%	27.6%	27.6%	27.6%	27.6%	27.6%	27.6%

- Assuming no changes to slips, rates, or expenditures outside of an annual 3% escalation
- The Marina will need a same-year fee increase of **27.4%** to cover the loss of General Fund support

Scenario 2: Project Executed Per FSA

Assumptions

- 172 slips reconstructed in the East Harbor at 90% occupancy
 - Charged at West Harbor rate
- 235 slips added to the West Harbor
- \$480,000/year debt service beginning 3 years after construction

Analysis

- Marina to generate **\$1.3 million in net income** when construction ends and **\$952,000** when debt service begins
- Ability to address \$1.3 million in annual deferred maintenance
- **No need** for General Fund support or supplemental revenue strategies to achieve financial viability

Scenario 3: Project Under Ordinance

Assumptions

- 172 slips reconstructed in the East Harbor at 90% occupancy
 - Charged at West Harbor rate
- No additional slips or revenue at the West Harbor
- \$390,000/year debt service beginning 3 years after construction

Analysis

- Net income **shortfall of \$521,000** when construction ends and **\$959,341** when debt service begins
- Collective harbor fees must increase **12%** when construction ends and **20%** when debt service begins
- To address capital spending needs, fees must increase by **32%**

Scenario 4: Project Under Ordinance, Base Expenditures Cap

Assumptions

- 172 slips reconstructed in the East Harbor at 90% occupancy
 - Charged at West Harbor rate
- No additional slips or revenue at the West Harbor
- \$390,000/year debt service beginning 3 years after construction
- Expenditures restricted to and escalated according to actual spending in FY 2022-23

Analysis

- Collective harbor fees must increase by **15%** by the time debt service begins to address the net income **shortfall of \$751,000**

Scenario Summary

FY 2033 and Beyond			
#	Scenario	Berthing Fee Increase	Marina Net Income
1	Status Quo (No Project)	31% fee increase for East and West Harbors	Breakeven
2	Remediation Project (As outlined in the Final Settlement Agreement)	Only for East Harbor (planned, approx. 40%)	\$1 million per year
3	Modified Remediation Project (East Harbor renovation, no West Harbor expansion)	20% fee increase beyond planned fees for East and West Harbors	Breakeven
4	Modified Remediation Project, Spending Baselined to FY 2023	15% fee increase beyond planned fees for East and West Harbors	Breakeven

Questions and comments

MARINA YACHT HARBOR FEE ANALYSIS

Policy Analysis Report to Supervisor Peskin

Presentation to:

LAND USE & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

January 29, 2024

Project Staff : Nicolas Menard

Alex Thibodo

Recreation & Park Department

Marina Improvement & Remediation Project Board of Supervisors | Land Use Hearing

January 29, 2024




Inspire, Connect, Play!


Marina Overview




Site History



FSA – Project Goals



FSA – Constraints



Project Plan



Impact of Ordinance

SLIP REDUCTIONS

Marina Overall - 736 to 542

East Harbor - 359 to 165

NO Fuel Dock

NO Breakwater at West Harbor

Minimal public access improvements for non boat owners



Slip Reductions

SLIP REDUCTIONS

Marina Overall - 736 to 542

East Harbor - 359 to 165

Fewer slips for smaller boats, historically berthed in East Harbor

Decreased revenues from berthing



Elimination of Fuel Dock

Utilized by Emergency Services

- US Coast Guard
- US Homeland Security Vessels
- SFPD
- SFFD

Also used by: State and Federal Agencies, Recreational Boaters, Commercial Fishermen, Tour Boats, and more

No on-site fuel dock could decrease demand for slips


Risk of fire hazards and fuel spills by using uncontrolled portable containers to fuel individual boats



Fuel Dock

Bay Area Fuel Docks

NOTE: Distance in Nautical Miles



Elimination of Breakwaters at West Harbor

Would not address dredging issue due to ongoing sedimentation and shoaling. Requiring ongoing General Fund subsidy

No waterfront flood protection

No protection from storm surges and wave action at existing outer West Harbor

No public access afforded by Lee Breakwater (off of Marina Green)



Financial Impact of Ordinance

Can it be built within constraints of FSA for repayment?

Berthing Rate Increases and their impact on future occupancy due to inelastic demand

Loss of Fuel Dock for revenue and as a Marina amenity

Ongoing dredging with no reduction



Outreach and Approvals

Community & Boaters

Regulatory Agencies and Permitting

BCDC, Recreation and Park Commission, Planning Commission (CEQA Certification), Water Board, USACE, USEPA, USCG, SLC, SWRCB, Port, NPS/GGNRA, USFWS, NMFS, CDFW, and BAAQMD



San Francisco Recreation & Park Department

Thank You



Inspire, Connect, Play!

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BUDGET AND LEGISLATIVE ANALYST
1390 Market Street, Suite 1150, San Francisco, CA 94102
PHONE (415) 552-9292 FAX (415) 252-0461

Policy Analysis Report

To: Supervisor Peskin and Supervisor Safai
From: Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office
Re: Marina Yacht Harbor Fee Analysis
Date: January 26, 2024



Summary of Requested Action

Your offices requested that the Budget and Legislative Analyst conduct a financial analysis of the Marina Yacht Harbor, including the annual fee revenue generated, General Fund subsidy, and options to reduce the General Fund subsidy.

For further information about this report, contact Nicolas Menard at the Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office.

Executive Summary

- Activities at the Marina are primarily accounted for in the Marina Yacht Harbor special revenue fund. Revenues include permit fees for special events, concession income from vendors and the Golden Gate and St. Francis yacht clubs, and fees generated from berthing and accessory fees at the harbor.
- Fees and other revenues to the Marina do not cover all operating costs, which are budgeted at \$4.86 million in FY 2023-24. To cover the shortfall, the Marina receives a General Fund subsidy which totals \$592,921. Certain variable structural maintenance expenditures are accounted for outside of the Marina Yacht Harbor Fund and are also paid for with General Fund monies. In FY 2022-23, actual General Fund spending at the Marina totaled \$956,077.
- A 2023 survey conducted among the 36 yacht harbors in the Bay Area revealed that the San Francisco Marina Yacht Harbor charged the highest fees to lease their berths to boat owners. Slips are charged at a set rate per linear foot and charged monthly to tenants. For every slip size offered, the Marina Yacht Harbor's rates per foot are several dollars higher than the median regional rate. There were no major differences in amenities between the Marina Harbor and regional harbors. However, the Marina Yacht Harbor is the only harbor in the Bay Area to offer slip sizes larger than 80 linear feet in length.

Budget and Legislative Analyst

Reducing General Fund Subsidy Without Any Marina Improvements

- The BLA determined berthing fees at the East and West Harbors could be raised by 31.4 percent to fully cover the General Fund subsidy and supplemental transfer. This estimate assumes no improvements to the Marina's harbors. The BLA cannot empirically gauge whether the Marina's tenants are willing to absorb a rate increase of that magnitude. However, demand indicators at the Marina Yacht Harbor such as waitlist length and few tenant departures following the 2022 implementation of a dredging fee for West Harbor tenants, which resulted in a 20 percent rate increase for West Harbor tenants between FY 2021-22 and FY 2022-23, suggest there is room to increase rates and capture additional revenue.
- Using data from a 2019 study conducted by the Municipal Transportation Agency, the BLA determined that paid parking could largely offset the General Fund subsidy required to operate the Marina. In this case, berthing fees would have to be increased by approximately 5 percent to cover the remaining costs.

Reducing General Fund Subsidy With Marina Improvements

- The BLA evaluated the Marina Yacht Harbor's financial viability through FY 2036 under four scenarios, described in Exhibit A below, given the proposed Gashouse Cove remediation project with PG&E, anticipated Citywide budget cuts, and a pending ordinance to prohibit expanding the West Harbor. Apart from the Gashouse Cove remediation going through as outlined in the Final Settlement Agreement with PG&E, no scenario will result in the Marina Yacht Harbor generating enough operating revenue to cover expenditures. In these cases, the Marina must either receive General Fund support or implement a berthing fee increase between 15 and 20 percent beyond planned fee increases to break even. The scenarios do not include paid parking revenue, which, if implemented, would reduce the fee increase necessary for the Marina to become financially independent.

Exhibit A: Scenario Summary

FY 2033 and Beyond			
#	Scenario	Berthing Fee Increase	Marina Net Income
1	Status Quo (No Project)	31% fee increase for East and West Harbors	Breakeven
2	Remediation Project (As outlined in the Final Settlement Agreement)	Only for East Harbor (planned, approx. 40%)	\$1 million per year
3	Modified Remediation Project (East Harbor renovation, no West Harbor expansion)	20% fee increase beyond planned fees for East and West Harbors	Breakeven
4	Modified Remediation Project, Spending Baselined to FY 2023	15% fee increase beyond planned fees for East and West Harbors	Breakeven

- This financial scenario analysis was conducted using the best available information as provided to the BLA by the Recreation and Parks Department (RPD). RPD advised additional scenarios are being explored in coordination with PG&E, as the design will dictate the type of remediation work performed.

Project Staff: Nicolas Menard and Alex Thibodo

The Marina Small Craft Harbor and Recreation Area

Amenities Overview

Exhibit 1: Map of Marina Greens and Harbors



Source: Google Maps

The Marina features three distinct areas of greenspace. Most notably, the Marina green spans 7.62 acres along the waterfront and offers views of the Golden Gate Bridge and the waterway between the Bay and Pacific Ocean. The Green may be rented out for special events including sports tournaments, festivals, and fundraising events. Directly southeast of the Green, the Triangle features a small outdoor calisthenics gym and just over 2 acres of greenspace. Finally, the Little Marina is a 2.2-acre rectangular lawn located on the westernmost side of the Marina park. Both the Little Marina and the Triangle are available for permitted special events.

The Marina Small Craft Harbor has 727 berthing slips across two harbors. The East Harbor, situated above the Marina Triangle, offers 326 permanent berths for watercraft ranging from 20 to 35 linear feet in length. The harbor also contains a floating fuel dock for berth owners and guests to purchase fuel for their vessels. The West Harbor also has 326 permanent berthing slips for boats between 25 and 100 linear feet in length. The West Harbor is periodically dredged, due to sediment buildup caused by tidal patterns in the immediate vicinity of the channel entrance.

Landside, the Marina features several parking lots extending from the peninsula where two concessionaire yacht clubs are situated down alongside the main Marina Green. Collectively, the Recreation and Parks Department administers 799 parking spaces in total, including

approximately 200 spaces reserved for berth owners and their crew. The remaining spaces are unrestricted and available to the public at no cost during park hours.

Marina Budget

Administered by the Recreation and Parks Department (RPD), Marina Yacht Harbor activities are primarily accounted for in two special revenue funds: a capital fund and an operating fund.

Capital Budget

The Marina’s capital budget for FY 2023-24 is \$12,070,879, of which \$11 million is appropriated for the East Harbor remediation project. RPD advises these funds are sourced from PG&E’s portion of the settlement agreement, described below, and will carry forward until remediation work begins. The remainder of the capital budget is designated for Marina dredging, which is paid for by dredging fee revenue and a transfer from the Marina operating fund. Additionally, the capital budget allocates funds for facilities and maintenance and the DBW Loan Reserve, which is paid for by a transfer from the operating fund.

