

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)
Andrea Gaffney, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Approved Minutes for August 7, 2017, BCDC Design Review Board Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Safety Announcement.** Design Review Board (Board) Vice Chair Gary Strang called the meeting to order at the Bay Area Metro Center, 375 Beale Street, Yerba Buena Room, First Floor, San Francisco, California, at approximately 4:30 p.m., and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Other Board members in attendance included Cheryl Barton, Stefan Pellegrini, and Jacinta McCann. Board member Tom Leader provided written comments for the Terminal One project. BCDC staff in attendance included Andrea Gaffney, Ethan Lavine, Jaime Michael, Hanna Miller, and Elena Perez. Port of San Francisco Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC) members in attendance included Laura Crescimano, Dan Hodapp, Marsha Maytum, and Jeff Joslin. Mr. Hodapp recused himself from project review to comply with conflict of interest rules. The presenters were Brian Aviles (National Park Service (NPS)), Tom Balbierz (GHD), Scott Cataffa (CMG Landscape Architecture), Jennifer Devlin (EHDD), Kristine Gaspar (GHD), Cleve Livingston (Laconia Development LLC), Greg Moore (Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy), and Toby Perry (East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD)). Public comment via email was submitted by Leora Feeney and Beverly Galloway. Also in attendance were Susan Hubbard (Brickyard Cove Alliance for Responsible Development (BCARD) and Richmond Yacht Club), Lee Huo (Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Bay Trail and Water Trail), and Brian Lewis (BCARD).

Andrea Gaffney, BCDC Bay Design Analyst, reviewed the safety protocols, meeting protocols, and meeting agenda.

2. **Report of Chief of Permits.** No Report was made at this meeting.

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



DRB MINUTES
August 7, 2017

3. **Approval of Draft Minutes for July 10, 2017, Meeting.** Mr. Strang referred to the second paragraph on page 8 and asked to include clarification of what he meant by a “reasonable” grading solution – that, because there was a large amount of fill proposed for the site and an ambitious horticultural program, he recommended that the composition and quantities of the structural and horticultural fill be presented in greater detail.

MOTION: Mr. Strang requested a motion for approval of the Minutes for the July 10, 2017, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as revised, moved by Mr. Pellegrini and seconded by Ms. McCann.

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 4-0-0 with Board Vice Chair Strang and Board members Barton, McCann, and Pellegrini voting approval with no abstentions.

4. **Alcatraz Landing at Piers 31, 31 1/2, and 33, City and County of San Francisco, and Joint Review with Port of San Francisco WDAC (Third Pre-Application Review).** The Board and the WDAC received a joint public briefing on a proposal by the National Park Service (NPS), Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, and Port of San Francisco to redesign the ferry terminal to service Alcatraz Island and other points at Piers 31, 31 1/2, and 33, on the northeast San Francisco waterfront. The proposed project would create three berths to expand ferry service, reconfigure and redesign the embarkation area at Pier 31 1/2, create a public plaza, and rehabilitate and reuse portions of bulkhead and shed buildings at Piers 31 and 33. Public access improvements include an interpretive exhibit area, a plaza, multi-level seating, a café and gift shops, public restrooms, and vehicle and bicycle parking spaces.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Ethan Lavine, Principal Permit Analyst, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of past iterations of the design from 2010 and 2012. He stated the joint Boards’ comments focused on reducing or eliminating parking from the pier, providing a better organization of the elements and spaces within the terminal, and finding a way to unify the design aesthetic. He summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the project:

(1) Encourages movement to and along the shoreline and provides for effective circulation through the site:

(a) Feels inviting, provides a clear connection to the site from Herb Caen Way and The Embarcadero, and provides a sense of arrival and a unique sense of place;

(b) Encourages visitors to be close to the Bay, particularly along the edge of the pier area;

(c) Incorporates unique and special amenities that will draw the public to the site and increases this draw through incorporating more forms of historical, cultural, and natural resource and interpretive expression, such as signage, art, event programming, or other amenities;

(d) Directs visitors to the amenities such as public restrooms, bicycle parking, and ADA parking;

(e) Maintains queuing areas for continuous shoreline public access;

(f) Includes inviting spaces along the Pier 33 shed; and

(g) Needs additional measures to avoid potential conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles in spaces that they will occasionally share.

(2) Utilizes forms, materials, colors, and textures that are compatible with the Bay and adjacent development:

(a) Designs the concrete canopies and enclosed on-deck café in harmony with the surrounding historic structures and the Bay setting;

(b) Do the concrete canopies, enclosed on-deck café, and glass panels in the queuing areas strike the correct balance between maximizing user comfort by designing for the wind and weather, while providing solar access to and minimizing shading of on-pier public access areas? and

(c) Incorporates plantings.

