

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

TO: Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Jaime Michaels, Chief of Permits (415/352-3613; jaime.michaels@bcdc.ca.gov)
Ellen Miramontes, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; ellen.miramontes@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Approved Minutes of April 11, 2016 BCDC Design Review Board Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Attendance.** Board Vice Chair Steve Thompson called the meeting to order at approximately 5:40 p.m. Other Design Review Board (DRB or Board) members in attendance included Karen Alschuler, Cheryl Barton, Roger Leventhal, Michael Smiley and Gary Strang. Gary Strang recused himself for the review of Alameda Point. BCDC staff in attendance included Todd Hallenbeck, Tinya Hoang, Ethan Lavine, Jaime Michaels, and Ellen Miramontes.

2. **Approval of Draft Minutes for the January 11, 2016 Meeting.** The Board approved these minutes with no revisions.

3. **San Leandro Shoreline Development Project, City of San Leandro, Alameda County (1st Pre-Application Review).** The Board reviewed a proposal by Cal Coast Companies, LLC and the City of San Leandro to redevelop the San Leandro Marina. The proposed project would include a 200-room hotel, a 15,000-square-foot conference center, 354 housing units, three new restaurants, a boat rental, an office campus, a parking structure, and a library. Public access improvements include a new promenade around the marina, a pedestrian/bicycle bridge, two community parks, pedestrian piers, a beach, a kayak launch, boat docks and other public amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Tinya Hoang introduced the project and summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including: whether the project would provide attractive public access areas and appropriate public access amenities; whether the building setbacks from the shoreline and promenade would be sufficient to create a sense of openness for the public; whether the location, design, and supporting facilities for public kayak launch and boat docks are appropriate; whether there would be sufficient public parking; and whether the public access would be viable with sea level rise.

info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov
State of California | Edmund G. Brown, Jr. — Governor



Ms. Hoang also summarized comments received from Bay Trail staff regarding the proposed project. Bay Trail staff commented that the bike path on the promenade should be widened to ten feet or that the promenade should not designate separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Bay Trail staff also wanted to point out that the bridge should be designed for both bicyclists and pedestrians. Finally, Bay Trail staff saw opportunities to widen existing shoreline trails along Pescador Point, and increase connections to existing trails at the site.

b. **Project Presentation.** Scott Cooper, Acquisitions Director of Cal Coast Companies, LLC, introduced Cynthia Battenberg, Community Development Director of the City of San Leandro, who described the design and planning process for the proposed project. The process has involved extensive community outreach, creation of a citizen advisory committee, and the provision of an exclusive agreement with Cal Coast Companies, LLC. Mr. Cooper, then provided context about the site, followed by Edward Miller, Chief Executive Officer of Cal Coast Companies, LLC, who gave a detailed description of the proposed project.

c. **Board Questions.** Following the presentation, the Board asked a series of questions:

Mr. Smiley asked about kayak storage location. Mr. Cooper answered that the boat storage, restrooms, and other kayak-related facilities would be located next to the existing boat launch, and also explained that the exhibits will be superseded by a different design. Mr. Smiley also asked for the length of the residential building block at the north of the site. Mr. Cooper answered that the residential buildings would be approximately 750 feet long and 37 feet tall.

Mr. Leventhal inquired about the existing grade, where the grade would be raised, and the location of existing and proposed riprap. Mr. Cooper responded that portions of the riprap would be removed from the internal basin. Mr. Cooper also stated that FEMA flood maps show that the majority of the site does not flood (he explained that there is only a small area that floods occasionally at Mulford Point), and that, as of now, raising the site is not proposed. Mr. Smiley asked how the site would be raised, if needed, and if the riprap would also be raised. Mr. Miller said that if more protection is needed, then sea walls may be used. Mr. Smiley noted that if the riprap is extended, the promenade would become narrower. Mr. Strang asked for the height between Mean Higher High Water and the existing grade. It was determined to be approximately 11 feet, according to the exhibits.

Mr. Thompson asked about the phasing of the development. Mr. Miller explained that the development would be built over five years with rolling phases. Ms. Alschuler asked what the marina would be used for. Ms. Battenberg explained that the marina silts up, and could no longer be used for larger boat berthing. She also stated that while they investigated the possibility of swimming, it was found not to be desirable due to water quality concerns. She explained that an aeration fountain is needed to keep the marina clean. She mentioned the possibility of including oyster farming within the marina basin and also interpretive information regarding the nearby monarch butterfly population. She further noted that the Water Trail Advisory Committee recommended that the primary non-motorized small boat launch occur at the existing concrete boat ramp rather than the proposed new launch site envisioned within the basin.

