

# 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

September 7, 2018

**TO:** All Commissioners and Alternates

**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: Draft Minutes of the July 9, 2018, BCDC Design Review Board Meeting**

1. **Call to Order and Safety Announcement.** Design Review Board (Board) Chair Karen Alschuler called the meeting to order at the Bay Area Metro Center, 375 Beale Street, Yerba Buena Room, First Floor, San Francisco, California, at approximately 5:30 p.m., and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Other Board members in attendance included Board Vice Chair Gary Strang and Board Members Tom Leader, Jacinta McCann, and Stefan Pellegrini. BCDC staff in attendance included Rebecca Coates-Maloon, Andrea Gaffney, and Ethan Lavine. The presenters were Bill Kennedy (Catellus Alameda Development, LLC, Developer), Andrew Thomas (City of Alameda), Jason Victor (Ken Kay Associates, Landscape Architect), and Sean Whiskeman (Catellus). Public comment via email was submitted by Ben Botkin (San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail), Steve Haines (Alameda County resident), and Lee Chien Huo (San Francisco Bay Trail Project).

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

2. **Other Announcements.** Ms. Gaffney provided the announcements as follows:

a. The Bay Bridge Pier Retention for Public Access Project will be reviewed by the Commission on July 19th.

b. The tentative agenda for the August 6th DRB meeting is the Potrero Power Plant Station and the Alameda Shipways Project.

3. **Approval of Draft Minutes for June 11, 2018, Meeting.**

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Strang moved approval of the Minutes for the June 11, 2018, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as presented, seconded by Ms. McCann.

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



**DRB MINUTES**  
**July 9, 2018**

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 7-0-0 with Board Chair Alschuler, Vice Chair Strang, and Board Members Barton, Leader, Leventhal, McCann, and Pellegrini voting approval with no abstentions.

**4. Alameda Landing Waterfront Mixed-Use Development (First Pre-Application Review).**

The Board held their first pre-application review of a proposal by Catellus Alameda Development, LLC (Catellus) and the Community Improvement Commission of the City of Alameda (CIC) to redevelop a 22.8-acre site at the Alameda Landing waterfront, across the Alameda-Oakland Estuary from Jack London Square, at the terminuses of 5th and Bette Streets in the city and county of Alameda. The proposed project would include residential, commercial, and retail development. Public access improvements include a waterfront plaza, public promenade, greenways, and a view corridor along 5th Street to the water, aligning with Broadway in Oakland, and other public amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Rebecca Coates-Maloon, BCDC Principal Permit Analyst, introduced the project and summarized the issues in the staff report including whether the project:

- (1) Maximizes physical and visual access
- (2) Includes public access areas that are designed in a manner that “feels public” and makes the shoreline enjoyable to the greatest number of people, includes waterfront activities for a wide variety of users, and creates a “sense of place”
- (3) Provides a variety of accessible opportunities for water-oriented public use
- (4) Includes public amenities designed appropriately for the microclimate of the site, considering sun and wind in particular, and for nighttime safety and visibility
- (5) Enhances the public invitation to the site from the adjacent waterfront public access
- (6) Includes a design that is compatible with plans under consideration to construct a touchdown for a bicycle and pedestrian bridge across the Estuary
- (7) Maximizes views and physical connections to the shoreline
- (8) Includes a fence around the substation that minimizes potential adverse impacts to Bay views and creates a sense of public connection to the proposed public access, while maintaining public safety
- (9) Designs public areas and amenities to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise

Ms. Coates-Maloon noted that the sea level rise numbers have been adjusted to new state guidance on Exhibits 26 and 27.

b. **Project Presentation.** Andrew Thomas, Assistant Community Development Director, city of Alameda, introduced the design team. He provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the planning and early project development and the public access project design process to date for the proposed project.

Jason Victor, Ken Kay Associates, the landscape architect for the project, continued the slide presentation and discussed the Waterfront Master Plan Amendment, which was approved in 2017, park plan, public access and connectivity, existing wharf, and development concepts and typologies. He stated the residential components of the project are yet to be determined.

Bill Kennedy, Catellus, continued the slide presentation and discussed sea level rise conditions.