(3) Preserves and enhances the view corridor to the Bay between the Pier 31 and Pier 33 bulkhead buildings and otherwise maximizes views to the Bay:

(a) Provides a welcoming place to appreciate Bay views at the civic plaza;

(b) Designs and sites the seating areas on the civic plaza to minimize the potential adverse impacts to Bay views and

(c) Minimizes potential adverse impacts to Bay views by incorporating sufficiently transparent and appropriate improvements, such as the on-deck café and queuing areas.

(4) Designs public areas that are resilient and adaptive to adverse impacts from sea level rise and shoreline flooding.

b. **Project Presentation.** Brian Aviles, Chief of Planning, NPS, Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), provided an overview of the background, stakeholder process, and location of the improved welcome center and ferry service to Alcatraz Island at Pier 31 1/2.

Greg Moore, President, Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, provided an overview of the purpose, common goals, and mission of partners and stakeholders of this project to preserve history, celebrate maritime use, improve access, and ensure sustainability.

Jennifer Devlin, Principal Architect, EHDD, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the project goals, existing site, and proposed improvements. She stated the proposed design concept is to consolidate and clarify functions in a three-part organization: embarkation, civic plaza, and disembarkation.

Scott Cataffa, Principal, CMG Landscape Architecture, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the site analysis and context, organization and views, general characteristics, constraints, and opportunities of the proposed project. He stated the National Park Interpretation Team identified four narratives that will be interpreted on the site: port, prison, protest, and protection. He stated the interpretive panels are translucent and also serve as windscreens.

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

Ms. McCann asked for additional detail on the bicycle parking, how it is accessed, and how the number of spaces was chosen. Ms. Devlin pointed out access paths on the presentation slides. The proposed design will double the 20 bicycle parking spaces that are currently on the site.

Ms. McCann asked about the number of seats or benches that are designed in the public areas. Mr. Cataffa stated all seating is accessible to the public with the exception of the group queue area.

Ms. McCann asked about the opening and closing weather-protected seating and what happens to the dashed areas in the presentation slides throughout the day. Ms. Devlin pointed out a set of aluminum and glass sliding double doors (in the weather protected seating area) on a presentation slide and stated the dashed areas are open and accessible during the day but close down at night.

Ms. McCann asked if the left-hand area (primary ferry queue) is secure. Ms. Devlin stated there is a secure edge that will be closed off around the stanchions.

Ms. McCann asked if there will be additional signage in front of the access to the café and interpretive retail areas to help direct the public. Ms. Devlin stated there would be signage as part of the interpretive retail and entrance to the café as part of the bulkhead buildings.

Ms. Crescimano member asked for the dimensions of the civic plaza or the pad with the distinct paving to help give an idea of scale. Mr. Cataffa stated the band around it is approximately 30 feet, the central gray (plaza) zone is approximately 140 feet by 50 feet, and there is 25 feet along the water's edge.

Ms. Crescimano asked about the intended use of the space just north of the café seating. Mr. Cataffa stated that area is primarily meant to be open for circulation. It is the shadiest part of the site.

Ms. Maytum member asked if the second ferry will go to Fort Baker and if other stops along the GGNRA are planned. Mr. Aviles stated the plan is to have two ferries going to Fort Baker on weekends. Other ferry vessels go to Angel Island. An interpretive cruise through park waters is planned out of the second queue. He stated there are an additional 200,000 to 300,000 visitors anticipated with the expansion of this project.

Ms. Maytum asked about the SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office) approval process. Mr. Aviles responded that the project has a finding of affect letter and hope to conclude the process within the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Joslin asked about the seating raft during presentations. Mr. Cataffa estimated that the seating raft area could support approximately 30 to 40 individuals for presentations.

Mr. Joslin asked about other intentions for the civic plaza. Mr. Cataffa stated it is meant to be open, flexible, and a place of respite from the volume of individuals moving through the site. The space can also be used for public art displays and performances.

Mr. Joslin asked about the purpose of the staff parking and how it is accessed. Mr. Cataffa stated it is service parking for deliveries and maintenance vehicles and is accessed through Pier 31.

Mr. Joslin asked about the interpretive glass facing the main public area. Mr. Cataffa stated the interpretive glass is double-sided so that there is access for the public to read the interpretations but it also delineates the queues with narrative stories for individuals who are waiting in line.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the locations of the shear walls. Ms. Devlin pointed to the locations on the slide of the site plan.

Mr. Strang asked about the materials of the interpretive panels and the shear walls, and if the degree of transparency can be maintained. He also asked for further details on paving types. Ms. Devlin stated engineering has verified that the number of shear walls is correct. The columns are thin; the edge of the post-tension concrete is five inches going to fifteen inches at the shear walls. Engineering has also verified the height of the aluminum and glass partitions. Mr. Cataffa stated the central “carpet” will be cast-in-place concrete with a slightly different finish than the rest of the plaza. He pointed out the use of wood, concrete, and steel materials on the presentation slides.