Ms. Alschuler inquired about the number and location of public parking spaces. Mr. Miller explained that all of the parking would be shared and open, not regulated, and that the number of spaces exceeds city requirements. Mr. Miller further explained that due to the usage patterns of the various uses, the parking needs would occur at different times and therefore he does not envision a parking deficiency. Mr. Thompson commented that the hotel patrons could use the public parking spaces. Mr. Strang asked whether there is public transit to the site. Ms. Battenberg answered that there are shuttles from the downtown BART station, and that there is also a Kaiser Permanente shuttle, but that there would be a consolidation of shuttle service upon development of the site.

Mr. Smiley asked whether there would be a wall separating the private areas from the public areas, as shown on Section A-A on page 14 of the exhibits. Mr. Miller responded that the design would be different from what is shown, and that there would be a more transparent fence and planting to separate the private and public areas. Ms. Battenberg suggested that the fencing could be 3-5 feet high.

Mr. Smiley asked about the access along the interior of the marina, adjacent to Horatio's restaurant, and whether it could be widened. Mr. Thompson asked that several sections along the interior shoreline of the marina basin be provided for the next review.

Ms. Alschuler inquired about the massing of the hotel structure, and noted that there would be no visual breaks or breezeways.

d. **Public Hearing.** Ms. Hoang clarified the summary of the comments from Bay Trail staff. She explained that Bay Trail would like to see a shoreline trail along the southeastern portion of the site, that would be bayward of the proposed mixed-use building and boat rental, and connections to existing public access, adjacent to Horatio's Restaurant and the Marina Inn, and connections to Marina Park to the south.

Mr. Ben Botkin, Water Trail Planner with the Association of Bay Area Governments, expressed support on behalf of the Water Trail for the project as generally outlined. Mr. Botkin explained that the Water Trail envisions a primary launching and landing access point at the southeastern area of the site, by the existing boat launch, and a vendor or boathouse that could be a major hub for access for small boats. He recommended that the project sponsors look at East Bay Regional Park District's boathouse located at Tidewater Cove in Oakland as a good example. Within the interior basin, Water Trail would like to see a dock access closer to the cul de sac to minimize the distance for carrying boats. He stated that this interior access point could be used by less experienced boaters and be desirable for all boaters on windy days. Mr. Botkin also commented that the bridge elevation should be at an appropriate height so that boaters and paddlers can pass underneath. Finally, Mr. Botkin reiterated that, in general, Water Trail was pleased with the proposal.

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board members discussed the following:

Mr. Strang asked that plan enlargements of key open space areas be provided for the next review. Mr. Thompson asked about the location of restrooms. Mr. Cooper explained that there would be one new restroom by the boat launch, and two upgraded bathrooms along the basin.

Mr. Leventhal asked about the height of the proposed buildings and the width of the adjacent public access areas, and noted that the general rule of thumb is a 1:1 ratio for these heights and widths. Mr. Thompson commented that the views at the site are very constricted. Mr. Smiley explained that city blocks are approximately 250-300 feet long. He described the proposed project as a “large lumped development,” and said that it should have a “finer texture.” Mr. Smiley commented that, for other projects, pinch points may be acceptable, but in this case, the structures are like a “wall,” and that the space is tighter than usual. Mr. Smiley also commented that the presence of the private patios adjacent to the promenade would make it uncomfortable for the public that would be walking by; that there are guidelines about vertical separation that clearly define private and public areas; and that the public access needs to be wide enough such that it does not feel as if “there are people looking down on the public space.” Mr. Smiley added that the length of the hotel would aggravate the discomfort for the public. Mr. Strang suggested providing “turn-outs” along the promenade to provide some relief. Ms. Alschuler commented that most people will be on the bay-side promenade, as opposed to the marina-side promenade, and suggested that the design favor greater widths along the bay-side while allowing tighter widths on the marina-side. Mr. Thompson said that he would be okay with a discontinuous feel on the interior, and that it did not need to meet the Bay Trail standards. Mr. Smiley noted that the interior sides of the peninsulas would feel more open because all of the vehicular circulation and parking are located towards the interior. He also requested that the cross-sections should be extended to the lagoon.