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

Ms. Alschuler stated the text mentioned the need to add additional support from below for sea level rise. She asked if that is true to any adaptation. Mr. Kennedy stated the soil will be stabilized at the top of the riprap slope inland by the use of soil mix columns. He stated reinforcement is not required under the wharf. The extension of the retaining wall will be built as part of the inland portion of development.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the residential design standards and if there are requirements that ground-floor units would be subject to. Mr. Kennedy stated they will be subject to the Alameda Flood Management Ordinance.

Vice Chair Strang referred to the FFE (Finished Floor Elevation) 15.0 designation in the Residential Development Area on the presentation slides and asked if project proponents are committed to that number. Mr. Kennedy stated project proponents are not committed to anything on the right-hand side of the line, the residential side, because the city of Alameda has not yet reviewed that section.

Ms. Alschuler asked the Board to focus on key elements such as the guidance given now for future development. She stated it would be unusual for the Board not to provide guidance for the future residential development area.

Ms. McCann asked if the waterfront park will be developed in stages. Mr. Victor stated the design of the park is being developed now; Catellus will bring on a development partner for the residential development area. Under the Master Plan Amendment, the park must be developed in no more than three phases with the development of the residential area and will be developed from east to west starting with the plaza. He stated the city of Alameda's preference is to complete the park prior to completing the housing.

Ms. McCann asked about the anticipated socioeconomic mix of the housing. Mr. Thomas stated the city of Alameda will develop as many units as possible. The Master Plan allows up to 400 units. Incentives have been put into the Master Plan for affordable, multifamily housing. There is a 15 percent deed-restricted affordable housing requirement on every project in Alameda County and there is a requirement on this project for a certain percentage of small units.

Mr. Leader asked why the presentation includes detailed designs for the park as opposed to the rest of the project, when the whole project has applied. Mr. Victor stated, although there is a residential development associated with it, the only design before the Board today is for the waterfront park. The design of the residential development area has yet to be completed. Elements such as the street grids, the view corridors, or how the public will traverse through and interact with the park along that edge is currently unknown.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board cannot do what it is charged to do without that information. She stated the Board will provide guidance as to what will need to be in place in those areas for the park to feel and be public.

Ms. Alschuler asked how many acres of park there are and what is public. Mr. Victor pointed out the plaza zone and parking areas on the presentation slides. He stated the red line along the edge down to 5th Street and through the parking area is the four-and-a-half-acre public park definition. There are 17 parking spaces within the four and a half acres and additional parking to total 35 spaces to serve the commercial component and access to the public component.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the Western Greenway. Mr. Victor stated it is approximately one acre, which is in addition to the four-and-a-half-acre park. It is publicly accessible, although it is not a dedicated public park.

Ms. Alschuler stated that is where the San Francisco Bay Trail will connect in the future, which is critical.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the Mitchell Avenue Greenway to the south. Mr. Victor stated it is approximately 1.3 acres and will be included in this project.

Ms. Alschuler asked if vehicles will be allowed beyond the turnaround. Mr. Victor stated it is the vehicular terminus of 5th Street.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the water shuttle landing/kayak launch. Mr. Victor stated there are two dedicated spaces in the parking zone on the eastern edge for kayak loading; a kayak storage area will also be included in the design, but the details of the dock and how it will be accessed have yet to be designed.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the surface area material that kayaks will be carried through. Mr. Victor stated the areas around the kayak launch will be active program spaces such as children's play areas, game tables, and picnic areas.

Ms. Alschuler asked for further details about the deck removal and soil improvement plans for the area at the 100-foot BCDC shoreline band. Mr. Victor pointed out the deck area that will be removed, which will make way for the soil improvement process, on the presentation slides.

Mr. Leader asked how the location of the retaining wall from the water was determined. Mr. Victor stated the soil mix column structure most effectively resists the lateral force next to the edge. The formula was to get as close to that cut line as possible by putting the DSM right behind the last column that hits the edge of the riprap where land returns. The mean high-water line is in close proximity to that cut line.

Vice Chair Strang asked for verification that the reason for the wharf removal is to seismically improve the soil to support the housing that will be pushed out beyond the 100-foot shoreline band. Mr. Victor stated that is correct.

