

INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN AMENDMENTS

SUMMARY

The Infrastructure Plan is Exhibit I to the HPS2/CP2 DDA. It details the Developer's Infrastructure Obligations, which include but are not limited to: sanitary sewer, storm drain, and water supply systems; joint utility trench systems for telephone, electrical, gas and other "dry utilities"; parks and open spaces; and streets, sidewalks, street lights and other street improvements. Most of these obligations are located inside the Project area; some apply to off-site improvements.

The Infrastructure Plan consists of two volumes: Volume 1: Candlestick Point Development and Volume 2: Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Development. The present actions for Commission consideration include amendments (the "Infrastructure Plan Amendments") to Volume 2: Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Development.

References to the stadium development alternative, a scenario including a stadium site for the San Francisco 49ers, are removed and infrastructure associated with the stadium alternative, such as lane control signs for stadium event days, are removed. This scenario is no longer planned because the 49ers relocated to another location subsequently to approval of the current Infrastructure Plan.

The currently approved network of streets in the southern part of HPS Phase 2 is replaced with a revised street network which is intended to create greater opportunity for the potential retention of legacy buildings. Both street locations and street cross-sections, which show overall street width and the width of individual components such as traffic lanes and sidewalks, are revised. Because utility systems are generally located under street rights-of-way, many utility system locations are also revised accordingly.

Configuration of the separated sanitary sewer system at HPS Phase 2 is changed at the direction of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission ("PUC"). The sanitary sewer now connects with the existing City sewer system at one location at Innes Avenue. A second connection previously planned at Palou Avenue and Griffith Street is removed. This results in sewers traveling a greater distance and traversing a greater change in elevation. To accommodate this, sanitary sewer pump stations are increased from two to seven.

Design criteria for accommodating sea level rise at the development perimeter, at the shoreline, and for the parks and open spaces are revised to account for updated sea level rise projections subsequent to the approval of the Infrastructure Plan in 2010. The development perimeter design will address a minimum of 66 inches of sea level rise, increased from 36 inches. Shoreline improvement designs and parks and open space designs will address a minimum of 24 inches of sea level rise, increased from 16 inches.

Subsequent to the approval of the Infrastructure Plan in 2010, site analysis of the Innes Avenue off-site improvement found that a significant retaining wall may be necessary if the City wishes to widen the Innes Avenue sidewalks beyond their currently planned size as defined in the Infrastructure Plan. The sidewalks' size as depicted in the current Infrastructure Plan is feasible to construct with no retaining wall or with a very small retaining wall. The construction of that sidewalk remains a Developer obligation, including any retaining wall that is necessary to do so.

The Infrastructure Plan is revised to clarify that if the City wishes to widen the sidewalk beyond the width depicted in the Infrastructure Plan, and if this requires enlarging the retaining wall or constructing additional lengths of retaining wall, such costs would not be a Project Infrastructure Obligation borne by the Developer;

and that lack of availability of funds for such a facility shall not delay the Developer's Infrastructure Obligation with respect to Innes Avenue.

Open space and park improvements are revised to conform with the changes to parks and open space detailed in the Parks and Open Space Plan amendments also before this Commission now. Those changes are described separately in the section addressing the Parks and Open Space Plan.

Assorted other revisions are made to conform with the general transportation network and land use changes now before the Commission; and with revisions to infrastructure designs that have been made in the course of design review in collaboration between the Developer, OCII, and City departments and agencies.

No changes are made to Infrastructure Plan Volume 1: Candlestick Point Development.

DETAILED AMENDMENT OVERVIEW

Amendments to the Infrastructure Plan include:

General Amendments

- Figures, tables and text updated to reflect revised utility layout, land use plan and program
- References to Stadium Alternative removed
- Street cross sections updated
- Figure and table references updated
- References to changeable message signs and overhead lane control associated with the Stadium Alternative removed
- Text clarified to indicate Navy is responsible for permitting and infrastructure on Parcel E-2
- Document updated to reference approved 2014 Subdivision Regulations as appropriate
- Elevations revised to reflect approved Subdivision Regulations
- Reference added to technical memos and Master Utility Plans (MUP) that informed the update to the Infrastructure Plan
- Text has been revised to indicate the Hunters Point Pressure zone in lieu of the McLaren Pressure Zone
- Provision for OCS wires serving MUNI transit lines within HPS2 has been removed and replaced with provision for bus charging stations within the Transit Center

Table of Contents and Table of Figures

- Updated to reflect edits below

§1 Introduction / Project Description

- » Text added to indicate: Permitting and infrastructure associated with Navy Parcel E-2 will be completed by the Navy. This is not meant to include Yosemite Slough Bridge and related approach span to Crisp Road which will be designed, permitted and constructed by the Developer
- » Text clarified to state that Director's approval is required to grant exception pursuant to subdivision code
- » Conceptual public utility easement figure added

§1.4 Project Datum

- Further clarification of project datum added

§1.5 Technical Memoranda and Master Utility Planning

- » Text clarified to read: These Technical Memoranda or other Draft Master Utility Plan form the basis of what will become the final Master Plans, as amended from time to time, for each utility system, to be approved initially by the City prior to any Subdivision Maps (excepting tentative and final transfer maps) or Construction Permits related to the Project. Any subsequent amendments to the Master Utility Plans must be approved by the City prior to issuance of any affected Construction Permits