Mr. Smiley commented that the design of the lagoon is critical. Mr. Thompson stated that the lagoon should not only appear as “a place where boats used to be.” He added that a more interesting path could be designed along the lagoon, and that there could be interpretive elements placed at viewpoints.

Mr. Leventhal asked whether the site would be an island in the year 2100 due to flooding, whether it would flood from behind, whether there is adaptation envisioned for the lagoon design, and how would lagoon flushing work. Mr. Leventhal also suggested incorporating a natural shoreline along stretches of the outer shoreline, as there were sand dunes in the area, historically.

Ms. Alschuler noted that the water and the development are not visible in the visual simulations. Ms. Battenberg stated that the views were taken from the Environmental Impact Report and were based on BCDC input. Ms. Miramontes emphasized the importance of the view from Marina Boulevard. Mr. Smiley pointed out that there are existing views of San Bruno Mountain; that, with the proposed development, one would not be able to see the mountain across the bay nor boats on the water, along the entire distance of Monarch Bay Drive; and that the hotel would block the existing views to the bay between Horatio’s Restaurant and the Marina Inn.

Mr. Smiley noted how important the view corridors down the streets in San Francisco are. Mr. Thompson added that the proposed building locations form “walls.” Mr. Smiley urged the project sponsors to work on the building locations, massing and separations between them. Mr. Thompson noted the value of the monarch butterflies in the area. Mr. Thompson stated that it is lucky if the project is on high ground; that it is a good start, with some obstacles; and that further information is needed for the public spaces and inside perimeter of the lagoon.

f. **Applicant Response.** The applicant responded positively to the Board’s discussion and suggestions.

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board made the following summary and conclusions:

(1) **Provide more details on the public access areas and the connections to and through the public access areas.** The Board would like to see additional cross sections that include the interior basin, the peninsulas and the southeastern corner of the site. The Board also would like to see enlargements of the open spaces areas, showing the connections to and through the public access areas.

(2) **Increase the width of the public access areas adjacent to the buildings.** The Board felt that the widths of the public access areas are too narrow, and that the horizontal and vertical separation between the private and public spaces should be increased.

(3) **Protect views of the Bay from Monarch Bay Drive to the Bay.** The Board emphasized the importance of the views through and across the site to the Bay and the hills beyond on the western side of the Bay, and that the buildings should be designed to minimize view impacts, such as by reducing the length of the buildings and positioning the buildings to allow for views between. Specifically, the Board stated that the proposed hotel should not form a “wall” blocking views to the Bay to such a great extent. The placement of the hotel within the site plan should be carefully examined to minimize view obstructions and a public passage through the hotel could also be incorporated.

(4) **Improve the openness of and connections to and through the public access.** The Board recommended turnouts along the promenade and a design that would create variation. The promenade could possibly have greater widths on the exterior and narrower widths on the interior of the peninsulas. One Board member also recommended making the parking lots more welcoming, and making safe ways for the public to cross the parking lots to get to the shoreline.

(5) **Provide dedicated public parking spaces.** The Board recommended that there should be signs that indicate areas of public parking only. In addition, the Board stated that the design of the parking lots should be improved to be more visually pleasing and more easily crossed by pedestrians accessing the two sides of the peninsulas.

(6) **Provide more information on flooding from sea level rise.** One Board member requested more information regarding sea level rise impacts within a broader context and to show whether flooding would occur from behind.

(7) **Provide more information on the lagoon design and function.** The Board wanted more information on the aerator, potential odor problems, the perched beach, and the stairs leading to the water.

(8) **Incorporate natural shoreline protection where possible.** One Board member suggested developing a natural shoreline along the outer shoreline where possible, as opposed to using riprap.

(9) **Provide a planting concept.** The Board asked about planting and shading within the parking lot, and whether there would be any trees. The Board would like to see a planting concept for the project.

(10) **Provide adequate restroom facilities.** One Board member asked for more information about bathrooms, including their geographic distribution and whether restrooms within buildings would be accessible to the public.