Vice Chair Strang asked about the densities, units per acre, and reasonable height limits in this setting. Sean Whiskeman, Senior Vice President of Development, Catellus, stated the Master Plan calls for a building to be built no closer than 100 feet from the edge of the wharf deck. Catellus plans to work closely with the future residential home builder partner on designing an interface with the park that creates great public access. He stated the design currently has 15 units per acre.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the red areas on the presentation slides denote the only commercial retail planned. She asked about the use of the ground-floor retail spaces - it is challenging because residential units often take up the green space in front of the door. Mr. Whiskeman said the areas in red on the presentation slides are meant to be representative - they could stretch down the street or up the building. It will continue to evolve with the future residential home builder partner. He stated the retail and commercial is the most viable at the 5th Street terminus and less viable around the corner.

Ms. Alschuler agreed but stated that area still needs to feel like a public park.

Mr. Pellegrini referred to Exhibit 9 and asked for verification that there is a Class III bicycle lane on Mitchell Avenue. He asked about the timing of the construction of the extension to Mitchell Avenue to the west. Mr. Victor stated the football field has already been completed but the piece between the football field and the pond has not. Within the next year or two, the extension of Mitchell Avenue will be completed out to the parking lot. The future plan is to bring Mitchell Avenue all the way to Alameda Point.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the Bay Trail extension will be a two-way trail on the south side of the road or if that has yet to be determined. He noted that a Class I bicycle lane goes down the west side of Bette Street. Mr. Victor pointed out the future Mosley Avenue extension on Exhibit 9 and stated the plan is to demolish buildings there within the next twelve months. The Mitchell Avenue extension of the Bay Trail will be constructed much later because it will require cutting through the Bay Ship and Yacht Company.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the future concept of the cross-estuary bicycle and pedestrian bridge. Mr. Victor stated the city of Alameda currently has three bridges and two tubes. The three bridges, which are located on the eastern end of Alameda Island, offer the only way for pedestrians and cyclists to leave the island.

Mr. Victor stated three locations have been identified for a bicycle/pedestrian drawbridge. The favored location for the cities of Oakland and Alameda is from the proposed project site across to Jack London Square on Washington Street next to Howard Terminal. The other potential alignments are just to the west over the existing tubes or from the Shipways Project to the foot of Oak Street.

Mr. Victor stated the challenge is how to run the bridge through or adjacent to a neighborhood. The Master Plan reserves the Western Greenway as a potential landing location but 5th Street is also a potential location. The question is if a third right-of-way will be necessary that runs through the residential project. (In certain scenarios, the bridge touchdown would land on Mitchell Avenue, requiring an elevated right-of-way from the water inland to Mitchell Avenue.)

d. **Public Hearing.** Three members of the public provided the following comments:

(1) Ms. Gaffney read the written comments submitted by Lee Huo, Bay Trail Planner, San Francisco Bay Trail Project, as follows:

(a) Align the Bay Trail through the project area along the shoreline of the Estuary

(b) Identify the entire wharf/promenade area as the Bay Trail that is open to bicyclists and pedestrians

(c) Design the shoreline Bay Trail to easily facilitate connecting to the potential future Bay Trail along the shorelines of the adjacent cities and create a seamless transition

(d) Increase the width of proposed pathways along the shoreline to accommodate future demand

(e) Design the active use areas adjacent to the shoreline trail to prevent potential conflicts with trail users

Mr. Huo wrote in support of the future bicycle/pedestrian crossing of the Estuary to the city of Oakland.

(2) Ms. Gaffney read the written comments submitted by Ben Botkin, Water Trail Planner, San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail, as follows:

(a) Ensure the water shuttle landing/kayak launch dock is adequately sized to accommodate both water shuttle and kayak access

(b) Specifically mark and designate a portion of the dock for kayak use

(c) Provide a low-freeboard dock attachment for kayak launching and a stand-up paddleboard (SUP) handrail

- (d) Incorporate universal design elements to make the launch accommodating for persons with disabilities
- (e) Make signs visible from the water guiding kayakers to the portion of the dock away from the water shuttle landing
- (f) The kayak rental/storage area is ideally located and appears adequately sized
- (g) Provide short-term storage as well as long-term storage for residents and members of the public
- (h) Clearly mark the path of travel from the dock to the kayak storage and the kayak loading zone
- (i) Consider offering kayak dollies during daylight hours to aid getting kayaks from the rental/storage and loading zone to the dock