Ms. Barton asked about the after-construction wind conditions and whether they had been modeled. Mr. Cataffa responded they have not yet been modeled, but will be. Ms. Barton also asked for clarification on who would be programming the central plaza. Mr. Cataffa responded that the Conservancy would be responsible for programming.

d. **Public Hearing.** No members of the public addressed the Board.

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

Mr. Strang asked if the bollards are removable. Mr. Cataffa stated they are removable for emergency access.

Ms. Barton asked about the lighting in the civic plaza area. Mr. Cataffa stated the emergency egress routes are in red which will be appropriately lighted. The goal of lighting in the concrete canopies is to up-light them to resemble sails. Standards frame the central “carpet” area that fill in the lighting from the canopy. There is up-lighting at the monument sign, washed façade lighting along the shed bulkhead, and task lighting at the welcome center.

Ms. Barton asked if the lighting tapers off toward the waterfront. Mr. Cataffa stated all cutoff controls and guidelines will be met but the team has not yet gotten to that level of specificity.

Board members gave the following comments and suggestions:

- (1) Design the removable bollards lower and wider to resemble furniture.
- (2) Ensure that the concrete canopies and connections down to the pier maintain the elegance as depicted in the drawings.

- (3) Ensure that the railing is not mistaken as seating, that it cannot be climbed upon given the raised curb at the base.
- (4) Consider night waterfront viewing when developing the lighting design.
- (5) The buildings along the Embarcadero orient to the tangent of the roadway. Consider a different geometry than imposing a rectangle in the middle, such as a fan shape that is more appropriate to the context and which would allow a more open interpretation of the view. The parti is appreciated, but a consideration of the plaza shape would be appreciated.
- (6) Increase the number of bicycle parking spaces, perhaps including some in the open space, or more directly connected to the plaza.
- (7) Include additional seating in the central zone.
- (8) Include things for children to do while waiting for the ferry, expand the ways the interpretive amenities can be experienced, beyond the proposed panels.
- (9) Improve the signage and wayfinding to easily direct the public to the location from the outside of the site and to the ticket booth once they arrive.
- (10) The NPS icon is obscure. Enhance the signage but incorporate it in a way that does not detract from the architecture.
- (11) Include plantings to begin the story and set up a distinct experience as the gateway to Alcatraz – something that will tie thematically to make it richer and layered as opposed to the current civic waiting zone.
- (12) Share more with the joint Board about what is envisioned as part of the interpretive story in addition to the panels.
- (13) Include views of the project from the water in future presentations to the joint Board.
- (14) Consider changing the bar seating at the raft to two-sided benches that can be used as bar seating and for viewing and events.
- (15) Incorporate as much differentiation as can be achieved by using like materials between Herb Caen Way and the “carpet” to invite the public in.
- (16) Consider the central part of waterfront railing as a different experience, different design.
- (17) The same design experience of the plaza should carry through to the in-water connections to the ferries.
- (18) The rock will invite children and others to climb on it. Consider incorporating this further into the overall design.

- (19) Think more about how the empty spaces could be used. Create a balance that is perhaps temporary and adaptable between the current cluttered location and the proposed design, which is perhaps too sparse.
- (20) Reconsider the front-most bench design that does not face out to the Embarcadero; it suggests a barrier. Encourage multi-directional seating all around.
- (21) Add more seating to the larger piece facing the water.
- (22) Consider additional seating in the space adjacent to the café while still maintaining the openness for circulation.
- (23) Consider another material besides concrete for the shear walls.
- (24) Include views from different positions to help the Board understand the most optimal place for the shear walls.
- (25) The opening to this location is small. Include views from other positions along the Embarcadero to help the Board see the important opportunity of the leading edge (of the objects in the plaza) to improve wayfinding and a sense of arrival.
- (26) Ferry Station 2 will be popular. Consider the signage and clarity for that and push individuals toward the Park Service sign since the majority of visitors will be going in that direction.
- (27) The corner of the canopy is important to study to determine how to make that the obvious place for the majority of the individuals to go to alleviate confusion.
- (28) The façades on Piers 31 and 33 can help amplify the sense of arrival. Provide further views and narrative to what is this experience.
- (29) Anticipate what modifications to the terminal may be necessary over time because future modifications could diminish the integrity of the overall design

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Aviles responded positively to the joint Boards' suggestions. He stated the design team will take the Boards' comments into consideration and will come up with an improved design. Ms.Devlin responded to the questions and comments about the skylights: they are proposed as glass. She also commented that they are at the beginning stages of the interpretive element design and the Board's comments have been very helpful. Mr. Moore stated this is a landmark location going to a landmark site. He stated the Boards' advice and questions will help bring the project up to a landmark standard.

g. **Board Conclusion.** The Board would like to review this project again.