Exhibit 2: Marina Capital Budget for FYs 2022-2025

	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25
DBW Marina Loan Reserve	78,700	77,300	79,654
East Harbor Remediation	1,817,590	11,000,000	0
Marina Dredging	600,000	550,000	550,000
Marina Yacht Renovation	5,233	5,579	5,683
Facilities and Maintenance	338,000	438,000	438,000
Total	2,839,523	12,070,879	1,073,337

Source: RPD Fund 19000

Operating Budget

RPD’s budgeted expenditures for direct operations at the Marina are \$4,857,921 for FY 2023-24. The largest annual expenditure for the Marina is a \$1.5 million loan repayment to the California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW) from renovations to the Marina’s West Harbor completed in 2013.¹ Outside of debt servicing, the bulk of the Marina’s operating budget funds salaries and benefits for 11.79 FTE positions. The remainder of the budget is allocated towards department overhead, materials and supplies, transfers to the Marina Capital Fund to pay for maintenance costs, and costs of services rendered from other departments. Exhibit 3 below shows the budgeted operating expenditures for the previous, current, and future fiscal years.

¹ RPD advises the \$24.5 million loan will be paid in full within the next 15 years.

Exhibit 3: Marina Operating Budget for FYs 2022-23 - FY 2024-25

	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25
Salaries	1,161,869	1,196,934	1,231,610
Fringe Benefits	560,004	553,846	572,693
Overhead & Allocations	640,793	681,195	694,118
Non-Personnel Services	224,097	224,097	224,097
Materials & Supplies	112,000	112,000	112,000
Debt Service	1,880,686	1,458,020	1,458,020
Services of Other Departments	145,024	210,950	224,779
Transfer to Marina Capital Fund	421,933	420,879	523,337
Total	5,146,406	4,857,921	5,040,654

Source: RPD Fund 11902

Actual spending in the Marina operating fund in FY 2022-23 was \$544,477 below budget due to staff vacancies (\$303,825), lower than budget spending on materials and services, (\$102,986), and lower than budget spending on debt service (\$137,666). As shown above, the FY 2023-24 budget of \$4.8 million is \$288,485 lower than the FY 2022-23 budget of \$5.1 million, due to a decrease in budgeted debt service costs,² however no adjustments were made to personnel, materials, and service budgets.

Other Operating Costs

As described below, in addition to the expenses noted above and accounted for in the Marina operating and capital funds, RPD pays for structural maintenance at Marina facilities, which is funded by RPD’s General Fund budget. In FY 2022-23, structural maintenance costs were approximately \$270,000, according to RPD staff.

Marina Operating Revenue

As described below, Marina operating revenue consist of yacht fees, concession fees, permit fees, and a General Fund subsidy.

Berth & Mooring Fees

The fee revenue from yacht berthing and associated chargeable services at the East and West harbors make up most of the Marina’s operating revenue. As shown in Exhibit 4 below, fees collected from East Harbor operations totaled \$784,134 in revenue while the West Harbor

² RPD advised the \$422,000 decrease in debt service is from the department no longer needing to contribute money the escrow account associated with the loan.

brought in \$2,946,646 in FY 2022-23—collectively representing 81 percent of the total operating revenue for the year (excluding the General Fund transfer in).

Exhibit 4: Harbor Fees Budgeted and Actual Revenue for FYs 2022-23 – FY 2024-25

	FY 2022-23 (Budget)	FY 2022-23 (Actuals)	FY 2023-24 (Budget)	FY 2024-25 (Budget)
General Fund	686,077	686,077	592,921	645,954
Permits	400,000	317,979	400,000	412,000
East Harbor Fees	710,000	784,134	675,000	675,000
West Harbor Fees	2,650,000	2,946,646	2,600,000	2,700,000
Concessions	575,000	553,402	590,000	607,700
Use of Fund Balance	125,329	0	0	0
Total	5,146,406	5,288,238	4,857,921	5,040,654

Source: RPD Fund 11902

The above fees include revenue from harbor slip reservation charges, billed to berth tenants each month. Slip fees follow a progressive schedule based on the vessel’s length with the fee-per-foot increasing according to the vessel’s size, as illustrated in Exhibit 5 below. Notably, fees at the West Harbor are greater than those in the East Harbor for slips of comparable size due to the proximity of nearby amenities and recent renovations.³ Additionally, fees for slips at the West Harbor include a dredging surcharge that is also applied on a fee-per-foot basis, though the dredging fee revenue is accounted for in the Marina capital fund.

³ Per communication from RPD Deputy Director Antonio Guerra. Following the East Harbor remediation project, RPD expects slip fees will match fees to rates at the West Harbor.

Exhibit 5: Slip Fee Schedule by Vessel Length, Harbor for FY 2023-24

West Harbor					
Slip Length	Fee (per foot)	Dredging Surcharge	# of Slips Available	Monthly Rate (per vessel)	Annual Rate (per vessel)
25	\$17.03	\$2.85	7	\$497.00	\$5,964.00
30	17.27	2.89	50	604.80	7,257.60
35	17.27	2.89	43	705.60	8,467.20
40	20.95	3.51	112	978.40	11,740.80
45	20.95	3.51	52	1,100.70	13,208.40
50	21.42	3.58	47	1,250.00	15,000.00
60	21.42	3.58	23	1,500.00	18,000.00
70	21.87	3.66	4	1,787.10	21,445.20
80	21.87	3.66	4	2,042.40	24,508.80
90	21.87	3.66	4	2,297.70	27,572.40
100	21.87	3.66	1	2,553.00	30,636.00
Total			347		
East Harbor					
Slip Length	Fee (per foot)	-	# of Slips Available	Monthly Rate (per vessel)	Annual Rate (per vessel)
20	\$12.16	-	20	\$243.20	\$2,918.40
25	12.16	-	139	304.00	3,648.00
30	12.33	-	99	369.90	4,438.80
35	12.33	-	68	431.55	5,178.60
Total			326		

Sources: Marina Harbormaster and Park Fee Schedule

Notes: Monthly and annual rates for West Harbor slips include the dredging surcharge.

Rates shown are for single hull vessels. Multihull vessels incur a surcharge of 40 percent of the monthly fee. Slip counts shown are distributed between permanent berth tenants and yacht club allotments.

In addition to slip fees, captured harbor fee revenue also includes the following items:

- Guest Dockage: Covers per foot, per day fees for guest watercraft at the Marina Harbors.
- Deposits: Includes one-time deposits for berthing slips, electric adapters, and keys.
- Parking: Berth owners at the Marina Harbors are allotted two annual permitted parking passes with their slip at no additional charge. Additional annual parking passes, and the daily rates for permitted crew members or trailers are included in this fee revenue.
- Transfer fees: When boats and slips are sold and transferred between berth owners, RPD collects both an administrative fee and a per-foot transfer fee from the seller.
- Wait list fees: Covers the \$103 annual fee from persons on the wait list to reserve a slip at the harbor.
- Services: Includes labor costs and fees for various services performed at the harbor.
- Other accessory fees include storage, kayak racks, key purchases, and late fees.

RPD does not track itemized fee revenue and therefore the BLA is unable to determine the proportional contribution of individual fee components to the overall funding source.⁴

Based on the number of slips and associated berthing fees in the west harbor, the revenue potential from berthing fees in the west harbor is \$3.6 million, or \$1.0 million less than the FY 2023-24 budgeted revenue of \$2.6 million. The revenue potential in the east harbor is \$1.4 million, or \$725,000 less than the FY 2023-24 budgeted revenue of \$675,000.

Special Events

The Marina hosts permitted events regularly throughout the year. According to the RPD Special Event master calendar, events typically take place on weekends and can accommodate up to 10,000 attendees.⁵ RPD advises permits for the main Marina green typically only cover part of the lawn, either east or west of the flagpole. So far in 2023, the only event that received a permit for the entire main green was Fleet Week.

Budgeted revenue for permitted special events at the Marina totals \$400,000 in FY 2023-24. According to RPD's fee schedule, permit costs for hosting Marina events are tiered based on where the event is situated within the Marina and the hosting organization. Permits for the picnic area (Marina Green West) are priced at a lower rate than those held on the main green, and non-profit organizations are charged at half the rate of commercially sponsored events. Permits for youth sport programming do not incur charges.

Exhibit 6: Budgeted and Actual Revenue for FYs 2022-2025

	FY 2022-23 (Budget)	FY 2022-23 (Actuals)	FY 2023-24 (Budget)	FY 2024-25 (Budget)
Special Event Permits	\$400,000	\$317,979	\$400,000	\$412,000

Source: RPD Fund 19002

As illustrated in Exhibit 6 above, actual revenues from special event permits totaled \$317,979 in FY 2022-23, \$82,021 below budgeted revenue. Budgeted revenue will increase by 3 percent in the upcoming fiscal year to \$412,000.

⁴ RPD advises revenue from East and West Harbor fees are tracked according to individual payee accounts rather than by revenue source.

⁵<https://sfrecpark.org/DocumentCenter/View/20850/RPD-Special-Events-Calendar-Marina-Green>

Concessions

Yacht Clubs

The St. Francis Yacht Club currently holds a 40-year lease with RPD, set to expire in 2054. As of December 1, 2021, base rent for St. Francis is set at \$27,281 per month, or \$327,370 annually. The lease agreement stipulates that every 5 years, base rent will increase according to whichever is higher: i) 115 percent of base rent, or ii) 50 percent of the property's fair market value. In addition to the base rent, St. Francis will also make payments for four guest slips in the West Harbor at the rate established in the RPD fee schedule.⁶ The lease agreement further stipulates that rent paid to RPD may be discounted in proportion with approved maintenance work to the Marina Harbor performed and paid by the St. Francis Yacht Club.⁷ Maintenance of the St. Francis Club and its utilities costs are paid for by the St. Francis Yacht Club.

Under the St. Francis lease agreement, the City is obligated to maintain the channel entrance to the West Harbor to an average water depth of 12 feet at median low water tide.⁸ If and when the channel entrance depth reaches an average of 10 feet, the City will initiate a sampling and dredging process to return the average depth to 12 feet. St. Francis Yacht Harbor may request dredging to additional depths, at which point the Club would assume responsibility for any environmental review, legal, and dredging costs incurred by dredging beyond 12 feet of depth. Meanwhile, the Golden Gate Yacht Club agreement stipulates the City has no obligation to dredge any portion of the harbor under the lease.