(3) Ms. Gaffney read the written comments submitted by Steve Haines, Alameda County resident, as follows:

- (a) Provide revised plans to address accessibility issues
- (b) Describe the quantity and location of accessible parking spaces to serve the commercial, waterfront plaza, and promenade users.
- (c) Allow a five-foot access aisle for the parallel parking spaces along 5th Street.
- (d) Include accessible parking spaces adjacent to the Alameda Municipal Power (AMP) Substation
- (e) Provide sufficient space for vehicles with extended ramps to safely discharge a person using a wheelchair at the drop-off location for water shuttle passengers
- (f) Address the various public transit systems serving Alameda such as AC Transit, Alameda's paratransit system, and various loop shuttles

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

Ms. Alschuler discussed phasing and stated the Board has looked at many projects that benefit from designing the public space early to create a sense of place to bring in the public.

Ms. McCann stated it will be disheartening with the early phases going in if individuals cannot walk to the end and connect back to the City. She suggested some type of temporary connection and access along the water connecting back to the City streets. This is a park that would benefit from having some type of interim park connections put in place ahead of the future phases.

The Board responded to questions from the staff report as follows:

**Physical and Visual Access:**

Given the unknown configuration of the residential development adjacent to the waterfront promenade:

(1) What are the key considerations for ensuring the waterfront promenade will be inviting to the public?

(2) What are the key considerations to maximize physical and visual access to and along the waterfront from Mitchell Avenue and 5th Street?

Vice Chair Strang stated the character of the residential units on the ground floor facing the water is key - the finished floor elevation, how they interface with the public area, and the uses, such as community uses, fitness center, or meeting rooms. He recommended including as many public uses as possible so it feels more welcoming to the public.

Vice Chair Strang stated concern about the quality of the landscape and planting in the narrow band of soil between the shoreline and the building setback, and if the building line really needs to be that close to the waterline. The goal would be to get as much planting in solid ground as possible, and move the trees away from the buildings.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested that the public right-of-way be separated from the building frontage along 5th Street and the promenade. He suggested shifting the sidewalk more closely aligned to the building frontage to allow more space for trees to reach a substantial size and not compete with the building face. This happens in two places that could be altered: along the waterfront and along 5th Street where there is a road condition where the landscape is between the public sidewalk and the private residential building face. Mr. Pellegrini suggests switching the location of the sidewalk and the planting to allow the landscape to grow more fully away from the building.

Ms. Alschuler agreed and asked why it needs to be a zero-lot line because there is room for flexibility in the development, by setting back the buildings from the property line. She suggested that the private areas be interfaced between the step into the unit, a setback behind the lot line that could allow a second type of planting associated with the building, rather than placing the public landscape between the sidewalk and the building.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested shifting the entrances back with more intention to develop frontage.

Mr. Pellegrini discussed connectivity across the site. He stated his concern that the Western Greenway is seen as a back-of-house connection between the maritime commercial area and the residential area. He stated it will be challenging to think about that as a public space because there is a mixed bag of residential frontage on the east side and the west side will continue maritime uses. He suggested a more public face coming down through the project

similar to the east, particularly with the future pedestrian/bicycle bridge. He suggested that the sub-connection function more like a public path that has the same kinds of uses on both sides leading to the waterfront as opposed to being stuck between the maritime commercial area and the residential area.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested two public streets that come through the project between 5th Street and the Western Greenway. He suggested making the western end of the project more an alley or service access that can easily insert a pedestrian bridge in the future. He suggested a new more public space that would come all the way down to the Mitchell Avenue Greenway one-half of a block to the east of the western greenway.

Ms. Alschuler referred to Exhibit 12 and stated Mr. Victor's comments suggest the importance of a widened area with a view back to San Francisco through the middle of the development and between the two Bay Ship & Yacht warehouse buildings. This view corridor suggests a different configuration of the residential development and edge condition between the maritime and residential uses. She stated it is important to have some kind of widening node of significance to capture the view.

Mr. Pellegrini agreed. The Oakland skyline is rapidly evolving. There are other opportunities to think about to take advantage of view corridors through the property.