5. Doolittle Drive San Francisco Bay Trail Extension, City of Oakland, Alameda County (First Pre-Application Review). The Board held their first pre-application review of a proposal by the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) for the first phase of the Doolittle Drive San Francisco Bay Trail Extension project at the Martin Luther King (MLK) Junior Shoreline Park. The proposed project would include the improvement of the southern trail area, a parking lot, and a boat launch and the construction of a pedestrian/cyclist bridge.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Hanna Miller, Coastal Program Analyst, provided an overview of the project, accompanied by a slide presentation, and summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the project:

- (1) Provides ample, diverse and adequate opportunities for public use
- (2) Provides adequate, distributed public amenities designed to balance the needs of visitors and natural resources in the project vicinity
 - (a) Provides appropriately-sized and located bridge overlooks with seating
 - (b) Includes waste receptacles, lighting, signage, landscape improvements, and additional seating opportunities
- (3) Encourages diverse recreational uses of the Bay and shoreline, including swimming, non-motorized boats, launching facilities, rigging areas, and equipment storage
- (4) Includes improved fishing piers and related access
- (5) Designs a bridge that is useable and safe with appropriate emergency evacuation access, emergency vehicle access, and/or other motor vehicles using this bridge
- (6) Designs consistent cohesive trail segments that reinforce the identity of MLK Jr. Shoreline Park
- (7) Adequately connects the trail to the existing public facilities, including the two fishing piers and adjoining Bay Trail connections
- (8) Minimizes or reduces the visual impact of the bridge and association guardrail on the Bay and shoreline along Doolittle Drive
- (9) Appropriately designs the trail to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise
- (10) Designs the bridge to facilitate future adaptation of the shoreline
- (11) Ms. Miller showed Board members a driving video along Doolittle Drive and turning into the boat launch area of the MLK Jr. Regional Shoreline Park.

b. **Project Presentation.** Toby Perry, Project Manager at EBRPD, introduced the members of his team. He provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the context, background, project options, and feasibility study results of the project. He stated this project will close one of the last Bay Trail gaps in the East Bay Region. The 60-percent drawings presented today are currently out for review by the Port of Oakland, the city of Oakland, CalTrans, the Bay Trail, and the BCDC.

Tom Balbierz, Senior Project Manager, GHD, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the phases of the project, existing amenities and trail gap, proposed improvements, and a detailed description of Phase 1 of the project. He stated the feasibility study indicated a nominal cost difference between an added embankment next to the road and an elevated trail. The elevated trail was chosen to minimize the environmental impact.

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

Mr. Strang asked about the approximate cost of the project. Mr. Balbierz stated it is approximately \$8 million, including the elective modifications suggested by the EBRPD of the existing trail and boat ramp improvements.

Ms. Barton asked about environmental impacts. Mr. Balbierz stated the elevated section is just under 28,000 square feet of fill. The EBRPD is on the front end in the environmental process and is looking at mitigation options in the Bay. He pointed out a location on a presentation slide where there will be minor impacts with riprap that must be shored up so that the integrity of the project will not be sacrificed.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about lighting. Mr. Balbierz stated there is currently no plan to include lighting in the project.

d. **Public Hearing.** Ms. Miller summarized the written comments and questions provided by Leora Feeney, which were included in the meeting packet.

Lee Huo, the Bay Trail Planner at the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), spoke in support of the project. He stated Ben Botkin, of the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail at ABAG, asked him to provide his comments to include a low freeboard dock, a rigging area for boats, and a drop-off area.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about project coordination with Caltrans. Mr. Balbierz said that Caltrans was involved in the Feasibility Study and they are currently reviewing the plans. Mr. Perry stated Caltrans Transportation Planners provided comments on the 30 percent plans. Mr. Pellegrini asked if this portion of Doolittle Drive retains an expressway designation. He explained that a new Highway Design Manual was adopted in 2015 that is progressive about controlling design speed, but that expressways have an expectation that no bicycles will be there at all, their design is more limited. Because there is a bike lane then maybe the road is subject more progressive standards. Mr. Perry said that EBRPD design standards will take Caltrans into consideration.

Ms. Barton asked what the plan is for landscape improvements. Mr. Balbierz responded that there is no plan for additional landscape improvements. Ms. Barton asked if the EBRPD will replant what is damaged by construction. Mr. Balbierz stated yes, they would replant or seed any vegetation that is damaged or disturbed.

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board members expressed befuddlement over the proposed project followed with a tepid endorsement based on the following discussion:

(1) Would the proposed Bay Trail extension, including the new elevated bridge and associated improvements (e.g., the facilities serving boaters and kayakers), provide ample, diverse and adequate opportunities for public use? Is the proposed elevated bridge trail of ample width to meet current and future uses?