The Golden Gate Yacht Club's lease is set for a term of 18 years through 2037. Per the agreement, base rent is set at 10 percent of monthly gross receipts for the preceding month with a minimum annual rent guarantee of \$85,000. As they offer youth educational programming, the Golden Gate Yacht Club is not obligated to pay market rate rent under their lease.⁹ In addition to base rent, the Club is obligated to pay 10 percent of the membership and dock fees collected in the prior month to the City, who will allocate these funds towards supplementing major harbor maintenance projects. RPD may suspend the Club's maintenance surcharge obligation if the Department does not have sufficient funds for major maintenance projects. As shown below, the Golden Gate Yacht Club paid \$67,049 in rent to the City in FY 2022-23, which is less than the

⁶ Rent for slips 113 and 115B fall under the lease agreement, while payment for slips 115 and 115A fall under a separate contract.

⁷ Section 5.7 of the lease agreement stipulates that in the event St. Francis Yacht Club wishes to perform harbor maintenance otherwise administered by the City, they shall provide a detailed cost estimate to the harbormaster and RPD and come to an agreement for a credit towards St. Francis's rental obligation.

⁸ See section 9.2 of the St. Francis Yacht Club lease agreement.

⁹ Golden Gate Yacht Club, per their lease agreement, administers a youth sailing program that offers a low cost of entry to sailing for San Francisco students.

minimum rent required by its lease with the Recreation and Parks Department. According to Recreation and Parks Department staff, the Department is in the process of collecting the outstanding rent owed.

As shown in Exhibit 7 below, the City budgets \$350,000 and \$80,000 in revenue from the leases for the St. Francis Yacht Club and Golden Gate Yacht Club, respectively. In FY 2022-23, the yacht clubs collectively produced just over 90 percent of their budgeted revenue in rental payments. Meanwhile, budgeted revenue for St. Francis Yacht Club and Golden Gate Yacht Club is set to increase by 3 percent each in FY 2024-25.

Exhibit 7: Budgeted and Actual Revenue from Yacht Clubs for FY 2022-23 – FY 2024-25

	FY 2022-23 (Budget)	FY 2022-23 (Actuals)	FY 2023-24 (Budget)	FY 2024-25 (Budget)
St. Francis Yacht Club	\$350,000	\$327,371	\$350,000	\$360,500
Golden Gate Yacht Club	85,000	67,049	80,000	82,400
Total	\$435,000	\$394,420	\$430,000	\$442,900

Source: RPD Fund 19002

Permitted Vendors

RPD currently holds leases with six vendors at the Marina, listed below in Exhibit 8, each set for a term of 12 months. Base rent for each establishment varies. Some vendors are obligated to pay a flat proportion of gross receipts, while others must pay the greater of a minimum monthly payment or a portion of gross receipts. Moreover, establishments with minimum monthly payment agreements may either have a flat payment obligation, or a minimum payment amount that varies seasonally.

Exhibit 8: Active Permit Agreements at Marina

Vendor	Type	Permit Fees
Dynamo Donuts	Kiosk	10% of gross receipts
Philz Coffee	Mobile Food Truck	Equal to the greater of minimum monthly payment or 10% of gross receipts
Parkwide Bike Rental	Kiosk and Storage	13.5% of gross receipts
Cousins Maine Lobster	Mobile Food Truck	10% of gross receipts
Los Colores 709	Mobile Food Bike	Equal to the greater of minimum monthly payment or 10% of gross receipts
Hometown Creamery	Mobile Food Truck	Equal to the greater of minimum monthly payment or 10% of gross receipts

Source: Permit agreements between vendors and RPD

Additionally, RPD holds a lease agreement with the Chevron-operated floating fuel dock in the East Harbor. The current agreement is a month-to-month contract from 2000 and indicates that base rent paid to RPD is a combination of set payment per gallon sold, revenue from dry boat storage and boat hoist operations, and a portion of remaining gross receipts.

As shown in Exhibit 9 below, budgeted revenue from the fuel dock in FY 2023-24 is \$40,000 while expected revenues from other vendors are collectively set at \$120,000. Actual concession revenue in FY 2022-23 exceeded expectations by over \$23,000 while revenue from the fuel dock fell short of budget by just over \$10,000. Both revenue sources are set to increase their budgets by 3 percent in FY 2024-25.

**Exhibit 9: Budgeted and Actual Revenue from Permitted Vendors,
FYs 2022-23 - FY 2024-25**

	FY 2022-23 (Budget)	FY 2022-23 (Actuals)	FY 2023-24 (Budget)	FY 2024-25 (Budget)
Marina Green Concessions	\$100,000	\$123,077	\$120,000	\$123,600
Fuel Dock	40,000	29,761	40,000	41,200
Total	\$140,000	\$152,838	\$160,000	\$164,800

Source: RPD Fund 11902

General Fund

According to RPD, the General Fund subsidy to the Marina Yacht Harbor Fund pays for the appropriated operating expenditures after budgeted operating revenue sources have been exhausted. The General Fund subsidy to Marina operations in FY 2023-24 is \$592,921, as shown in Exhibit 10 below, and will increase 8.9 percent to \$645,954 in FY 2024-25.

Exhibit 10: General Fund Subsidy, FY 2022-23 - FY 2024-25

	FY 2022-23 (Budget)	FY 2022-23 (Actuals)	FY 2023-24 (Budget)	FY 2024-25 (Budget)
General Fund Transfer	\$686,077	\$686,077	\$592,921	\$645,954
Other General Fund Spending	\$270,000	\$270,000	\$278,000	\$285,000
Total General Fund Subsidy	\$956,077	\$956,077	\$870,921	\$930,954

Source: Fund 11902

RPD advised that in addition to the subsidy, General Fund monies cover structural maintenance and gardening expenditures that are accounted for outside of the Marina Yacht Harbor Fund.¹⁰ These expenditures are variable year-to-year and are administered by the operations division of RPD. In FY 2022-23, structural maintenance expenditures at the Marina were \$270,000, bringing total General Fund spending to \$956,077 for that year.

Regional Fee Comparison

The following section will report key findings from the 2023 Annual Marina and Boatyard Survey. The survey, conducted each year, polls the 36 public and private marinas in the Bay Area regarding their harbors' berth rates, amenities, accessory fees, and occupancy rates.

Highest Fees and Largest Berths

According to the 2023 survey results, the San Francisco Marina Yacht West Harbor had the highest rate per linear foot for almost all slip sizes in the Bay Area. For 35' slips, the West Harbor was the third most expensive out of the 36 harbors polled. As shown in Exhibit 11 below, West Harbor rates per foot are nearly double the median and average rates for regional harbor slips of comparable sizes. For the slip sizes where the West Harbor has the most expensive rates, the Marina's rates exceed those of the second-most expensive by one to six dollars per linear foot. While not illustrated in the table below, rates for the 20 to 35-foot East Harbor slips at approximately \$11 per linear foot are in line with the median and average rates recorded throughout the regional harbors.

¹⁰ RPD's structural maintenance subdivision provides trade work including painting, carpentry, and electrical work within San Francisco parks.

Exhibit 11: Comparative Fee Schedule by Slip Size

Slip Size	Marina Rate Per Foot	Median Rate Per Foot	Average Rate Per Foot
25'	\$18.36	\$9.96	\$10.79
30'	18.62	10.26	11.15
35'	18.62	10.93	12.25
40'	22.58	12.2	13.12
45'	22.58	12.08	13.24
50'	23.09	13.75	15.33
55'	23.09	13.75	13.44
60'	23.09	13.87	15.2
70'	23.58	17.37	17.53
80'	23.58	15.19	16.42
90'	23.58	-	-
100'	23.58	-	-

Source: 2023 Annual Marina and Boatyard Survey Results

Notes: Marina slip rates shown are for the West Harbor only and reflect the slip fees submitted by the Marina harbormaster when responding to the survey.

As shown in Exhibit 12 below, the Marina Yacht Harbor is notably the only harbor in the Bay Area that offers slip sizes longer than 80 linear feet in length. The West Harbor accommodates four 90-foot slips and one 100-foot berth. Otherwise, the distribution of slip sizes at the Marina largely reflects that of the greater regional harbor stock and is largely concentrated between slip sizes of 30 and 40 linear feet in length.

Exhibit 12: Slip Size Distribution at Marina and Regional Harbors

Slip	Marina Harbor		Regional Harbors	
	Count	% of Total Stock	Count	% of Total Stock
25'	28	4.29	1,653	13.05
30'	187	28.68	3,148	24.84
35'	141	21.63	2,516	19.86
40'	172	26.38	2,235	17.64
45'	47	7.21	1,390	10.97
50'	43	6.60	811	6.40
55'	0	-	271	2.14
60'	21	3.22	292	2.30
65'	0	-	68	0.54
70'	4	0.61	34	0.27
80'	4	0.61	12	0.09
90'	4	0.61	0	-
100'	1	0.15	0	-
Total	652		12,671	

Source: 2023 Annual Marina and Boatyard Survey Results

Notes: Marina figures include both East and West Harbor slip counts.
 Regional harbor counts exclude Marina Harbor counts.

Standard Amenities Relative to Regional Accommodations

Outside of slip fee pricing, the amenities and accessory fees offered by the Marina Yacht Harbor largely reflect that of the typical marina in the Bay Area. Amenities offered by more than 50 percent of regional harbors such as Wi-Fi, free parking for berth owners, and yacht clubs on or near the premises are also present at Marina Harbor. Likewise, amenities and services offered by a minority of regional harbors are typically not included at the Marina. These include features such as a boat wash, houseboat accommodations, and dry storage. Furthermore, the average harbor occupancy rate for Bay Area harbors is approximately 87 percent according to survey results. The Marina Yacht Harbor did not respond to the survey question regarding occupancy, however RPD provided the BLA with occupancy statistics for the West Harbor between July and November 2023. During these months, occupancy hovered between 85 and 89 percent.

Key differences from other harbors include the presence of a fuel dock. Including the Marina Yacht Harbor, only 15 of the 36 regional harbors polled have a fuel dock on the premises. Additionally, the Marina Yacht Harbor does not allow liveaboards and associated fees, while this

is only true for four other harbors in the Bay Area.¹¹ Liveaboards are prohibited under the Marina Rules and Regulations and under the lease agreement with the St. Francis Yacht Club, as well.

Recommended Mechanisms to Cover General Fund Subsidy

The recommendations selected as options to increase the Marina's operating revenue and eliminate the General Fund subsidy were chosen according to the following criteria:

1. **Fiscal Impact:** The recommendation must be able to generate a sizeable increase in Marina revenue to the extent it could reasonably cover most or all of the General Fund subsidy for FY 2024-25 in the amount of \$645,954, plus a supplemental General Fund allocation for structural maintenance expenditures. Assuming a 3 percent increase in expenditures each fiscal year, we anticipate a supplemental General Fund allocation of approximately \$285,000, bringing the total amount of additional revenue necessary to cover General Fund money to \$930,954.
2. **Feasibility:** The recommendation must be within the powers of the Recreation and Parks Department and/or the Board of Supervisors. Additionally, the recommendation must be reasonable under economic conditions, avoiding excessive fees and unrealistic demands of Marina patrons and the public.
3. **Reliability:** The recommendation must be able to generate revenue in a predictable manner, thereby mitigating the risk of over or under-budgeting. Emphasis is placed on favoring fixed or less variable price structures for increased financial stability.

