

test scenarios review + input

results




test scenarios review + input

results

The following list of comments represent feedback collected during a break-out session facilitated during the June 4, 2011 public workshop:

Participants looked at the (4) Test Scenarios presented earlier in the workshop (refer to Workshop 2 ppt and Scenarios A, B, C and D on the following page) and provided the input recorded herein.



✓ test scenarios

6/4/2011

GENERAL NOTES	South Reach				
	A - Max Habitat	B -Max Recreation	C - Max Green Infrastructre	D - Utility Infrastructure	GENERAL
Group A	Tunnel reroute: concern for impact to zoo. Traffic concerns if GH rerouted?	Fleishhacker pool too low-lying to restore.			emergency procedure for animals at the zoo? ; recreational impact at LM to the lake if outlet built?
Group B					Rec makes most sense, making most of what we have; Protect infrastructure.
Group C	x	x	x	x	x
Group D	wave generation out at sea. Protect surfers. Short term solution needed for erosion protection.	child friendly beach area somewhere. Recreation based at beach + sea + built infrastucture	move road + tunnel (makes good sense).	x	what is life of plant [160 yr life wt updates?]; Disagreement: relocate plant; protect plant for forseable future (for surfing?); concern over location of new plant - social justice issues (?), short term project plant
Group E	like restoration of linkage between lake merced & the ocean; LOVE idea of restoring zoo to become an ecological center (maintain the character of original zoo - keep diverse array of species, but include celebration of CA ecosystems)			HATE hard armoring. Armoring inevitably has unintended consequences. LOVE The idea of phasing out armoring	is it possible to decentralize sewage treatment? What are the unintended consequences of creating an artificil reef? Move national guard somewhere else. Consider building a bluff on skyline boulevard.
Group F		Surf riders don't support artificial reef - it does not create better surfing, possibly contributes to contaminated water and is not good for bank swallows.			

GENERAL NOTES	Mid Reach				
	A - Max Habitat	B -Max Recreation	C - Max Green Infrastructre	D - Utility Infrastructure	GENERAL
Group A	Concerned about cost of property acquisition. Caution: have to get agreement of people in SF who don't live here and may not want to pay for it. (east side vs west side residents)		LID applicable anywhere in SF. Start right now.		
Group B		be weary of over-developing with draws & amenities. Don't need to bring more people out there	possible to separate the syestm for sewer; LID is good idea to integrate in any proposal --> lets reduce need for transport box solutions.		
Group C	x	x	x	x	x
Group D	worried about traffic if take abmt great hightway; Maximize the beach; Plant more trees.	Kee center area for birds. No kite flying or kite surfing (scares birds); Don't use GH as highway, move it to sunset; Access for parking 2 lanes; Don't build playgrounds here - kep native; Don't need 4 ___ 2 is enough.	permeable everything, composting toilets, Wetlands.	x	need global action; generate energy with waves.
Group E	national park feel; preservation of wildlife habitat - importance of designation of restricted areas & then have recreation oriented areas.		love idea of neighborhood responsibility & greening; love green insfrastructure;		HATE the idea of note replenishing the beach - "beach" = very important to Sfcans; idea of spiral (wild life friendly) wind turbines & the use of solar panels
Group F	like concept of acquireing housing, but needs to be considered based on practical method -policy for voluntary release, etc. Possibly focuse housing acquisition on the south end where erosion is the greatest.		LID should be combined with other scenarios.		

GENERAL NOTES	North Reach				
	A - Max Habitat	B -Max Recreation	C - Max Green Infrastructre	D - Utility Infrastructure	GENERAL
Group A					
Group B					
Group C	x	x	x	x	x
Group D	protect sea wall at new park/beach threshold to create safe area.	recreation only at north end; No artificial turf; Great hwy underground.	like promenade; Protect highway + beach chalet; Seawall good; Preserve Park + promenade; GG park natural condition history.	x	Disagreement: Don't loose any GG Park; losing park = letting nature take course to what it was.
Group E					love the idea of continuing to preserve sutro dunes; minimize recreation on North Reach to preserve habitat
Group F			like wetlands		

GENERAL NOTES		GENERAL NOTES			
Group A	Hot days: climate change = more days at the beach.	San Andres Fault, not too dangerous.	use this concerns, this planning model of other parts of the city.	loss of life? (coastal hazard line). Disaster preparedness.	note high outflow years
Group B	money question - do we want to spend money fighting or harmonizing with natural processes.	key to think in long-term	acknowledge a densely populated area	recreation is very important since it is an urban beach. Protect our exp. Infrastructure.	not opposed to moving great highway, as long as circ. is ok.
Group C	x				
Group D	Off shore underwater turbines? Impact on sea life?				
Group E	Important to incorporate new technology as it evolves	what about putting the great highway underground?? (\$\$)	idea of boats that pump sand back up onto the beach, as used in Santa Cruz (idea worth exploring)		
Group F					