(2) Ms. Gaffney asked if the million-user reference is a typo. Mr. Perry agreed that the number sounds high and stated it is data from the feasibility study. He stated he will look into it.

(3) Mr. Strang stated the typical 12-foot width of the trail is restrictive when it includes rails and open areas with bicycles passing. Mr. Balbierz stated the width meets the current Bay Trail standards and that the four viewing areas give pedestrians an opportunity to step out of the way or stop and rest. Mr. Perry added that there is a large interest in fishing in this area and that EBRPD anticipates the viewing areas being used for that purpose.

(4) Ms. McCann stated the boat launch improvements will address the issues in Issue 1, especially the kayaking.

(5) Are the proposed public amenities adequate, distributed, and designed to balance the needs of visitors and natural resources in the project vicinity?

(a) Are the proposed bridge overlooks with seating appropriately sized and located?

(b) Would the project be enhanced by including waste receptacles, lighting, signage, landscape improvements, and additional seating opportunities?

As mentioned earlier, no additional landscape improvements are currently being proposed other than replacing what is damaged during construction and the part of the trail that is widened.

Ms. McCann suggested not providing trash receptacles at the viewing areas to keep the view clear, make maintenance more efficient, and keep litter from blowing out onto the water.

Mr. Strang stated the landscape improvements is a significant omission. Doolittle Drive is a noisy, unpleasant, high-speed road with no buffer between the walkway and the road. He stated he wished there was a way to calm the traffic, frame the views, or have some visual separation from the roadway.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the driving video was helpful to see that Doolittle Drive is a two-lane road with four-lane sections bookending at both ends where individuals take the opportunity to speed up and pass. He stated his concern about amenities on the causeway that are difficult to service, subject to vandalism, and not controllable. He mentioned that lighting could help in areas of cross conflict, such as the boat launch, and said maybe the lighting could be at the ground level.

(6) Does the project encourage diverse recreational uses of the Bay and shoreline, including swimming, non-motorized boats, launching facilities, rigging areas, equipment storage, etc.?

Ms. McCann stated there is currently one dilapidated bench in the kayak boat landing area. She suggested improving the area with additional seating.

(7) Would public shoreline use be enhanced if the existing fishing piers and related access were improved?

Mr. Strang stated this question falls into the same category with landscape improvements: it would greatly improve the project to enhance the existing fishing piers.

Ms. McCann suggested cleaning up and including additional seating at the existing fishing spots.

(8) Is the proposed bridge designed in a manner that is useable and safe? Do you have concerns about emergency evacuation access, emergency vehicle access, and/or other motor vehicles using this bridge?

Mr. Pellegrini said the view locations seem arbitrary. He suggested shifting the viewing areas to the existing amenities to the north where individuals naturally gather along the path, such as at the ramp and around the pump station. There is a greater concentration of birds to view up in the marsh area. Ms. Barton added that the view areas could be grouped closer together and do not have to be equidistant. Mr. Perry clarified that the viewing areas have been spaced so people could approach from the north or the south and use the platforms.

Ms. Michaels asked about the dimensions of the view areas. The Board agreed they were appropriate. Mr. Pellegrini said the platforms would be great for fishing, and perhaps the benches could be longer.

Ms. McCann made a comment about the lack of access on and off the causeway except at the ends. Mr. Balbierz explained that EBRPD has talked about adding additional access points but because there is no safe way to connect to the road, no further connections have been added to the design.

Ms. McCann asked if it would be prudent to include emergency phones on the bridge for public safety.

Mr. Strang stated the lack of mid-point access areas on the bridge makes the design solutions awkward and may present public safety concerns.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested coordinating with Caltrans to see if there are portions of the trail that could be coordinated back onto the land for some portions. Mr. Balbierz said locating the trail on the road, while still addressing sea level rise, would lead to a drainage issue for the road. Mr. Strang stated that the trail could be located on land with a gap underneath for drainage that would cost less.

(9) Are the three trail segments designed in a consistent and cohesive manner? Does the trail design reinforce the identity of MLK Jr. Shoreline Park?

Ms. Barton stated there are awkward abrupt connections between the sections where the bridge meets the land. She suggested putting more thought into the forms of the design to make them more safe to navigate, and more compatible with the shoreline edge.

(10) Does the trail adequately connect to the existing public facilities, including the two fishing piers and adjoining Bay Trail connections?

Board members agreed that the plan does a good job of making connections in closing a Bay Trail gap.

(11) Would the proposed bridge and associated guardrail visually impact Bay and shoreline access of users along Doolittle Drive? If so, are there ways to minimize or reduce that effect? In certain areas, there are guardrails for both the road and the trail.

Mr. Strang suggested that the rail be as transparent as possible. He questioned whether the rail needs the cap, which presents a thick horizontal line. Ms. McCann said that people might lean and rest on the top of the rail, and perhaps the rail design could differ at the overlooks.