The estimates included in the following section represent the best possible approximations of scenarios and figures given the data RPD provided to the BLA. RPD advises additional scenarios are being considered and analyzed, using engineering information the BLA does not have access to.

Raise Berthing Fees

Fiscal Impact

The Recreation and Parks Department could increase harbor berthing and accessory fees by 31.4 percent to fully cover Marina operating expenditures and eliminate the need for General Fund support. Exhibit 13 below shows a revised FY 2025-26 operating budget using the FY 2024-25 operating budget as a baseline. If the General Fund subsidy and supplemental monies were to

¹¹ Liveaboards describe persons whose permanent or partial residence is aboard their watercraft at a marina. Regional liveaboard slip rates typically incur an additional fee ranging between \$100 and \$500 per month.

be completely removed from the Marina’s budget, and all operating expenditures, permit revenue, and concession revenue were to increase by 3 percent the following fiscal year, harbor fees overall would need to increase by 31.42 percent for revenue to break even with expenditures, assuming no change in slip occupancy.

Exhibit 13: Marina Budget Adjusted to Cover General Fund

Expenditures	FY 2024-25	Change	FY 2025-26
Marina Fund Budgeted Expenditures	\$5,040,654	3%	\$5,191,874
Structural Maintenance	285,000	3	293,550
Total	\$5,325,654		\$5,485,424
Revenue	FY 2024-25	Change	FY 2025-26
General Fund (Subsidy)	\$645,954	-100%	\$0
General Fund (Supplemental)	285,000	-100	0
Permits	412,000	3	424,360
East & West Harbor Fees	3,375,000	31.42	4,435,425
Concessions	607,700	3	625,931
Total	\$5,325,654		\$5,485,716

Source: FY 2024-25 Operating Budget, BLA Analysis

For a 40-foot boat currently docked at the Marina Yacht Harbor, this fee adjustment would equate to a monthly payment increase from \$903 to \$1,187 and an additional \$3,404 per year being paid to the Marina between Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26.

Feasibility

The workability that the Marina will be able to increase their fees by 31.4 percent without causing a significant decrease in patronage relies upon how elastic the demand is for harbor slips from current and potential berth tenants. The San Francisco Marina Small Craft Yacht Harbor already has the highest fees per linear foot in the Bay Area. Furthermore, the regional harbor vacancy rate averaged 18 percent in 2023, which offers Marina patrons the option to relocate to other nearby harbors should fees become prohibitively high. However, in July 2022, the Board approved a Dredging Fee for west harbor slips, effectively increasing slip fees by 20 percent. According to RPD staff, this had no impact on the occupancy and waitlist at the West Harbor.

Despite high fees, standard amenities, and the availability of slips at nearby harbors, demand for slips at the Marina exceeds supply by 54 percent. As of 2023, the waitlist for the 326 slips in the West Harbor is comprised of 177 individuals who pay an annual fee of \$103 to remain in the queue. The distribution of waitlist members per requested slip size is shown in Exhibit 14 below.

Exhibit 14: Wait List Length by Slip Size

Slip Size	25'	30'	35'	40'	45'	50'	60'	70'	80'	90'
Wait List	8	27	29	27	21	17	16	14	9	9

Source: RPD West Harbor wait list.

Note: RPD advises the wait list for East Harbor slips is currently closed.

To implement the proposed fee increase, RPD must determine how to increase itemized fees in a manner that increases collective harbor berthing and accessory fees by 31.42 percent. Secondly, the Board of Supervisors would have to amend the Park Code to adjust the fee schedule beyond the standard CPI adjustment.

Reliability

RPD could improve the reliability of fee revenue and possibly lower the fee increase necessary to cover operating expenditures by implementing management strategies to reduce berth turnover at the Marina. In Exhibit 15 below, the BLA calculates the fee revenue expected at occupancy rates between 80 to 100 percent using actual revenue and scheduled fees for FY 2022-2023. Actual fee revenues for FY 2022-2023 at the West and East Harbors were \$2.9 million and \$784,134, respectively. These fees include non-berthing revenue, prohibiting the BLA from estimating an accurate occupancy rate, however RPD occupancy reporting for 2023 suggests West Harbor occupancy was approximately 87 percent. RPD did not provide occupancy data for the East Harbor, but advised occupancy is far lower due to the continued loss of slips to deterioration. RPD is unable to repair East Harbor slips at this time due to contamination in Gashouse Cove.

Exhibit 15: Fee Revenue Potential by Occupancy Rate

West Harbor Occupancy						
Actual	100%	95%	90%	85%	80%	
Revenue	\$2,946,646	3,196,895	3,037,050	2,877,205	2,717,361	2,557,516
East Harbor Occupancy						
Actual	100%	95%	90%	85%	80%	
Revenue	\$784,134	1,284,429	1,220,208	1,155,986	1,091,765	1,027,543

Source: FY 2022-23 RPD Actual Revenue, BLA analysis

As shown above, just a 5 percent increase in overall occupancy could generate more than \$220,000 in revenue between the East and West harbors, based on current fees.

Charge for Public Parking at Marina Lots

Fiscal Impact

RPD could implement paid public parking at the Marina parking lots to cover the vast majority of the \$930,954 in General Fund support to the Marina. The Municipal Transportation Authority (MTA) conducted a parking feasibility study in 2019 at the request of RPD that estimated the entry costs, routine expenditures, and revenue that could be expected if the Marina converted their public lots to a paid parking system. Continuing the 3 percent expenditure and revenue increase between fiscal years assumed by the MTA, the BLA adjusted the five-year net income estimated by the MTA and show them in Exhibit 16 below.

Exhibit 16: Estimated Costs and Revenue for Marina Paid Parking

	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28	FY 2028-29
Parking Revenue	\$1,323,208	\$1,362,904	\$1,403,791	\$1,445,905	\$1,489,282
Parking Tax	(246,178)	(253,563)	(261,170)	(269,005)	(277,076)
Credit Card Fees	(116,832)	(120,337)	(123,947)	(127,665)	(131,495)
Pay by Phone Fees	(3,282)	(3,380)	(3,482)	(3,586)	(3,694)
Expense	(190,819)	(196,544)	(202,440)	(208,513)	(214,768)
One Time					
Implementation Cost	(719,492)	0	0	0	0
Parking Net Income	\$46,605	\$789,080	\$812,752	\$837,135	\$862,249

Source: MTA 2019 Analysis

According to MTA estimates, paid parking at the Marina would generate positive profit immediately after the first year, and approximately \$790,000 the following year assuming implementation occurs in 2024.

Exhibit 17 below incorporates the BLA-adjusted parking revenue estimates with the Marina Operating budget for FYs 2024-2027. Assuming parking meters are implemented in FY 2024-25 and the General Fund support to the Marina ends the following year, the Marina operating budget would see a budget shortfall of \$169,803 and \$174,898 in the subsequent two fiscal years.

Exhibit 17: Example Marina Operating Budget Including Paid Parking Revenue

Expenditures	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27
Marina Fund Budgeted Expenditures	\$5,040,654	\$5,191,874	\$5,347,630
Structural Maintenance	285,000	293,550	302,357
Total	\$5,325,654	\$5,485,424	\$5,649,987
Revenue	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27
General Fund (Subsidy)	\$645,954	\$0	\$0
General Fund (Supplemental)	285,000	0	0
Permits	412,000	424,360	437,091
Harbor Fees	3,375,000	3,476,250	3,580,537
Concessions	607,700	625,931	644,709
Parking Net Income	46,605	789,080	812,752
Total	\$5,372,259	\$5,315,621	\$5,475,089
Marina Net Income	46,605	(169,803)	(174,898)

Source: MTA 2019 Analysis, BLA Analysis

Note: Revenue and expenditure estimates assume a 3 percent growth between fiscal years.

Feasibility

If enacted, the Marina would be just one of three RPD properties to have paid public parking on the premises.¹² To charge for public parking in the Marina lots, the Board of Supervisors must amend the Park Code to authorize the MTA to set rates for parking spots on the premises.¹³ The financial impact noted above assumes that all 799 parking spaces are charged for parking, include the 199 currently set-aside for berth tenants, who currently are provided two free parking spaces per berth.

Reliability

Revenue estimates for paid parking at the Marina were generated in 2019, prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, based on rates and usage from the adjacent Fort Mason parking lot. It is reasonable to believe revenue estimates calculated today would differ from MTA conclusions, especially as permitted events have not yet returned to pre-2020 levels. However, the estimates derived from the MTA study conservatively assume that throughout the year, occupancy of the public parking stalls would average 25% with an average stay of 2.5 hours.

¹² Golden Gate Park’s music concourse and Kezar Stadium parking lot are the only two RPD-managed paid parking facilities in the City.

¹³ Section 6.14 of the Park Code authorizes the MTA to work with RPD staff to 1) identify locations for the establishment of paid parking, 2) set rates for paid parking on park property, and 3) develop and implement a parking management plan for park properties with parking facilities.

Parking and Berthing Fee Increase

Through a combined approach of implementing paid parking and instituting a modest berthing fee increase above the standard 3 percent adjustment between fiscal years, RPD stands to achieve independence from General Fund transfers to the Marina Yacht Harbor Fund. To cover the revenue shortfall after paid parking is established at the public Marina lots, RPD would need to increase harbor fees by just 5.03 percent for operating revenue to break even with budgeted expenditures.

Policy Considerations

Gashouse Cove Remediation

Overview of Settlement and Proposed Remediation Project

In the 19th and early 20th centuries, Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) operated a coal gasification plant near what is currently the East Harbor of the Marina. Site studies conducted several decades later discovered that toxic chemical compounds from the plant's output were polluting the soils and sediments underlying the East Harbor. The City filed a lawsuit against PG&E in 2001 seeking recovery of costs related to the cleanup of the contamination. The parties reached a Final Settlement Agreement in 2020.

In 2021, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a resolution approving the Final Settlement Agreement (File 21-0067), which provided a high-level scope of the project, outlined project management responsibilities, and set the terms for cost-sharing and repayment according to expected project output. Per the settlement agreement, the remediation and contingency costs not to exceed \$160 million will be paid for by PG&E. The City will reimburse PG&E for 9 percent of the project costs up to \$160 million, and excess contingency costs incurred beyond \$160 million up to \$190 million will be shared on a 50-50 percent basis between the parties. PG&E will initially fund all project costs and the City will repay its share from Marina revenues at zero percent interest beginning three years after the remediation is completed for a term of 30 years. Exhibit 18 below shows the estimates that form the basis of the settlement amount. Any costs beyond \$190 million would have to be agreed by both parties and cost sharing would be subject to a future agreement.

Exhibit 18: Marina Yacht Harbor Project Budget

Cost	Estimate	Cost-Sharing¹
Pre-Construction	\$3,523,000	91-9
CEQA/Regulatory Compliance	4,450,000	91-9
Public Fuel Dock	2,289,000	91-9
East Harbor Remediation	67,961,000	91-9
East Harbor Renovation, Public Access, and Recreational Amenities	23,897,000	91-9
West Harbor Breakwater and Marina Improvements	27,880,000	91-9
Subtotal	\$130,000,000	
Contingency	\$30,000,000	91-9
Excess Contingency	\$30,000,000	50-50
Total	\$190,000,000	

Source: Final Settlement Agreement between PG&E and the City of San Francisco

Notes: ¹ Reflects the percentage obligation for PG&E and percentage obligation for the City, respectively.