§2.1 Street Improvements

- Text clarified to indicate that the Infrastructure Plan applies to public streets to be accepted
- Privately owned and maintained mid-block breaks referenced

§2.1.1 Street Surface Improvements

- Text clarified to reference Public Works Code 786 regarding City acceptance of improvements
- Reference to flexible paving removed
- Class IV bicycle facility added

§2.1.3.C Innes Avenue / Hunters Point Boulevard / Evans Avenue

- » Text added regarding potential widening of sidewalks on Innes pending City funding

§2.2 MUNI Improvements

- Text added indicating the Project is not required to meet light rail ready standards, nor is it required to accommodate the Overhead Contact System
- Text added regarding electric bus charging infrastructure

§2.3 Wet Utilities

- Text clarified to reference MUPs in planning the public wet and dry utility systems to be reviewed by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)

§2.3.1 Separated Sanitary Sewer

- Seven lift/pump stations indicated
 - Draft Sanitary Sewer System Master Plan for the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development, prepared by BKF Engineers and currently under review by the SFPUC.

§2.3.2 Separated Storm Drainage

- Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines (SMR) replaced Stormwater Design Guidelines and LEED based performance
- Applicable state trash capture requirement referenced
- Following text added:

- Runoff from proposed Arelious Walker will be collected in a separated storm drain system that discharges to the adjacent combined sewer system serving the properties to the east of the proposed right-of-way.
- Historic Buildings 231 and 253 are proposed to remain with adjacent grades elevated above the existing finished floors to meeting grading requirements defined by Table X.1 in Attachment 4 within Appendix C of the Project Subdivision Regulations. Should economic studies associated with rehabilitating Buildings 231 and 253 indicate that is not feasible to preserve the buildings or raise the grade adjacent to the buildings while maintaining the building(s) integrity, the project may pursue an alternative grading and drainage strategy that includes maintaining existing grades and revise the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Grading and Storm Drain System Master Plan for review and approval by the SFPUC.
- Should LID strategies include treatment of development parcels and open space areas in combination with public right-of-ways, such combined or centralized treatment areas and associated infrastructure required to meet SMR performance standards will not be owned and maintained by the SFPUC, except for Northside Park treatment facility that will treat Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Phase 1 stormwater flows. This facility will be owned and maintained by PUC.

§2.3.3 Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS)

- Following text added:
 - The SFPUC has determined there is limited hydraulic capacity to serve HPS2, and the current AWSS cannot meet the required pressures and flow. A salt water pump station is shown on Figure 2.3.3 as an alternative water source to be designed and constructed at the developer's expense. However, the Developer and the SFPUC will work together to explore an alternative design that utilizes offsite facilities, or a combination of onsite and offsite facilities, instead of the salt water pump station shown. Should it be determined that this alternate design is desirable by both parties, the corresponding Master Utility Plan will reflect this change in design.
 - The Developer will design and construct, or pay for the reasonable costs of designing and constructing the AWSS as shown on Figure 2.3.3, including an alternative to the salt water pump station. . The City will provide hydraulic modeling criteria for the AWSS MUP to be prepared by the developer and submit design plans to the Developer for coordination purposes. The City will use its best efforts to control the costs as agreed by the City and the Developer in the ICA, DDA, and other Plan Documents. Upon acceptance of the Auxiliary Water Supply System by the City, the SFPUC will assume responsibility for the operation and maintenance of all facilities, including responsibility for compliance with all regulations and mitigation measures.

§2.3.4 Low Pressure Water System

- Connection points updated

§2.3.5 Recycled Water System

- Text revised to clarify that Developer will build a Recycled Water (RW) distribution network to be charged with potable water. If a RW source is constructed, the RW network will be disconnected from the potable low pressure system and connected to the RW system

- Connection point clarified to be required only if necessary to meet project demands
- Pressure reducing valves added to description of the recycled water system
- A new non-potable water section was added to address Article 12C of the Health Code

§3 Sea Level Rise

- Section revised to account for additional sea level rise (SLR) not contemplated in the original 2010 Infrastructure Plan: the 2010 plan accommodated 12" and 36" of SLR for the shoreline and development areas, respectively. The updated IP accommodates for 24" of SLR for shoreline areas and 66" for development areas. Reference to the development and implementation of an Adaptive Management Plan remains.