4. **Alameda Point “Site A” Waterfront Park, Phase I; City of Alameda, Alameda County (1st Pre-Application Review).** The Design Review Board reviewed the design by Alameda Point Partners, LLC for Phase 1 of the Waterfront Park area of the Site A mixed-use development project at Alameda Point, a redevelopment of a former Naval Air Station. The 2.63-acre waterfront park would include shoreline pathways for pedestrian and bicycle access, seating areas, a large lawn, a café, public restrooms, and areas for special events.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Ethan Lavine introduced the project and the issues identified in the staff report, which focused on: circulation of pedestrians, bicyclists, and persons with disabilities within the park; the adequacy and desirability of the public access areas; and the potential design responses to sea level rise. Mr. Lavine also read comments submitted by Lee Huo, a Bay Trail Planner for the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Mr. Huo’s comments focused on the proximity of the proposed alignment of the Bay Trail to the shoreline. He asked that the project team clarify if slow-moving bicyclists would be able to access the promenade paths at the top and bottom of the terraced area, or if all bicyclists would be limited to the proposed bicycle path identified on the project plans along the “Taxiway” mixed-use trail. Located at 85 to 160 feet back from the shoreline, Mr. Huo commented that such an alignment for the bicycle portion of the Bay Trail would be inconsistent with the goals and vision of the Bay Plan given the distance from the shoreline. Mr. Huo also asked that the project team describe if the 25-foot-wide promenade proposed for Phase 2 would be available for both pedestrians and bicyclists. Finally, Mr. Huo commented that the alignment of the Bay Trail in Phase 3 is 130 feet away from the shoreline. He recommended that the 24-foot-wide Bay Trail segment be sited between the proposed seasonal wetland and recreation zones, where a smaller 10-foot-wide trail is currently proposed.

b. **Project Presentation.** Joe Ernst of Alameda Point Partners, LLC, the developer of the proposed project, began by providing an overview of the plan to redevelop the former Naval Air Station by various developers over the coming decades. He explained that the 68-acre Site A development would serve as the gateway to Alameda Point, and that it would consist of a mix of multi-family residential units and commercial uses, including retail and a hotel. Mr. Ernst

then described the open space areas that would be provided within the interior of the Site A development as well as on the waterfront, which he explained were important considerations for the City of Alameda's Planning Commission in its review and subsequent approval of the project.

Following Mr. Ernst's presentation, Jennifer Ott from the City of Alameda explained the City's vision for the Alameda Point redevelopment, which is to become a new major job center within the City in the coming years. She explained that it was important to the City that the waterfront park be in place for the initial phase of the redevelopment in order to act as town center for the redeveloped area. She told the Board that a number of applications for development within Alameda Point would be coming forward for the Board's review in the coming years, the first of which would be for a proposed ferry terminal. She indicated that the ferry terminal was being designed in coordination with the Site A development, and that the City believes the ferry terminal would make the development of a commercial center in Alameda Point viable.

Following Ms. Ott's presentation, April Philips of April Philips Design Works, the project's landscape architect, walked the Board through the design of the proposed waterfront park. She indicated that the park was designed to align with a major view corridor focused on the San Francisco skyline. She explained that the project was on the edge of a historic district, and thus the design included certain historic elements that would be preserved as the waterfront area is redeveloped. Her goal was to maintain the horizontality of the site so that it felt reminiscent of the historic Naval Air Station with its landing strips. She then described the various areas within the waterfront park, beginning with its connection to the road along its eastern edge. The roadway would be designed as a "naked street" that might feel like an extension of the park, and which would calm traffic with raised intersections to reduce potential conflicts among motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians. Ms. Philips described the "Taxiway" pedestrian and bicycle trail that would intersect with the street as the park's main element, and a reference to its historic use. She then described two promenades that would run parallel to one another and be sited Bay-ward of the Taxiway trail. Addressing the comments from Mr. Huo of the Bay Trail, she indicated that while the project plans indicate that the Taxiway would serve as the Bay Trail, the promenades closer to the water's edge could be used by slower bicycles as well as pedestrians.