While the project is still in the early design phase, the proposed project components developed over the course of the settlement agreement includes both the clean-up of the East Harbor and the construction of new public amenities. Specifically, the San Francisco Marina Improvement and Remediation Project would:

1. Demolish all docks and berths in the East Harbor.
2. Dredge the northern half of the East Harbor to remove pollutants.
3. Backfill the southern half of the East Harbor with an engineered sediment cap, to prevent contaminated sediment from leeching into the water.
4. Reconstruct the docks and berths in the northern half of the East Harbor.
5. Expand the West Harbor to accommodate the lost slips from the southern half of the East Harbor and to add a fuel dock.
6. Construct a new breakwater for the West Harbor that will decrease the dredging frequency.

With the engineered sediment cap, the southern half of the East Harbor would be too shallow for the berths to return. RPD anticipates this cove would become five acres of protected shallow open water recreation. According to the resolution approved by the Board of Supervisors accepting the Final Settlement Agreement, the project framework outlined in the settlement is

subject to future City approvals, California Environmental Quality Act review, and other environmental regulatory oversight.¹⁴

Implications for Fee Revenue

The Board of Supervisors is currently considering an ordinance to limit the extension of the West Harbor by more than 150 feet from its current boundary (File 23-1191). Such a decision would effectively prohibit lost East Harbor slips from being redistributed to the West Harbor and reduce potential fee revenue by \$2.0 million per year, altering the extent to which support from the General Fund and/or alternative revenue streams will be needed.

Scenario 1: No Improvements to the Marina

Exhibit 19 below outlines an estimated budget schedule for the Marina between Fiscal Years 2029-30 through FY 2035-36 for the scenario in which the remediation project does not proceed as planned. Under these circumstances, operating revenue would fall short of expenditures by more than \$1 million per year, requiring a General Fund subsidy or a 27.6 percent increase to overall berthing fees. When accounting for the year-to-year increase in expenditures, the required fee hike translates to a one-time 31.4 percent increase, as explained earlier, with subsequent 3 percent annual increases thereafter.

¹⁴ File 21-0067

**Exhibit 19: Marina Status Quo Budget Schedule
FYs 2029-30 – FY 2035-36**

	FY 2030	FY 2031	FY 2032	FY 2033	FY 2034	FY 2035	FY 2036
Expenditures							
Operating	5,843,499	6,018,804	6,199,369	6,385,350	6,576,910	6,774,217	6,977,444
Structural Maintenance	330,393	340,305	350,514	361,029	371,860	383,016	394,507
Total Expenditures	6,173,893	6,359,109	6,549,883	6,746,379	6,948,771	7,157,234	7,371,951
Revenue							
Permits	477,621	491,950	506,708	521,909	537,567	553,694	570,304
East Harbor Fees	782,510	805,985	830,165	855,070	880,722	907,144	934,358
West Harbor Fees	3,130,040	3,223,941	3,320,659	3,420,279	3,522,888	3,628,574	3,737,431
Concessions	704,491	725,626	747,394	769,816	792,911	816,698	841,199
Total Revenues	5,094,662	5,247,502	5,404,927	5,567,074	5,734,087	5,906,109	6,083,293
Marina Net Income	(1,079,231)	(1,111,608)	(1,144,956)	(1,179,305)	(1,214,684)	(1,251,124)	(1,288,658)
<i>Fee Increase Necessary to Cover Shortfall</i>	27.6%	27.6%	27.6%	27.6%	27.6%	27.6%	27.6%

Source: BLA Analysis

Notes: All revenue and expenditure estimates are assumed to increase 3 percent each year, using the FY 2024-25 operating budget as a baseline. The Fee Increase Necessary to Cover Shortfall figures represent the same-year one-time fee increase needed to cover unfunded expenditures that year.

Scenario 2: Remediation Project

Exhibit 20 below shows a potential budget schedule for the Marina under the same time period, but assumes the remediation project proceeds as described in the Final Settlement Agreement at a cost of \$160 million. The cost includes base project cost of \$130 million plus the \$30 million contingency, but not the \$30 million Excess Contingency. Here, East Harbor fees are calculated by assuming 90 percent occupancy for 172 reconstructed berths charged at the same rate as West Harbor slips. RPD advised they intend to equalize East and West Harbor fee rates to pay for the City’s obligation to the PG&E settlement. Notably, this change would represent an increase of approximately 40 percent for East Harbor berth tenants. West Harbor Fees include revenue from its existing berths and the expansion of 235 additional slips at 90 percent occupancy.¹⁵ Assuming construction finishes, and revenue begins generating in FY 2029-30, repayment to PG&E would begin in FY 2032-33 in the amount of \$480,000 per year. If the remediation project requires use of the project’s Excess Contingency, the debt service would increase from an assumed \$480,000 per year to \$980,000 per year.

¹⁵ Though not accounted for in the West Harbor Fees item of the operating budget, the BLA notes dredging fees imposed on West Harbor berth tenants may be reduced or eliminated, given the reduced dredging frequency needed with the new proposed breakwater. Eliminating the dredging fee would represent a 14 percent decrease in fees for West Harbor berth tenants, if implemented.

**Exhibit 20: Marina Budget Schedule Under Remediation Project
FYs 2029-30 – FY 2035-36**

	FY 2030	FY 2031	FY 2032	FY 2033	FY 2034	FY 2035	FY 2036
<u>Expenditures</u>							
Operating	5,843,499	6,018,804	6,199,369	6,385,350	6,576,910	6,774,217	6,977,444
Structural Maintenance	330,393	340,305	350,514	361,029	371,860	383,016	394,507
PG&E Debt Service				480,000	480,000	480,000	480,000
Total	6,173,893	6,359,109	6,549,883	7,226,379	7,428,771	7,637,234	7,851,951
<u>Revenue</u>							
Permits	477,621	491,950	506,708	521,909	537,567	553,694	570,304
East Harbor Fees	1,340,713	1,380,935	1,422,363	1,465,034	1,508,985	1,554,254	1,600,882
West Harbor Fees	4,961,829	5,110,683	5,264,004	5,421,924	5,584,582	5,752,119	5,924,683
Concessions	704,491	725,626	747,394	769,816	792,911	816,698	841,199
Total	7,484,654	7,709,193	7,940,469	8,178,683	8,424,044	8,676,765	8,937,068
Marina Net Income	1,310,761	1,350,084	1,390,586	952,304	995,273	1,039,531	1,085,117

Source: BLA Analysis

Notes: PG&E Debt Service amount is assumed to be \$14.4 million over 30 years, representing 9 percent of the \$130 million project costs plus \$30 million contingency.

All revenue and expenditure estimates are assumed to increase 3 percent each year, using the FY 2024-25 operating budget as a baseline.

As shown above, the Marina stands to operate at a surplus of approximately \$1.0 million per year if the remediation project goes through as planned, after including new debt service for the PG&E loan, without requiring support from the General Fund or additional revenue streams. According to RPD, the surplus will be used to fund a deferred maintenance fund. Deferred maintenance needs are estimated to cost approximately \$1.3 million per year, based on a lifecycle analysis of Marina assets.¹⁶ The Marina’s operating budget in the exhibit above includes a \$700,000 transfer, on average starting in FY 2033, to the Marina capital budget to pay for maintenance needs, leaving a remaining capital funding need of approximately \$650,000, on average, per year, if policy makers decide to fully fund the Marina’s estimated capital needs.

¹⁶ Deferred maintenance projects include the improvements to the Harbormasters Office, Marina Green bathrooms, landscaping, and parking lot.

Scenario 3: Modified Remediation Project

Next, we consider the impact of the project control ordinance limiting the expansion of West Harbor. In this scenario, the remediation project moves forward as planned, except for reconstructing the lost East Harbor slips in the West Harbor. We assume no other project scope changes. Exhibit 21 below outlines the estimated budget schedule under these circumstances. Here, the West Harbor is assumed to generate revenue with its existing slips and occupancy rates, while the East Harbor would collect fees from its proposed 172 reconstructed slips, charged at the same rate as West Harbor berths. Debt service to PG&E is reduced to a flat payment of \$390,000 per year as the estimated \$30 million to expand the West Harbor would no longer be included in total project costs.

**Exhibit 21: Marina Budget Schedule Without West Harbor Expansion for Fys 2029-30 –
FY 2035-36**

	FY 2030	FY 2031	FY 2032	FY 2033	FY 2034	FY 2035	FY 2036
<u>Expenditures</u>							
Operating	5,843,499	6,018,804	6,199,369	6,385,350	6,576,910	6,774,217	6,977,444
Structural Maintenance	330,393	340,305	350,514	361,029	371,860	383,016	394,507
PG&E Debt Service				390,000	390,000	390,000	390,000
Total Expenditures	6,173,893	6,359,109	6,549,883	7,136,379	7,338,771	7,547,234	7,761,951
<u>Revenue</u>							
Permits	477,621	491,950	506,708	521,909	537,567	553,694	570,304
East Harbor Fees	1,340,713	1,380,935	1,422,363	1,465,034	1,508,985	1,554,254	1,600,882
West Harbor Fees	3,130,040	3,223,941	3,320,659	3,420,279	3,522,888	3,628,574	3,737,431
Concessions	704,491	725,626	747,394	769,816	792,911	816,698	841,199
Total Revenues	5,652,865	5,822,451	5,997,125	6,177,038	6,362,349	6,553,220	6,749,817
Marina Net Income	(521,027)	(536,658)	(552,758)	(959,341)	(976,421)	(994,014)	(1,012,134)
<i>Fee Increase Necessary To Cover Shortfall¹</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>20%</i>	<i>20%</i>	<i>20%</i>	<i>20%</i>

Source: BLA Analysis

¹ Represents the one-time, same-year increase needed to cover shortfall.

As shown above, the BLA estimates that this scenario would generate an operating revenue shortfall of approximately \$1 million dollars per year once debt service to PG&E begins. In order to cover the loss without transfers from the General Fund, the BLA estimates that berthing fees in the East and West harbor would need to increase by 20 percent by the time debt service begins for the Marina to break even, including the annual \$700,000 maintenance transfer to the capital fund. To generate revenue sufficient to maintain capital spending of \$1.3 million per year, fees would need to be increased by 32 percent rather than 20 percent.

Scenario 4: Modified Remediation Project, Spending Baselined to Actual Spending in FY 2022-23

Finally, as noted above, FY 2022-23 spending in the Marina operating fund was \$544,477 less than budgeted, while revenues that year included a \$686,077 General Fund transfer. Due to the City's projected General Fund deficits in FY 2024-25 and beyond, the Department is considering eliminating the Marina's General Fund subsidy in FY 2024-25, which would essentially freeze operational spending at the Marina \$141,600 below FY 2022-23 actual spending. If that spending level is maintained but escalated by three percent through FY 2036, then berthing fees would need to be increased by 15 percent by the time debt service payments begin to cover operating costs if the remediation project is completed without the expansion of the West Harbor.