(12) Is the trail appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise? Should the enhanced trail segments on land be raised to a higher elevation to address resiliency to sea level rise?

Mr. Strang stated the trail is lower than will be required in the future.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested coordinating that with the required future elevation of Doolittle Drive since it will be impacted at the same time that the trail will be impacted.

(13) How can the bridge design facilitate future adaptation of the shoreline?

(14) This question was not addressed.

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Perry responded positively to the Board's discussion and suggestions. He stated the design team will take the Board's comments into consideration and will come up with an improved design.

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board did not summarize their conclusions. Board members collectively stated they do not feel they need to see this project again and asked staff to continue to work with the applicants.

6. Terminal One/Latitude Project, City of Richmond, Contra Costa County (Fifth Pre-Application Review). The Board held their fifth pre-application review of a proposal by Laconia Development, LLC and the city of Richmond to redevelop the 13-acre shoreline site, Terminal One. The proposed project would replace the heavy industrial port-related land use of the site with a mixed-use development, including residential homes, retail space, and a public waterfront park. Public access improvements include the shoreline extension of the San Francisco Bay Trail, a new shoreline loop roadway with on-street public parking and loading zones, an elevated walk connecting the Bay Trail to the proposed waterfront park, and a public waterfront trail along an existing railway.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Elena Perez, Coastal Program Analyst, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the location, context, property ownership, and existing conditions of the proposed project. She noted this particular site has already gone before the DRB four times, once with Laconia, LLC, and three other times with another project proponent. She summarized the changes made to the design since incorporating the Board's comments from the June 7, 2016, meeting, which were included in the staff report. She summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the project:

- parks
- (1) Provides appropriate public access
 - (2) Provides appropriate visual access from the shoreline, nearby roads, and public parks
 - (3) Impacts views by the design of the pedestrian bridge
 - (4) Includes a sufficient mix of recreational opportunities
 - (5) Encourages diverse activities
 - (6) Includes sufficient public parking to accommodate visitors
 - (7) Includes sufficient public transit connections
 - (8) Should repurpose the existing rail lines as an informal trail
 - (9) Blends the waterfront park and the development
 - (10) Incorporates the site's history sufficiently
 - (11) Addresses potential conflicts with wildlife
 - (12) Addresses the micro-climate in the design of the public space

b. **Project Presentation.** Cleve Livingston, Project Representative on the Latitude Project, Laconia Development, LLC, introduced the members of his team. He provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the panoramic view, existing post-industrial condition, history, development challenges, and design process to date for the proposed project.

Scott Cataffa, Principal, CMG Landscape Architecture, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the context, Bay Trail circulation, public access features, and revisions made to the design based on Board guidance. He reviewed historical elements that will be preserved or repurposed throughout the project.

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

Mr. Strang asked if the single-family homes will have fencing. Mr. Cataffa stated they have front patios that can be fenced in.

Mr. Strang asked about the soil depth on the pier for the coastal garden. Mr. Cataffa stated the soil depth is 12 inches.

Mr. Strang asked about the purpose of the pedestrian bridge. Mr. Cataffa stated residents share podium amenities – a pool, a playground, and a picnic area. The pedestrian bridge offers a convenient way to access the amenities and creates a dramatic viewing opportunity.

Mr. Strang asked about the podium grade. Mr. Cataffa stated the podium goes from 8 to 12 feet. The pedestrian bridge has a clearance of 14 feet to allow emergency vehicles underneath.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the drawings look like the central portion is public and front yard spaces to the buildings are private. Mr. Cataffa stated they are not front yards but are more like patio/deck spaces. He pointed out features on a presentation slide showing the front areas of the groundfloor units. He stated there are planting and stormwater treatment gardens separating the homes from the public path in the middle.

d. **Public Hearing.** Mr. Huo stated one of the goals of the Bay Trail is proximity to shoreline experience and equal access for bicyclists and pedestrians. The current design places the Bay Trail approximately 40 feet to 91 feet away from the proximity to the shoreline throughout the project site. He stated there is enough room at this location to create different spaces for pedestrians and bicyclists. He requested that the Bay Trail be located closer to the shoreline.

Susan Hubbard, Brickyard Cove Alliance for Responsible Development (BCARD) and the Richmond Yacht Club (RYC), stated BCARD and RYC have never totally opposed the project and look forward to improving the location. She stated concern with regards to the heights and density of the project, sea level rise, viewpoints, and views of the Bay. She stated the heights and density are inappropriate for the site.