Ms. Philips then described public access amenities that would be provided as part of the proposed project, including a large pavilion that would have a public restroom and that might be used for events such as weddings. She described proposed seating elements, many of which would be made of reclaimed industrial materials from the site, and some of which were designed to be fun, including hammocks and benches that users could pivot to keep the high winds prevalent at the site to their backs. She indicated there was currently no railing being proposed along the bulkhead so that it would retain its historic look, but that more research was needed to determine if this design could be accomplished safely. She indicated that at the mid-point of the park along the upper promenade there would be space for a rotating art installation. Her team is also exploring the use of pole lights topped with wind turbines to take advantage of the high wind at the site. Many of the amenities she referenced would

incorporate reclaimed materials from the Naval Air Station, and educational and informational elements would be built into the projects design to appeal to a child's sense of discovery. Finally, she discussed a variety of programming events that might occur at the site, including yoga, food trucks, volleyball tournaments, and viewing of sailing races.

Mr. Ernst then described the approach the project would take in response to rising sea levels, and explained that it was based both on requirements by the City's specific plan that the project be resilient to 24 inches of sea level rise (including an additional 24 inches of freeboard) and BCDC staff guidance that it should be adaptable to rising sea levels over time. He described a sea level rise adaptation zone on the site, primarily behind the terraced wall and just inland of the bulkhead, where engineering improvements to the ground would be made so that a seawall or levee could be built in the future. He described three options for adapting to higher tides in the future, including a seawall, a levee at the bottom of the terraced wall, and a levee at the top of the terraced wall. Mr. Ernst said that a seawall would allow for the preservation of the maximum amount of public access area over time.

c. **Board Questions.** During and following the presentation, the Board asked several questions.

Mr. Thompson asked about the condition of the bulkhead structure along the shoreline. Mr. Ernst said that it was a historic element that needs to be preserved, but that work would be required to make the development behind the bulkhead seismically sound in the event that it failed during an earthquake.

Mr. Smiley asked when the next phases of the project would be built, and Mr. Leventhal additionally asked what the logic was behind phasing the park as proposed. Mr. Ernst responded that Phase 1 was to break ground next year. Phase 2 is to proceed after a Navy cleanup is complete and the land transfer to the City, which would happen in roughly 2021. Phase 3 would be built in 2026, when there would be enough development to support the cost of building the final portion of the park. Mr. Smiley then asked if the design of Phase 1 would set a precedent for the design vocabulary that would lock in certain decisions about future phases of the park. Mr. Ernst and Ms. Philips responded that each phase of the park would have a different feel. Phase 2 would have a wider terraced area and a perched beach, while Phase 3 would have a more naturalistic feel, as called for in the specific plan for Alameda Point.

Mr. Smiley expressed that he was concerned about the lack of a proposed guardrail at the water's edge. He asked how someone who falls into the water would get to safety if there were no mechanism built into the design to allow them to get back onto dry land. Mr. Ernst said that the decision to not include the rail was based on community feedback in support of keeping the views unobstructed, and Ms. Philips indicated there is precedent for not using handrails along the waterfront, such as at Toronto's waterfront. She explained they are studying their options, and that they are investigating constructing periodic rescue stations with life preservers along the promenade or building stairs to the water. Ms. Miramontes stated that the Port of San Francisco had recently decided that the traditional wooden bull rail along parts of its waterfront is insufficiently safe for public safety, and that in the last few years they

developed a standardized design for a safety rail. Participants involved with the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail have recommended that the Port of San Francisco install safety ladders along the seawall for emergency purposes. Ms. Ott stated that the City has required that this issue be studied further as a condition of approval, that this matter would need to come back for additional review, and that the City would welcome suggestions from the Board.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the fast lane for bicyclists along the Taxiway couldn't be closer to the shoreline given the amount of space in the waterfront park. Mr. Ernst and Ms. Philips explained that there are more Bay-ward paths where bicycles are not prohibited, and that the area along the Taxiway with painted markers for bicyclists is to allow for faster-moving bikes to proceed across the park with fewer conflicts with pedestrians. The striping for the fast-moving bicycle route is not presently proposed to be continuous along the path, but only in those areas where there are anticipated conflicts with pedestrian crossings. However, Ms. Philips indicated that continuous striping could be incorporated easily. Ms. Ott then responded to Mr. Huo's comments on the distance between the shoreline and the bike trail, stating that her impression from previous meetings with Mr. Huo is that Bay Trail staff would be happy with the proposal so long as the more Bay-ward trails were also designated as part of the Bay Trail. She said more thought would need to be given to how the bicycle routes should be aligned in Phases 2 and 3.

d. **Board Discussion.** The Board members discussed the following:

Mr. Thompson expressed that the process of designing a park at the interface of an urbanized area before designing the buildings themselves is somewhat backwards. It may work better if some elements of the park's design respond specifically to the actual buildings.