Conclusion

The Marina Small Craft Yacht Harbor currently does not generate enough revenue to cover expenditures and therefore cannot operate independently from the General Fund. The Recreation and Parks Department has been developing a project, largely funded by PG&E and a thirty-year repayment of certain project costs by the City, that would remediate contamination and renovate slips in the Marina's East Harbor and expand the number of slips in the West Harbor. The renovated and new slips would together be more than sufficient revenue to cover the Marina's operations, with net income going towards deferred maintenance needs.

The Board of Supervisors is considering an ordinance (File 23-1191) that would prohibit expansion of the West Harbor. After evaluating regional harbor fees, current revenue streams, and berth demand at the Marina, we conclude there are two viable options for the Recreation and Parks Department to significantly reduce or eliminate reliance on the General Fund if the Marina's West Harbor is not expanded. The Department could increase berthing fees at the East and West Harbors by 15 to 20 percent more than currently planned to achieve total financial independence from the General Fund. RPD could also implement paid parking at the public Marina lots and in turn increase operating revenue by enough to cover 82 percent of the current General Fund subsidy, thereby reducing the fee increase necessary to cover remaining costs no longer funded by the General Fund. Through a combined approach of instituting paid parking, modestly increasing berthing fees, and adopting strategies to improve optimal harbor management, the Marina could achieve its intended goal of financial independence from the General Fund.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

TO: Phil Ginsburg, General Manager, Recreation and Parks Department
Rich Hillis, Director, Planning Department

FROM: John Carroll, Assistant Clerk, Land Use and Transportation Committee

DATE: November 22, 2023

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Transportation Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by Supervisor Safai on November 14, 2023.

File No. 231191


Ordinance prohibiting the Recreation and Park Department and Planning Department from performing environmental review of, or otherwise implementing, a project to clean up and reconstruct the Marina Yacht Harbor in a manner that would extend the West Harbor Marina by more than 150 feet from its current boundary.

If you have comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at: john.carroll@sfgov.org.

cc:

Offices of Chair Melgar and Supervisor Safai
Sarah Madland, Recreation and Parks Department
Beverly Ng, Recreation and Parks Department
Dan Sider, Planning Department
Corey Teague, Planning Department
Tina Tam, Planning Department
Lisa Gibson, Planning Department
Devyani Jain, Planning Department
Aaron Starr, Planning Department
Josh Switzky, Planning Department
Joy Navarrete, Planning Department
Debra Dwyer, Planning Department
Elizabeth Watty, Planning Department

DRAFT ORDINANCE 231191



CURRENT:


... that would extend the eastern boundary of the West Harbor Marina by more than approximately 150 feet from its current location.

POSSIBLE:

*... that would extend the eastern boundary of the West Harbor Marina by more than approximately 150 feet ~~from its current location~~. **defined as a line parallel to and easterly of the current location of the sheet pile breakwater.***

BEST:

... refer to City Attorney for wording



DISCLAIMER

The street map is traced from the Autocad write protected San Francisco Department Public Works Key Maps 021,032 and 033 using Pickbox 7.

The Grant Boundary map is plotted from metes and bounds of Grant to City and County of San Francisco, Chapter 941 Statutes of 1963, revised 1970, recorded by San Francisco Recorder in Map Book "U" pages 78 and 80, July 20, 1965.

The West Harbor is an inserted Moffit and Nicols drawing.

There are discrepancies between the street map and the Grant Boundary map.

The area shown as dotted hatch is defined by S.F Port Authority Jurisdiction Line July 1961 sketched from Assessor Map 021. Attempts to get this line of authority confirmed by the Port has not succeeded.

The Gas House Cove, East Harbor, Marina Triangle and Fort Mason are best efforts to mimic Recreation and Park Department Marina Project PDF document.

State Lands Commission yet to document jurisdiction north of Grant.

PROJECT NORTH

↑

1 YACHT ROAD HARBOR GRANT 2.dwg MODEL

12/06/23 MPB

12/07/23 MPB

12/25/23 MPB

01/22/24 MPB

1

From: [Risley Sams](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Comment on File number 2321191 SF Marina harbor project
Date: Monday, January 29, 2024 11:33:31 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

My colleague on the board of the SF Marina Harbor Association Bruce Stone wrote earlier with regards to the proposed Ordinance file # 231191. My suggestions and opinions mirror his as we have both met with Rec and Park regarding this proposed project numerous times after they had drawn up their plans without any input from the users of the harbor (the berth holders).

In short, I believe that there should be a project, but current plan does not serve the community or the boating community well. As Bruce Stone wrote, the SF Marina Harbor Association's mission is is to have a safe and navigable facility that serves berth holders who pay the monthly fees that enable the harbor to operate, the many junior sailors who train at the two clubs, and the public who arrive from elsewhere and visit short-term. We want to see a successful renovation of East Harbor but are not opposed to some slips being installed in Outer West.

I too suggest a more nuanced approach with a small expansion of the outer breakwater and a successful renovation of the East Harbor and that further study is required before shutting down this project entirely.

I agree with all the reasons that Bruce Stone mentioned in his detailed email and Ask that you re-read his email to better understand our point of view. We want this project to be a success, not a mess.

Sincerely,

Risley Sams
Berth Holder 561 & 607

From: [Bruce Stone](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Comment regarding file number 231191 with reference to SF Marina Harbor
Date: Sunday, January 28, 2024 8:52:40 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing with reference to the proposed ordinance, file 231191, which seeks to prevent Rec and Park from installing anything beyond 150 feet to the East of the existing West Harbor sheet pile breakwater. I suggest in this memo a more nuanced approach, allowing a small expansion of the outer breakwater and around 30 slips along the seawall.

I have been sailing in and out of this harbor since 1982 and a berth holder since 2000, and am also President of the SF Marina Harbor Association, representing berth holders and users of the harbor. Our mission is to have a safe and navigable facility that serves berth holders who pay the monthly fees that enable the harbor to operate, the many junior sailors who train at the two clubs, and the public who arrive from elsewhere and visit short-term. We want to see a successful renovation of East Harbor but are not opposed to some slips being installed in Outer West.

The plan developed between Rec and Park and PGE had no input from users of the two harbors, nor from the public, which has led to today's quandary. We'd like a resolution so that a project may move forward, and high-quality berths may be installed. However, the preliminary design suffers from poor alignment of the slips in East Harbor – they should face into the wind – and from the reliance on a wave attenuator to stop the surge from entering East Harbor from the northeast. A proper sheet pile breakwater is the only solution. Without these two improvements, sailboats will continue to tip sideways and interlock their masts, dock lines will chafe, and cleats will tear out of decks, as they do now. We have expressed these concerns to Project Management, and they are looking into them. Irrespective of the final decision on Outer West, the East Harbor project is doomed to failure because it depends on being able to charge the premium rates that people pay in West Harbor, yet it will be a second-class experience for boat owners.

Specifically regarding the Outer West project...the extended breakwater and docks would displace the Cove, the practice area along Marina Green used by junior sailors, match racers and team racers, all of whom would have to travel farther and into open water to practice. Given the high winds on SF Bay, the Cove provides important relief. Also, the large number of sailboats without motors (Knarrs, Folkboats, IODs, J/22s and the various junior trainers) would have to tack back and forth a substantial extra distance in a narrow fairway to make it back into the West Harbor where most are based. This imposes a lot of time, energy, and risk of collisions, especially if the fuel dock were relocated to that area and commercial boats were loitering to take their turns to be refueled.

The extended breakwater of the Outer West project expansion makes it hard for the police and fire rescue boats to exit the harbor and save people. It significantly hurts the efficiency of race committee boats which can only motor at 5 mph and need to get out to set buoys for competitions, and often tow boats back into the harbor.

Now, to focus on the proposed ordinance. For many years, West Harbor has been silting in. We believe the sand reclamation at Ocean Beach has caused the sand to migrate into our harbor, and this has been exacerbated by the renovations of the beach at Crissy Field. As a result, the harbor is often not navigable, and Rec and Park has had to conduct repeated, and costly, dredging, while raising berthholder rates to cover this. We believe that a short extension and redesign of the breakwater that currently protects West Harbor could be beneficial, without affecting the Cove practice area, and is being studied by Rec and Park, but this ordinance would inadvertently prohibit that. There could also be a small addition to West Harbor to pick up the 30 or so slips that will be lost in the redesign of East Harbor so it can have East-West facing slips. We feel that this modest expansion of Outer West could be done without affecting the views that some non-boaters are seeking to preserve.

We recommend you table the proposal until further study has been conducted.

Sincerely,

Bruce J. Stone
Berthholder – West Harbor slip #231
President, SF Marina Harbor Association
bruce@brucestone.com
917-822-4060

From: [Linda Aldrich](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Ordinance 231191 Support
Date: Friday, January 26, 2024 8:26:27 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I support Ordinance 231191, please protect the Marina.

Linda Aldrich
2200 Sacramento Street, #701
San Francisco CA 94115

Linda Aldrich
lindilou@att.net
415-346-8855;415-999-6202(c)
RegardingArtSF.com

From: [Alice Ryan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Ordinance 231191, please protect the Marina
Date: Thursday, January 25, 2024 3:27:01 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

I am a District 2 resident, and know that many others who do not live in the district come to Marina Green to enjoy the natural and unobstructed beauty, that is hard to find along the SF Bay coastline.

I support the Ordinance 231191 and encourage you to consider my position when this comes under review at the January meeting. We concur that the greater Marina Green area, including both harbors, is an open space jewel, which deserves a better plan.

Money to fund this project would be better suited to clearing up SF streets so that tourism can come back to SF and we can enjoy a rejuvenated economic community.

Thank you,

Alice Ryan

From: [zrants](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Ronen, Hillary](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Joel Engardio](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support Ordinance # 231191- Implementation of Gashouse Cove Project
Date: Thursday, January 25, 2024 2:55:19 PM
Attachments: [pastedGraphic.png](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



January 24, 2024

Mayor London Breed, Supervisors and Staff,

Re: Please support Ordinance # 231191- Implementation of Gashouse Cove Project - Marina Yacht Harbor and oppose the plans proposed by San Francisco Rec & Park.

Members of the East Mission Improvement Association (EMIA), along with many of your constituents in District 9, support Ordinance # 231191- Implementation of Gashouse Cove Project - Marina Yacht Harbor.

We oppose San Francisco Rec & Park plans to divert funds for remediation of the toxic site at G. to move the East Harbor slips in front of the Marina Green, and relocate the gas fuel tanks to a less stable area.

The settlement from PG&E was meant to cover the remediation of toxic deposits from the old Manufactured Gas Plants in the East Harbor & Gashouse Cove.

Rec and Parks proposes to do only 15% of the cleanup and use the remaining funds to develop a new harbor in front of the Marina Green in which to relocate boat slips from the existing East Harbor marina so they may build a new harbor where the current one exists.