Brian Lewis, BCARD, stated he provided staff with a two-minute video showing parking problems on Saturday, April 29, 2017.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fD5Ve1gc7hM&authuser=0>

He stated nothing was special about that day but there was not one parking spot available. He pointed out where he filmed on one of the presentation slides. The proposed project includes 40 visitor parking spots limited by time. He questioned what individuals who come to this location to work will do. A parking garage for residents but not for employees was mentioned in the presentation. He predicted that visitors and residents who do not have enough parking will spill over to the adjacent residential streets. He stated this project displaces the community of Richmond, which loves this park and uses it on a regular basis. He asked the Board to consider public access to Miller Knox Regional Shoreline Park and Ferry Point, which will be displaced by this project. Mr. Lewis interjected at the end of the meeting, to note that while limiting the number of cars along the Shoreline Drive would open up views, it would take away parking from the public and preserve private views for the residents. He believes the cars would take away from the residents' views, but restricting parking would take away from public access.

Ms. Gaffney stated Board member Tom Leader submitted written comments, which were included in the meeting packet, and Beverly Galloway submitted written comments to staff about parking.

Ms. Gaffney stated the Terminal One project will be presented to the Engineering Criteria Review Board (ECRB) tomorrow, focused on the structural integrity of the deck in the development and shoreline protection.

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

(1) Does the project provide the right mix of recreational opportunities, including in-water access and fishing, and related improvements or facilities to accommodate a wide variety of users? Does the proposed project encourage diverse activities and create a “sense of place” that is unique and enjoyable?

Board members agreed that breaking the location up into definable spaces is a good idea and introduces a variety of ways to enjoy the park and shoreline. Access to the water nearby is a good mix of uses that are made available.

(2) Is the public access area “designed for the weather of the site”?

Mr. Strang stated the location is open to the elements. The shelter of the canopy and windbreaks in the picnic areas are important. He stated, although the artificial turf works to make the pier usable, there are maintenance and durability questions. The artificial turf can also get very warm. He suggested considering using something other than artificial turf.

Ms. McCann suggested considering the possibility of including trees immediately north of the park in the triangular spaces (on land) to provide protection against the elements.

Mr. Strang suggested consolidating some of the green spaces (on land) to allow room for trees.

Mr. Strang stated one of the public comments was that the Bay Trail should be closer to the water, which the design team opposes for a number of reasons. He referred to Tom Leader’s statement that the Bay Trail should not be on the water, it should be off the wharf. Mr. Strang stated having the Bay Trail on the wharf is not a bad idea because there is plenty of space in that area.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he likes the idea of the Bay Trail having access to the water’s edge, but also likes the idea of the public space along the water’s edge being more pedestrian-oriented and not conducive to fast bicycle traffic.

(3) Is the shoreline drive designed in a way that blends the waterfront park and the development?

Ms. McCann stated the higher elevation of the Bay Trail in this area works well. She stated there is a sidewalk that follows the edge of the road on the southwest corner, then the Bay Trail, then paths. It seems like there is one too many things there. She suggested, if the path is needed, realigning it and curving it a little closer to gain more green area.

Ms. McCann stated she likes the buffer between the trail and the road and the natural coastal plant landscape. She stated, if this became a trail sitting within that coastal landscape on both sides, the curve of the road and the landscape would work together. She suggested adding trees with seating or picnic tables under them. She stated locating the Bay Trail on the wharf edge changes the opportunity that the wharf edge currently presents, which is for a beautiful, restful viewing area. It is a quiet space; bringing bicycles moving at higher speeds through there could be difficult.

(4) Is there sufficient public parking to draw the public and enable the public to access the proposed waterfront park? Is there sufficient public transit to enable the public to access the waterfront park?

Mr. Strang stated he appreciated the public comment on this item.

Mr. Livingston responded that the parking has always been a significant issue and concern. As a result, when the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was done on this project, the draft EIR looked at parking in the context of whether or not it met the city standard. Since that analysis was done, the project has been downsized so the parking adequacy is even greater than it was when the EIR was done. He stated the project has designed 50 spaces over what the city requires. Because parking is such a sensitive issue, a Peak Parking Analysis was done, which concluded that the project has planned for 12 spaces over peak demand for residents, guests, and employees for off-street parking and 6 spaces over for on-street parking.

Mr. Livingston said the City of Richmond is currently working with the Park District to try to dedicate some of the property it owns for parking. The City is also working with a nearby developer to create additional parking.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if there are ADA spaces in the design. Mr. Livingston stated there are a total of six ADA spaces situated throughout the project and additional ADA spaces inside the parking podium.

(5) Does the project incorporate historic working waterfront elements in a way that provides educational opportunities and further understanding of the site's history?

Board members agreed that the plan does a good job of incorporating historic elements.

(6) Given this site is adjacent to Miller Knox regional open space, are there any wildlife conflict considerations needed at this site?

Board members agreed that they do not have enough information to answer this question.

(7) Is the project designed to maximize access to, along, and through the proposed development? Is the public promenade through the proposed development designed in a way that is inviting to the public?