§3.2 Sea Level Rise Strategies

- Text clarified to reflect the fact that the appropriate district will develop the Adaptive Management Plan, not the City
- Added reference to the 2018 Ocean Protection Council guidance

• §3.3. Project Design Criteria

- Table 3.3.1
 - Updated in row "Development Perimeter – Separated Storm Drainage System 5-Year Storm Event" to indicate that the minimum elevation of the stormwater treatment bio-retention soil mix will be at or above the 5-year HGL
 - Updated in row "Development Perimeter – Structures" to indicate that Occupied facilities, including pump station facilities and above grade electrical infrastructure, shall have a minimum first floor elevation of 103.7 feet, Project Datum, based on SLR

§3.4.1 Shoreline Improvements

- Text clarified to correctly reference the extent by which the various shoreline improvements will exceed the 1% annual chance event based on increased SLR shoreline protection
- Text clarified to correctly reference the extent by which the various shoreline improvements will exceed the 1% annual chance event based on increased SLR shoreline protection
- Figure added (Figure 3.4.1) showing the location of all the areas discussed in Section 3.4 with annotations indicating the proposed shoreline protection strategies (riprap, wave berm, habitat creation, etc.)

§3.4.2 Open Space and Park Improvements

- Section revised to reflect 24" of SLR for shoreline areas and 66" for development areas
- Outdated elevations removed

§3.4.3 Development Perimeter

- Section revised to reflect 24" of SLR for shoreline areas and 66" for development areas

§3.4.4 5-Year Storm Drainage System

- Following text added:

- Historic structures 140, 204, 205, 207, and 208 within the Historic District area include elements below the minimum required grading and hydrology requirements for proposed structures in “Development Perimeter – Structures” as defined by Table X.1 in Attachment 4 within Appendix C of the Project Subdivision Regulations and Table 3.3.1. However, such structures are compliant with the minimum grading requirements (100-yr tide, elevation 98.2) for “Parks and Open Space Adjacent to the Shoreline” as defined in Table X.1. Since certain building elements are not elevated above the 5-year HGL (100-yr tide + 24-inches SLR) but are above the 100-year tide elevation, drainage infrastructure, such as pump stations, historic structure disposition, and the current uses of the area will be evaluated and adapted over time in context with hydrologic and sea level conditions, and the AMP. Responsibility for and liability directly related to flooding and associated damage that may occur in buildings with elements below the minimum required grading and hydrology requirements or within private streets will be by the owner of the Open Space parcel containing the Historic District.

§3.5 Adaptive Management Strategies

- Section revised to reflect 24” of SLR for shoreline areas and 66” for development areas

§4.1 Open Space Parcels

- Following text added: Unless otherwise defined by the DA, DDA, or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), infrastructure within the Open Space Parcels will be owned and maintained by the Agency retaining ownership the Open Space Parcel(s).

§5.2 Interim Operational Requirements

- Requested’ replaced with ‘required’
- Text clarified to state that removal relocation or abandonment of interim improvements are sole cost of Developer
- Following text added:
 - Where requested by Developer, and if the designated City Agency or Agencies with jurisdiction over the affected Infrastructure, determines it is appropriate in connection with the phased development of the Project, portions of the Infrastructure may be constructed or installed as interim improvements to be owned and maintained by the Developer. Interim improvements would be removed or abandoned, as determined by the Acquiring Agency, when substitute permanent Phase Improvements are provided to serve a subsequent Development Parcel. Where requested by Developer, and if the designated City Agency or Agencies with jurisdiction over the affected Infrastructure, determines it is appropriate in connection with the phased development of the Project, portions of the Infrastructure may be constructed or installed as permanent improvements outside of the current phase.

§5.4 Waterfront Improvements

- Text added to clarify that shoreline improvements identified in the IP are based on preliminary engineering estimates and will be refined based on detailed investigations of the shoreline conditions. The findings from these investigations will be included in a technical memo. If the shoreline structures are determined to be significantly deficient or expensive to repair, they will be demolished or left in place with appropriate landscape improvements to deter unsafe public access

- Level of detail regarding improvements revised to reflect statement above

§5.5 Yosemite Slough Bridge

- Width revised to 45'

§5.7 Utility Relocation

- Text added to clarify that utility relocations are to be considered a financial obligation of the Developer unless otherwise indicated in the DDA or separate agreement

§6.1.1 Adjacency

- Following text added:
 - Unless specifically agreed to otherwise, segments of adjacent infrastructure required for a Major Phase, Sub-Phase, or Block shall be no less than complete street sections (back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk) for at least one continuous block (intersection to intersection)
 - The conceptual limits of the existing Infrastructure to be demolished as well as conceptual layouts of the permanent and/or temporary infrastructure systems for each Development Parcel will be provided as part of the construction document submittals for that Development Parcel or Phase. Repairs and/or replacement of the existing facilities necessary to serve the Development Parcel will be designed and constructed by the Developer.

§6.2.5 Northside Park

- Following text added
 - Subject to the Navy parcel conveyance schedule, installation of the stormwater treatment infrastructure serving the Hunter's Point Phase 1 Hilltop development shall be installed concurrently with the first sub-phase of Phase II Infrastructure development in Parcel B.

§7.2.2 Historic Preservation Strategy

- Figure 7.2.1 added showing location of historic buildings
- Text clarified to reflect historic preservation of the DDA: economic feasibility of Building 211, 224, 231 and 253 will be studied to determine the feasibility of preservation prior to development

§7.3 Sea Level Rise Strategy

- Following text added
 - Storm drainage improvements may be required to support implementation of the AMP and shall be constructed and financed by the Agency in ownership of the affected open space parcel at the time improvements are required and being implemented