This will require building a very large breakwater at the level of the existing small one, that ends with Wave Organ and will leave 2/3rds of the East Harbor and Gashouse Cove to “silt over” at the location of a former toxic waste dump.

San Francisco Rec & Park developed this project and got it passed through the Planning Department without much public outreach, but, now that the public is aware of the plans there is massive outcry and calls for an alternative plan. That plan developed by multiple citizens

groups and the boating community, puts a greater emphasis on the toxic cleanup (up to 42%) and rebuilding the existing boat slips that are presently in the East Harbor and Gashouse Cove.

The alternative plans:

1. Preserve the unobstructed public views of the water at the Marina Green that the public has enjoyed for decades.
2. Place significant emphasis on toxic remediation (42% vs 15%).
3. Reconstruct of the boat slips in the East Harbor and Gashouse Cove that are presently in a state of severe disrepair.
4. Maintain the ideal location of the only fueling station for boats, including emergency vehicles, in its present location.

EMIA urges you to support Ordinance # 231191- Implementation of Gashouse Cove Project - Marina Yacht Harbor as it makes its way through committees to the full Board of Supervisors with recommendations to support the ordinance.

Sincerely,

Mari Eliza,
EMIA, and CSFN
zrants@gmail.com

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Gordon Laventurier](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Gas House Cove debacle! - BOS File No. 231191 - LUT January 29, 2024
Date: Monday, January 29, 2024 3:15:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the LUT committee, and I will include your comments in the file for this ordinance matter.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

-

[Board of Supervisors File No. 231191](#)

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

-----Original Message-----

From: Gordon Laventurier <glaventuri7@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2024 12:07 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Gas House Cove debacle!

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Sir,

How in anyone's world is this a good idea?

Having sailed from Gas House Cove for many years, it is rare to see very many empty slips even in ideal weather conditions. For many sailors it is a relaxing pastime and for others who enjoy a challenging sail the bay certainly offers that.

Turning the Cove into a paddle boat park is ridiculous as there will have to be SFPD water rescue team on site at all times as neophytes adventure off to see Alcatraz or the GG Bridge up close.

I have no clue why anyone condone this!

I'm sure the people who work for Park and Rec have good intentions but obviously caught up in this bureaucratic nonsense!

Please reject this very damaging, irreversible folly,

Gordon Laventurier

Sent from my iPhone

January 27, 2024

Land Use and Transportation Committee
City of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Support for Ordinance #231191

I am one of the creators of the Wave Organ, which is located on the eastern tip of the jetty which forms the West Marina Yacht Harbor. I am also Senior Artist Emeritus of the Exploratorium. In 1985 the Exploratorium and the SF Dept of Recreation and Parks jointly applied for permits to install what was to become the Wave Organ. Recently Exploratorium staff and I have been meeting with Parks staff concerning how the proposed Marina Renovation will affect the Wave Organ. Although we have explored several options, it is my opinion the Wave Organ will be negatively impacted if the proposed sheet-pile breakwater is extended from the jetty tip eastward. We have considered alternative locations but find there will still be negative impacts. The wave action needed to activate the organ pipes will be significantly diminished if the breakwater is located at the tip. It will be subject to shoaling if the breakwater is located on the south side of the installation.

The Wave Organ, an internationally famous public artwork, is noted for its evocation of a powerful sense of place and for its' connecting people to nature, to the city, and to the Bay. It is sited amongst the Golden Gate Bridge, Alcatraz and Angel Island, the north and east-bays, the Marina Green and the views of downtown San Francisco. It couples comfortably with the powerful experience of walking along the Marina Green seawall. This whole area is a special, multi-faceted place for all San Franciscans to enjoy and a destination for world travelers. The monies given by PG&E should be used for sensitively cleaning up a toxic waste situation in the middle of one of San Francisco most treasured public places.

Peter Richards
prichards@exploratorium.edu

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Bruce Stone](#)
Cc: [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Comment regarding file number 231191 with reference to SF Marina Harbor - LUT January 29, 2024
Date: Monday, January 29, 2024 10:09:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the LUT committee, and I will include your comments in the file for this ordinance matter.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

- [Board of Supervisors File No. 231191](#)

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Bruce Stone <bruce@brucestone.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 28, 2024 8:56 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Comment regarding file number 231191 with reference to SF Marina Harbor

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing with reference to the proposed ordinance, file 231191, which seeks to prevent Rec and Park from installing anything beyond 150 feet to the East of the existing West Harbor sheet pile breakwater. I suggest in this memo a more nuanced approach, allowing a small expansion of the outer breakwater and around 30 slips along the seawall.

I have been sailing in and out of this harbor since 1982 and a berth holder since 2000, and am also President of the SF Marina Harbor Association, representing berth holders and users of the harbor. Our mission is to have a safe and navigable facility that serves berth holders who pay the monthly fees that enable the harbor to operate, the many junior sailors who train at the two clubs, and the public who arrive from elsewhere and visit short-term. We want to see a successful renovation of East Harbor but are not opposed to some slips being installed in Outer West.

The plan developed between Rec and Park and PGE had no input from users of the two harbors, nor from the public, which has led to today's quandary. We'd like a resolution so that a project may move forward, and high-quality berths may be installed. However, the preliminary design suffers from poor alignment of the slips in East Harbor – they should face into the wind – and from the reliance on a wave attenuator to stop the surge from entering East Harbor from the northeast. A proper sheet pile breakwater is the only solution. Without these two improvements, sailboats will continue to tip sideways and interlock their masts, dock lines will chafe, and cleats will tear out of decks, as they do now. We have expressed these concerns to Project Management, and they are looking into them. Irrespective of the final decision on Outer West, the East Harbor project is doomed to failure because it depends on being able to charge the premium rates that people pay in West Harbor, yet it will be a second-class experience for boat owners.

Specifically regarding the Outer West project...the extended breakwater and docks would displace the Cove, the practice area along Marina Green used by junior sailors, match racers and team racers, all of whom would have to travel farther and into open water to practice. Given the high winds on SF Bay, the Cove provides important relief. Also, the large number of sailboats without motors (Knarrs, Folkboats, IODs, J/22s and the various junior trainers) would have to tack back and forth a substantial extra distance in a narrow fairway to make it back into the West Harbor where most are based. This imposes a lot of time, energy, and risk of collisions, especially if the fuel dock were relocated to that area and commercial boats were loitering to take their turns to be refueled.

The extended breakwater of the Outer West project expansion makes it hard for the police and fire rescue boats to exit the harbor and save people. It significantly hurts the efficiency of race committee boats which can only motor at 5 mph and need to get out to set buoys for competitions, and often tow boats back into the harbor.

Now, to focus on the proposed ordinance. For many years, West Harbor has been silting in. We believe the sand reclamation at Ocean Beach has caused the sand to migrate into our harbor, and this has been exacerbated by the renovations of the beach at Crissy Field. As a result, the harbor is often not navigable, and Rec

and Park has had to conduct repeated, and costly, dredging, while raising berth-holder rates to cover this. We believe that a short extension and redesign of the breakwater that currently protects West Harbor could be beneficial, without affecting the Cove practice area, and is being studied by Rec and Park, but this ordinance would inadvertently prohibit that. There could also be a small addition to West Harbor to pick up the 30 or so slips that will be lost in the redesign of East Harbor so it can have East-West facing slips. We feel that this modest expansion of Outer West could be done without affecting the views that some non-boaters are seeking to preserve.

We recommend you table the proposal until further study has been conducted.

Sincerely,

Bruce J. Stone
Berth holder – West Harbor slip #231
President, SF Marina Harbor Association
bruce@brucestone.com
917-822-4060

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [regina.sneed](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Board of Supervisors Land Use Committee File 231191 January 29, 2024 meeting: support for ordinance passage.
Date: Monday, January 29, 2024 10:09:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the LUT committee, and I will include your comments in the file for this ordinance matter.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

- [Board of Supervisors File No. 231191](#)

John Carroll

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

-----Original Message-----

From: regina.sneed <reginasneed@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 28, 2024 11:44 AM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>
Subject: Board of Supervisors Land Use Committee File 231191 January 29, 2024 meeting: support for ordinance passage.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

I am a resident of District 2. Today's Gray Panthers email provided information on this agenda item. I support this ordinance that will preserve the use of Gashouse Cove including the sailing activities of youth. I support increasing the funds for toxic cleanup provided in the PGE settlement. I agree that we do not want to block an iconic San Francisco view by changing the location of the boat slips.

I read about the Cities plan to address sea level rise along the SF waterfront. I wonder how this plan will impact on this project.

Regina Sneed
SF resident

Sent from my iPad

From: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Marina waterfront project and BOS 231191
Date: Saturday, January 27, 2024 12:07:18 PM

Please add to file

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Renee Richards and John Hill <fogline@pacbell.net>
Sent: Saturday, January 27, 2024 11:21:30 AM
To: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ahsha Safaí <ahsha@ahshaformayor.com>
Subject: Marina waterfront project and BOS 231191

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

Thank you for drafting and supporting BOS 231191.

Since I first read about the proposed changes to the Marina Green waterfront and Aquatic Park, the whole effort has felt like a huge overreach by SF Rec and Parks. I am a regular SF Bay swimmer and have many friends who share the fun and health benefits of swimming in the bay. We are extremely concerned about the risks the projects pose to the quality and safety of the water and the waterfront area, not only for those who swim, row and wind/kite surf in the bay, but for anyone who recreates at Crissy Field beach, including children and dogs.

Thank you for your consideration and for voting for BOS 231191.

Renee A. Richards
666 42nd Ave.
SF CA 94121

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [P.C. Fergusson](#)
Cc: [Erin R Roach](#); [Laura Thompson](#); [Dan Clarke](#); [Bill Clarke](#); [Joe Bravo](#); [Fati Scampa](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Comment for Monday's Land Use Committee Meeting January 29, 2024 - BOS File No. 231191
Date: Friday, January 26, 2024 3:29:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the LUT committee, and I will include your comments in the file for this ordinance matter.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

-

[Board of Supervisors File No. 231191](#)

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: P.C. Fergusson <pcferg@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 8:34 AM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Cc: Erin R Roach <erinroach@gmail.com>; Laura Thompson <thoml68@yahoo.com>; Dan Clarke <clarkedan@yahoo.com>; Bill Clarke <>wgc198@gmail.com>; Joe Bravo <joebravo@bravolaw.com>; Fati Scampa <fatiscampa@aol.com>
Subject: Comment for Monday's Land Use Committee Meeting

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Members of the Land Use Committee,

I was planning to come to your meeting Monday to support the Safai/Peskin ordinance which stops RPD plans to build a new boat harbor in front of Marina Green. Unfortunately, I contracted Covid, so I'm sending this email instead.

There are many reasons the public hates this plan, including big groups like the St. Francis Yacht Club, Dolphin Club, South End Rowing Club, Sierra Club, Pacific Coast Yachting Association, and the hundreds of members of the public who walk along or sit beside the open waterfront daily. I'd like to add one more.