Mr. Pellegrini stated the Board does not know much about the elements from the drawings of the podium that would either be exposed or above grade and defining the edge condition of the public space, but makes the assumption that it will be nicely designed around the bridge.

Board members agreed that the central green space is working well.

(8) Does the revised site plan provide appropriate visual access to the Bay?

Board members agreed that the plan provides appropriate visual access to the Bay.

(9) Does the design of the proposed pedestrian bridge maximize views to the Bay from the publicly-accessible promenade?

Board members agreed that the bridge design maximizes views to the Bay, but that the central column should be reconsidered in the development of the design.

(10) Should the project proponent use the existing rail lines along the shoreline to create a public amenity, e.g. an informal walking trail, that would likely be inundated in the future (“interim” public access)? Or should the area be treated as visual access which the public cannot physically access?

Board members agreed it is a good idea and, if it gives visitors pleasure to use for years to come, it is worth it. It is a wonderful historic reference on the site that creates a distinctive character for to the park. Access to the riprap area is great.

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Livingston responded positively to the Board’s discussion and suggestions. He stated the design team will take the Board’s comments into consideration and will come up with an improved design. He stated it would be great if the design can remain free of parked cars so the views can remain open. Parked cars take away from the residents’ views but open views take away from public access.

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board did not summarize their conclusions. Board members collectively stated they do not feel they need to see this project again as long as the project does not significantly change, and asked staff to continue to work with the applicants.

6. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, Mr. Strang adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREA GAFFNEY
Bay Design Analyst

Approved, as corrected, at the
Design Review Board Meeting of September 11, 2017.

APPENDIX A
TERMINAL ONE WATERFRONT PARK
COMMENTS FOR DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 7, 2017

Tom Leader, July 28, 2017

- **Size** – Really glad to see the wharf structure can support this park and applicant is investing significant resources in structural retrofit. This is critical to accomplishing this valuable new amenity for the Richmond waterfront. I definitely feel the wharf park should be maintained at the proposed size corresponding to the original wharf and not reduced.
- **Lawn** – understand the need to reduce weight of wet soil. But if the coastal garden can have soil then the thin 6” section required for real lawn should be OK too, no? Real lawn would be more user-friendly in this context. Also if there can be hummocks in the coastal garden then how about some subtle, ergonomic hummocks in certain of the lawn areas (say 25%) which could also create some wind speed reduction for picnickers sitting on grass.
- **Bay Trail location** – should absolutely not be forced onto the water edge promenade. That would be very unsafe for park users, especially kids and older people, and seriously detracts from the general use of the promenade by pedestrians. Bay Trail is well positioned as currently shown for water edge views and tracks the actual shoreline.
- **Historical elements** – glad to see the forest of roof trusses gone. The new program of artifacts as a diverse ensemble is more informative and money better spent. Especially like the crane truss used as a bridge (really excellent), the old tie off “bollards”, and the old pediment sign. If the old redwood roof timbers could be the picnic deck that would be great and if not, use husky recycled timbers, not smaller, newer wood as shown on page 25. Trying to use the old roof trusses laid flat for the picnic arbor feels weird though? - could be too much alteration of their original context? Maybe if they stack up several layers deep with spacers in between it might have more substance.
- **Seat wall** – I still think more could be done to tell the actual story of the place and this could easily happen on the seat wall facing the promenade. Ideally that wall would be made of sawn-up chunks of the old building wall, but OK if poured in place too. But the opportunity for the wall is to tell the story of what happened here and why? Who was here? What did they look like? What did they say? etc.? The story-telling panels at the Rosie Memorial are a great example of how this can be done at the level of public art, not just factual interpretive signs. This could easily become a sort of narrative scroll on the seat wall adding meaning to the promenade. In terms of civic and waterfront value I think it would be worth a lot more than the expense of the restored roof trusses for the arbor (not that there’s anything bad about it).

CONTINUATION OF TERMINAL ONE WATERFRONT PARK COMMENTS – Tom Leader

July 28, 2017

- **Promenade** – is 30' of unrelieved concrete it appears. Was 20' width considered? Then the green park could be bigger? As shown I think it needs some furnishing / seating on the surface or something worked into the rail edge to make it more pedestrian-friendly and less enormous scale, given the non-Embarcadero type of setting. I can guarantee there will be lots of people fishing at the edge here – some accommodation for them as done at Ferry Point?
- **Windscreens** – there will be stiff winds and fog here. I noticed some windscreens on page 19 that will be valuable in that zone. But further to the east (page 20) feels pretty flat and exposed given the climate. I think a comfort strategy with more screening of some sort as you move east – maybe additional modulation of the surface and/or the height of planting in the eastern zones will make the park more usable on windy/foggy summer days.
- **Coastal Garden** – seems like there should be some type of seating here? Could just be old timbers.