Ms. Alschuler asked how other Board members felt about two places that would pass through the Mitchell Avenue Greenway to the water with respect to other view corridors.

Ms. McCann stated the design is all about edges and how critical the edges are. She stated a series of neighborhoods have been developed to the south of the site with trees and sidewalks and low traffic areas. These are natural places to walk and bicycle to the waterfront. She stated, in addition to 5th Street, which is a strong, critical view corridor to the water, Bette Street could also be a critical view corridor along the western edge of the development. She suggested that something more be done to make that area (western greenway/west end of site) seem more parklike and welcoming.

Ms. McCann stated the existing entrance to the industrial parcel on the far side of the estuary provides an interesting view with four cranes in the background that can draw individuals to the waterfront. She suggested something in the middle of the site that picks up on the incredible view to the cranes, which are part of the maritime industrial character.

Ms. McCann suggested a midpoint appealing connection through the development to make it work successfully and strengthen the western end. She suggested negotiating a pedestrian/bicycle path through the site for more permeability from the street edge.

(3) Are the public access areas (Waterfront Plaza, the Waterfront Wharf Promenade, and the Western Greenway) designed in a manner that "feels public" and makes the shoreline enjoyable to the greatest number of people? Do the proposed designs provide waterfront activities for a wide variety of users, and create a "sense of place"? Ms. Alschuler

stated it is important to reinforce the connection that is happening already to the east of the project site, make that feel public, and ensure there is enough width given to those walkways to accommodate individuals carrying kayaks.

Mr. Leader agreed that the site needs more permeability and something through the center that feels public, and the Western Greenway needs to feel like the front of something, not just a back access. What will make the waterfront park feel public depends on what is along the edge inside the shoreline band. He suggested private open space and circulation space in back of the lot line for the ground-floor residential units instead of taking over the park. He suggested connecting through to the waterfront park at every possible place to make a clear series of the sub-connections out from the interior of the project to the public park. He stated possible connections are currently unknown since the residential area has yet to be developed.

Mr. Leader stated it is the same with 5th Street - that area may all be retail and more public or it may be ground-floor residential units. A wall to the ground would not make the area feel public. A transition zone is needed all the way along the promenade and down 5th Street to deal with ground-floor residential units. He stated, if it was all retail it would be great, but that is probably too much.

Mr. Leader stated the need to know how much retail there will be and where the retail spaces will be located. He stated he was skeptical on what the Board can achieve with this review because the areas and features that are not yet developed are important to the overall project review. The park under review today is generic and does not contain the required information to complete the design. A reasonable functional diagram of the park was presented and the uses listed sound good, but he stated he felt uncomfortable commenting on the detail of the park design. He stated the residential area and the park should be designed at the same time. He questioned why the park is being designed prior to the rest of the project.

Vice Chair Strang added, on the waterfront side, the desire for a naturalistic shoreline has been identified with a larger buffer between the wharf and the residential units and that seems like the right impulse. But, when getting into the details, that naturalistic edge is established by making essentially a podium landscape - planter boxes on top of the wharf, which are restricted in soil depth. He stated it looks great in the plan but he was concerned about the ability to establish the green naturalistic edge as seen in the plan. The maintenance of that podium landscape on top of a wharf in a seacoast setting will be a burden for the city. It will be more sustainable, especially given the low density of the units, to try to pull it back and plant the landscape in the ground with a larger buffer. Landscape growing in soil is more permanent and will be easier for the city to maintain.

Ms. Alschuler suggested that the city think about how to use this space for special events and possible amenities to better accommodate the events such as lighting, water, and food trucks.

Ms. McCann stated including the uses, the connections needed between uses, and the distances between them would help the Board better understand the design. The first step is to be clear about the intent of the park from a character standpoint such as to reflect a maritime or industrial setting. At the moment, it seems to be four or five different things, which diminishes from a truly successful design. The next step would be to have a clear understanding of how the uses are distributed. She suggested looking carefully for more space that can be planted or green along the 5th Street corridor. The uses or size of the plaza is unknown.

Ms. McCann stated it is unclear why there would be bulges of green and planters along the walkway to the rest of the site without defining the edges and connection points and where the second view corridors to the water would be. There are choices about how the design would develop based on those end uses.