RPD says they need to destroy an historic, irreplaceable public resource to make money, yet they give no financial projections of how that money-making will occur. It's not at all likely they will be successful. Ask any small business owner in SF. They'd be better off putting the millions they propose spending in a bank making 5% interest. But of course, they can't do that, since the funds are meant to clean up the toxic substances in Gashouse Cove. Banking the money would be too obvious a misuse of clean-up funds.

The boat harbor plan is just a less obvious misuse, with the added problems of not offering a guaranteed income and concomitantly destroying a precious and beloved public space. Please stop RPD's destructive plan.

Sincerely,

Patsy Fergusson

San Francisco resident and nature lover

P.S. Here's a transcript of what the public had to say about the plan at a public meeting on Oct. 19: <https://www.keepthewaterfrontopen.org/post/what-people-said-at-the-rpd-commission-meeting-on-10-19-2023>

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: ["Kimball Livingston"](#)
Cc: [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Looking our for my boys, and supporting 231191/Land Use Committee January 29, 2024
Date: Friday, January 26, 2024 3:29:00 PM
Attachments: [Letter to Monica Scott.docx](#)
[image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am forwarding your comments to the members of the LUT committee, and I will include your comments in the file for this ordinance matter.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

-

[Board of Supervisors File No. 231191](#)

John Carroll

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Kimball Livingston <kimball.livingston@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 12:06 PM

To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>

Subject: Looking our for my boys, and supporting 231191/Land Use Committee

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

While I agree with the many, many points against the RPD plan for expanding the yacht harbor, I am specific and passionate on one. The letter attached addresses it.

Among the missions I believe in are two: the value of youth sail training, and the value of outreach to underserved communities.

At TISC, Treasure Island Sailing Center, every fourth grader in SFUSD experiences the outdoors, the bay, the big sky - many of the kids have never trailed their fingers in water before - and they receive age appropriate introductions to ecology.

I am presently mentoring three brothers, 10-15, who became passionate sailors through learning to sail at TISC. But TISC's programs do not support them presently.

A worried, impecunious widow's own outreach found me 10 months ago, and the photo below shows her two older sons sailing last July in the city front "Cove" referenced in my letter. We've kept them on the water, in the great outdoors.

They are thriving.

These are great kids. I'm in this for them.

The harbor expansion would kill the program.

Kimball Livingston, District 1

kimball.livingston@gmail.com

+1.415.831.1000

+1.415.831.1001 mobile





Ms. Monica Scott, RPD Project Manager
August 29, 2023

Dear Ms. Scott,

The City's well-intentioned plan for redeveloping the yacht harbor would be a catastrophe for youth sail training in San Francisco. Sorry to say so, but.

The proposed expansion would envelope and eliminate what we in sail training ambitiously and ironically call the Cove—the area close along the seawall between the Wave Organ and Fort Mason. It's not what most people would consider protected water, but hey, it's what we got. (For us, it's everything.)

There are very few days when we can sail beginners or intermediates outside the Cove.

Without the Cove, we are shut down.

Know too that no one can teach sailing without the safety factor of coaches in motorboats. Our national authority, US Sailing, governs instructor certification and takes it as self-evident. Their prerequisites to begin Level 1 training, to then teach under the supervision of advanced coaches, are:

1) Membership in US Sailing. 2) A minimum age of 16. 3) Sailing proficiency.

And this is cut & paste: 4) Experience operating a powerboat.

There is a lot to unpack. I am terrified by what it would mean to tell kids, go away and come back when you're good enough. Most would not "go" and fewer still would come back. St. Francis Yacht Club's role of developing the city's world champion sailors and Olympians would be crippled. On a different level, Golden Gate Yacht Club would be unable to replicate a certain day when I brightened a lunchtime program, introducing a kid proudly wearing his Mission High Sailing Team jacket. Every year, hundreds of San Francisco schoolkids are introduced to their beautiful, historic Bay through sailing on the city front. San Francisco was born from the sea ...

The Cove was the location in July, 2023 of two youth championship events. We sailed ages nine to fifteen, coming from as far away as Utah for the special San Francisco Bay experience. We could not have done it outside the Cove. Our winds would have blown us off on day one, a training day, not even a race day. A reconfigured Gas House Cove would never have accommodated, even if our coach boats and mark-set boats were allowed there.

Please know me as someone recognized nationally in youth sailing, and I hope to be known, as a journalist, for the first stories on social justice ever published in the national sailing press. Those stories focus on disadvantaged youth, but I have also moderated panels for US Sailing on LGBTQ in American sailing. That was kinda sorta a first. The beauty of it is, today's kids don't see it as a big deal.

Know me too for recognizing there are constraints, but the PG&E money should go toward remediation of Gas House Cove and improvements to the existing marina, which is below standard.

And we need our Cove, the other one.

Kimball Livingston SC, StFYC
Commodore, Pacific Coast Yachting Association

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Please support Ordinance # 231191- Implementation of Gashouse Cove Project
Date: Thursday, January 25, 2024 3:30:38 PM
Attachments: [pastedGraphic.png](#)

From: zrants <zrants@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 2:55 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Cc: Ronen, Hillary (BOS) <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Joel Engardio <jengardio@gmail.com>; StefaniStaff (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please support Ordinance # 231191- Implementation of Gashouse Cove Project

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



January 24, 2024

Mayor London Breed, Supervisors and Staff,

Re: Please support Ordinance # 231191- Implementation of Gashouse Cove Project - Marina Yacht Harbor and oppose the plans proposed by San Francisco Rec & Park.

Members of the East Mission Improvement Association (EMIA), along with many of your constituents in District 9, support Ordinance # 231191- Implementation of Gashouse Cove Project - Marina Yacht Harbor.

We oppose San Francisco Rec & Park plans to divert funds for remediation of the toxic site at G. to move the East Harbor slips in front of the Marina Green, and relocate the gas fuel tanks to a less stable area.

The settlement from PG&E was meant to cover the remediation of toxic deposits from the old

Manufactured Gas Plants in the East Harbor & Gashouse Cove.

Rec and Parks proposes to do only 15% of the cleanup and use the remaining funds to develop a new harbor in front of the Marina Green in which to relocate boat slips from the existing East Harbor marina so they may build a new harbor where the current one exists.

This will requiring building a very large breakwater at the level of the existing small one, that ends with Wave Organ and will leave 2/3rds of the East Harbor and Gashouse Cove to “silt over” at the location of a former toxic waste dump.

San Francisco Rec & Park developed this project and got it passed through the Planning Department without much public outreach, but, now that the public is aware of the plans there is message outcry and calls for an alternative plan. That plan developed by multiple citizens groups and the boating community, puts a greater emphasis on the toxic cleanup (up to 42%) and rebuilding the existing boat slips that are presently in the East Harbor and Gashouse Cove.

The alternative plans:

1. Preserve the unobstructed public views of the water at the Marina Green that the public has enjoyed for decades.
2. Place significant emphasis on toxic remediation (42% vs 15%).
3. Reconstruct of the boat slips in the East Harbor and Gashouse Cove that are presently in a state of severe disrepair.
4. Maintain the ideal location of the only fueling station for boats, including emergency vehicles, in its present location.

EMIA urges you to support Ordinance # 231191- Implementation of Gashouse Cove Project - Marina Yacht Harbor as it makes its way through committees to the full Board of Supervisors with recommendations to support the ordinance.

Sincerely,

Mari Eliza,
EMIA, and CSFN
zrants@gmail.com

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: I support Ordinance 231191, please protect the Marina
Date: Thursday, January 25, 2024 3:30:29 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: Alice Ryan <aliceryan123@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 3:26 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: I support Ordinance 231191, please protect the Marina

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

I am a District 2 resident, and know that many others who do not live in the district come to Marina Green to enjoy the natural and unobstructed beauty, that is hard to find along the SF Bay coastline.

I support the Ordinance 231191 and encourage you to consider my position when this comes under review at the January meeting. We concur that the greater Marina Green area, including both harbors, is an open space jewel, which deserves a better plan.

Money to fund this project would be better suited to clearing up SF streets so that tourism can come back to SF and we can enjoy a rejuvenated economic community.

Thank you,

Alice Ryan

From: [fogtownsf1](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: KEEP THE WATERFRONT OPEN
Date: Thursday, January 11, 2024 9:11:12 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Please SUPPORT Gashouse Cove Project Ordinance 231191 proposed by Supervisors Safai, Peskin, and Chan concerning protecting the San Francisco Marina waterfront from development. The ordinance ensures public access to the waterfront for all San Francisco residents and visitors and reflects the diversity, equity, and Inclusion principles the city strives to achieve.

The Recreation and Parks Department (RPD) has plans to construct a new harbor and breakwater in what is currently open water rather than focusing on cleaning up and rebuilding the existing East Harbor marina as per the initial lawsuit with PG&E. The open water in front of Marina Green is the last remaining undeveloped waterfront in San Francisco. The park adjacent is enjoyed by millions of visitors from every corner of the city and the world each year. Its flat terrain, open space, parking, and easy access by Muni make it accessible to residents of every demographic and physical ability.

There are superior alternatives to satisfy RPD's Marina remediation project, such as reallocating funds to restore and maintain existing East Harbor facilities. Your support of the Gashouse Cove Project (BOS 231191) will be a pivotal step in ensuring no City funds are directed toward compromises to this iconic city asset.

susan wilpitz
1747 17th aven
san francisco ca. 94122

From: [Tony An, PhD](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please keep the marina view open to the people, not boats
Date: Friday, January 12, 2024 7:59:57 AM


This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

It's absurd for the parks and rec department to propose a harbor at the marina green area and to block the view for millions of locals and visitors walking along the shore every year. Please pass the legislation by Supervisors Aaron Peskin, Ahsha Safai and Connie Chan to block such an ill-planned project, and keep the marina green open to the people of San Francisco, not a bunch of boats.

Thank you.

Introduction Form

(by a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor)



I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee (Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment)
- 2. Request for next printed agenda (For Adoption Without Committee Reference)
(Routine, non-controversial and/or commendatory matters only)
- 3. Request for Hearing on a subject matter at Committee
- 4. Request for Letter beginning with "Supervisor [redacted] inquiries..."
- 5. City Attorney Request
- 6. Call File No. [redacted] from Committee.
- 7. Budget and Legislative Analyst Request (attached written Motion)
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No. [redacted]
- 9. Reactivate File No. [redacted]
- 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the Board on [redacted]

The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following (please check all appropriate boxes):

- Small Business Commission Youth Commission Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission Building Inspection Commission Human Resources Department

General Plan Referral sent to the Planning Department (proposed legislation subject to Charter 4.105 & Admin 2A.53):

- Yes No

(Note: For Imperative Agenda items (a Resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Agenda Form.)

Sponsor(s):

Safai

Subject:

Implementation of Gashouse Cove Project - Marina Yacht Harbor

Long Title or text listed:

Ordinance prohibiting the Recreation and Park Department and Planning Department from performing environmental review of, or otherwise implementing, a project to clean up and reconstruct the Marina Yacht Harbor in a manner that would extend the West Harbor Marina by more than 150 feet from its current boundary

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: 