Ms. Alschuler commented that the proposed waterfront park is five to ten times as wide as the Embarcadero, and thus it is important that the design encourage movement to and along the shoreline. It will thus be important to have a strong public programming element in place, possibly even 365 days a year.

Mr. Smiley said it was unclear why bicycling along the shoreline promenade isn't encouraged, particularly as it will be 25 years before sea level rise becomes a real problem. Bicyclists will go there anyway, and it should be designed so that bikes can go there safely as well. As the waterfront promenade is quite wide, there may not be significant conflicts between pedestrians and bicyclists. However, it's important to continue thinking about how to address it, because when there are a lot of people out, it will become an issue.

Mr. Thompson commented that this is a very wide space for a waterfront park, so he is less worried about the potential loss of some public access areas as sea levels rise. He pointed to Venice as an example, where there is about 50 feet between the Doge's Palace and the water's edge, and far more people than this site will ever see. Mr. Thompson said that overall the design scheme is very pleasant.

Mr. Leventhal commented that a continuously urban park might feel more appropriate than to transition directly from this park design into the more naturalistic park design proposed for Phase 3. The decision to have different park designs side-by-side feels like design by committee. It might be appropriate to encourage certain development up closer to the water's edge to activate the space.

Mr. Smiley said that the worst thing that could happen here would be if a child fell off the edge of the promenade and into the water, and that the project team must think more about the decision to not incorporate a safety rail. This is a design challenge in terms of preserving the way the historic bulkhead feels while balancing public safety. A safety railing built into a foot well could make the railing less visually obstructive.

Mr. Leventhal commented that it could be a public safety hazard if during periodic inundation debris washed up on the promenade along the bulkhead and that a railing would help to prevent this.

Mr. Leventhal said that it isn't necessary for the project team to settle on a particular sea level rise adaptation response at this time. However, he and Mr. Thompson both commented that a seawall is more desirable than a levee because it preserves a greater amount of public access area.

Ms. Alschuler directed the project team to look for more opportunities to "tell a story" about the project site and its history through interpretive elements. They should also consider how they could tell the story behind the wind turbines built into the light poles.

Mr. Thompson said that the terraced design of the park would allow for inundation of the lower promenade without compromising access to the waterfront. It is an elegant design because it allows people to continue to interact with the water's edge during periods of inundation, much like at the beach or the edge of a swimming pool.

Ms. Alschuler said that it may be necessary to put something up to avoid public safety concerns associated with the periodic inundation of the bulkhead promenade, but that it's a ways off before it will be a problem.

Overall, the Board was supportive of the proposed project.

e. **Applicant Response.** The applicant responded positively to the Board's discussion and suggestions.

f. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board made the following summary and conclusions:

(1) **Consider how bicyclists and pedestrians will interact on the trails close to the water.** The Board encouraged the project team to put additional thought into the ways in which pedestrians and bicyclists can share the trails closer to the waterfront without conflict. Bicyclists should be allowed, but that doesn't mean that they should go fast along the waterfront.

(2) **Address the potential safety concerns present with no guardrail along the edge of the bulkhead.** The project team should study the options for treating the edge of the bulkhead to provide for public safety. While there is the desire to keep the existing historic character of the bulkhead structure, it is necessary to provide for public safety by either providing a railing to avoid the potential for people to fall into the water, or to provide a reliable means for them to get safely back to dry land should they fall in.

(3) **The design responds well to sea level rise, and in the future a seawall is preferable to a levee.** The Board overall liked the project's ability to remain functional during periods of periodic and, at some point in the future, permanent inundation of the waterfront promenade along the bulkhead structure. When it is necessary to provide an engineered response to rising sea levels, a seawall is preferable because it will allow for more usable public space than a levee.

(4) **Interpretive signs and elements that explain how the area is designed to accommodate sea level rise should be included.** The design of this public space presents an opportunity to explain to the public access users what will happen over time.

5. **Adjournment.** Mr. Thompson adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ELLEN MIRAMONTES
Bay Design Analyst

Approved, with corrections at the
Design Review Board Meeting of May 9 , 2016