Ms. McCann shared Vice Chair Strang's concern about the amount of green on the wharf deck.

Ms. Alschuler stated this is not a location that needs interpretive signage about what used to be part of the site because the active maritime uses around the site are significant. This site includes views of the city, the cranes, and the active waterfront. She suggested making that great backdrop more visible and provide information about what's happening now versus focusing on the history.

Mr. Leader asked if parking will be surface parking or if there will be a layer of parking under the residential units. Mr. Victor stated there will likely be parking under the townhome and condominium buildings with parallel parking along the streets.

Mr. Leader suggested stepping down or terracing so parking would not be seen from the park. Underground parking gives the opportunity for layers of separation that overlook the park.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the retail area would benefit from the proximity and connectivity along the shoreline and adjacent to activities rather than in its current odd location away from prominent streets and separated from the waterfront. He suggested pulling the retail closer to the shoreline edge and wrapping to the west along the water.

Ms. Alschuler stated there is an idea about some kind of temporary use structures such as market structures. She suggested learning more about the relationship between those structures and the retail, which would help the Board better understand how the city wants to use this park.

(4) Does the proposed project provide a variety of accessible opportunities for water-oriented public use?

If a kayak launch and water shuttle share a single float, what are the Board's concerns or considerations?

Ms. Alschuler stated the public comments submitted to the Board cover Question 3.

(5) Are the proposed public amenities designed appropriately for the microclimate of the site, considering sun and wind, in particular? Is the site designed appropriately for nighttime safety and visibility?

The Board did not address this question due to lack of design clarity between the park and the adjacent residential uses.

65) Does the proposed design enhance the public invitation to the site from the adjacent waterfront public access?

The Board did not address this question due to lack of information about the proposed adjacent residential development.

(7) Is the design of the Waterfront Wharf Promenade compatible with plans under consideration to construct a touchdown for a bicycle and pedestrian bridge across the Estuary? If not, how could the space be designed to function whether or not the bridge is ultimately constructed?

Mr. Leader stated he was fascinated with the bridge, which would span over the channel. He stated it would be fantastic for this project and would give it added scale, meaning, and desired foot traffic.

(8) Does the design of the Western Greenway maximize views and physical connections to the shoreline?

Comments and recommendations to this question are incorporated in the responses to other questions.

(9) Does the proposed fence around the substation minimize potential adverse impacts to Bay views, and create a sense of public connection to the proposed public access, while maintaining public safety?

Mr. Pellegrini stated he had concerns about trying to insert the AMP Substation into a landscape environment. He suggested a more architectural solution by creating a perimeter around the substation rather than a heavily-programmed landscape, especially when viewed from the waterfront to the east. He suggested designing the substation at the back of the public area rather than in the front as it is in the current design.

**Sea Level Rise Resiliency and Adaptation:**

Are the public areas and amenities appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise?

Ms. Alschuler stated reinforcing the edge is important for the long term. She stated the Board usually sees occupied floors raised higher than one foot.

Mr. Leader stated the logic for the cut wall seemed right. It is key for resiliency.

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Whiskeman responded positively to the Board's discussion and suggestions. He stated the project 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. (Please refer to the Board Questions and Discussion.)

Ms. Gaffney asked about the timeline for bringing on a builder. Mr. Whiskeman stated a residential home builder partner has been identified; plans will become available in the coming months. He asked to present the residential plans to the Board at a future Board meeting.

Ethan Lavine, BCDC Coastal Program Manager, stated the project may not come back to the Board prior to going to the Commission, but there are options for a post-issuance review.

Ms. Alschuler and Ms. McCann stated the importance of seeing this project again.

Mr. Leader stated he would like to see the project again. He stated the Board cannot comfortably comment on the detailed design of the park or the character without understanding how it relates to everything else within the shoreline band.

Vice Chair Strang agreed and stated he does not understand about the wall location, which is an expensive part of the project. He stated the more it is pulled back from the water, the less expensive it becomes. He stated it needs some definition of how to build to it so they know what architecture to plan behind it. Mr. Pellegrini agreed.

Ms. Gaffney stated the Board will review this project again at the November or December meeting.

5. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:00 p.m.