

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

October 26, 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 October 15, 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 6:30 p.m., and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Other Board members in attendance included Board Members Tom Leader, Jacinta McCann, and Stefan Pellegrini. Comments via email were provided by Board Vice Chair Gary Strang and Board Member Cheryl Barton. BCDC staff in attendance included Andrea Gaffney, Ethan Lavine, and Brad McCrea. The presenters were Bill Kennedy (Catellus Alameda Development, LLC), Kathleen Livermore (City of Alameda), Damir Priskich (Catellus Alameda Development, LLC), Jason Victor (Ken Kay Associates), and Sean Whiskeman (Catellus Alameda Development, LLC). Public comment via email was submitted by Lee Chien Huo (San Francisco Bay Trail Project).

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

Ms. Gaffney reminded Board Members to take the ethics course.

Ms. Gaffney stated the next Board meeting will be held on November 5th. The Board tentatively will review the Jack London Square Hotel Project. The project proponents' draft exhibits have been submitted.

Ms. Gaffney stated the following Board meeting will be held on December 17th. The Board will review the Alameda Shipways and the Alameda Encinal Terminals Projects.

Ms. Gaffney stated the Potrero Power Plant Station Mixed-Use Redevelopment, Monarch Bay in San Leandro, Lake Merritt to Bay Trail Bridge, and Brooklyn Basin Projects are tentatively scheduled for the early part of 2019.

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



DRB MINUTES
October 15, 2018

Ms. Gaffney showed images of the update of the San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge Pier Retention for Public Access Project, which she stated is under construction and moving along quickly. According to the permit, the project will be completed by December of 2019.

Ms. Alschuler asked for additional detail on the presentation slide looking back toward Oakland that shows the project from the park. She asked if the piece on the right of the presentation slide will be removed.

Ms. Gaffney showed the slide of the Oakland side and pointed out E-23, the old pier foundation that is on the edge of the shoreline, and the future Gateway Park with the Port of Oakland in the background. She pointed out E-21, the end of the pier, the belvedere. She stated the framing and containment will eventually be removed and a railing will be constructed along with a 600-foot-long public access pier.

Ms. Gaffney then showed a slide of the Yerba Buena Island side of the project and pointed out E-2, a large pier foundation. She noted that the slide showed a crane lifting a portion of the deck into place.

Ms. Gaffney stated the permit was issued in July of 2018 and noted that construction on the project is proceeding swiftly.

Brad McCrea, BCDC Regulatory Program Director, stated Bob Batha (phonetic), former BCDC Chief of Permits and Staff Biologist for many years, passed away last Saturday. Board Members offered their condolences.

2. Report of Chief of Permits. Ethan Lavine, BCDC Coastal Program Manager, presented his report:

a. Several items seen by the Board in recent months will be presented to the Commission early next year, including the Alameda Landing Waterfront Mixed-Use Development, the project being presented to the Board today, the Alameda Marina Mixed-Use Redevelopment, the Alcatraz Landing, and the San Francisco Fireboat Station Projects.

b. Board Members are invited to attend a process workshop on improving the efficacy and efficiency of staff reports to ensure they give the right information and communicate projects well. The workshop is scheduled as part of the November 15th Commission meeting at 1:00 p.m. A professor and researcher, who is an expert in staff reports from the University of Kansas Policy and Planning Department, has been invited to present her research on the topic and to facilitate the 90-minute workshop.

3. Approval of Draft Minutes for September 17, 2018, Meeting. Ms. Gaffney stated Board Vice Chair Gary Strang and Board Member Cheryl Barton sent revisions to staff for the September 17th meeting minutes since they were unable to be in attendance for today's meeting. Ms. Gaffney read their comments into the record, as follows:

Ms. Barton referred to her comment in the third paragraph from the bottom on page 15 and requested changing the end of her sentence from "how much of the public area would still be available during sea level rise" to "how much of the public area would still be available during a mid-century sea level rise event."

Mr. Strang referred to his comment on page 14 under paragraph (2)(c), Physical and Visual Access, and requested changing the last sentence from “he suggested narrowing it to eight or ten feet” to “if a 26-foot fire lane is required, the paved portion should be narrowed to eight to ten feet while the remaining required width could be engineered for fire trucks with a softer surface like turfblock cells filled with gravel. If a fire lane is not required, then ten feet for emergency vehicles is sufficient.”

[Chair Alschuler moved the Board on to Agenda Item 4, the presentation on the Alameda Landing Waterfront Mixed-Use Development, prior to voting on the minutes due to the lack of a quorum.]

[After the establishment of a quorum and the completion of business for Agenda Item 4, the Board resumed the process for the approval of the minutes from the September 17th Board meeting.]

MOTION: Mr. Pellegrini moved approval of the Minutes for the September 17, 2018, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as revised, seconded by Mr. Leader.

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 4-0-0 with Board Chair Alschuler and Board Members Leader, McCann, and Pellegrini voting approval with no abstentions.

4. Alameda Landing Waterfront Mixed-Use Development (Second Pre-Application Review). The Board held their second pre-application review of a proposal by Catellus Alameda Development, LLC, and the Community Improvement Commission of the City of Alameda 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, pocket parks, view corridors, and other public amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Ms. Gaffney provided the report for Rebecca Coates-Maloon, BCDC Principal Permit Analyst, who was on vacation. Ms. Gaffney reviewed the project and summarized the changes made to the design since incorporating the Board’s comments from the July 9, 2018, meeting, which were included in the staff report. She summarized the issues in the staff report including whether the project:

(1) Ensures that the waterfront promenade will be inviting to the public, and that the physical and visual access to and along the waterfront from Mitchell Avenue and 5th Street will be maximized

(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

(3) Provides a variety of accessible opportunities for water-oriented public use, and avoids or reduces conflicts among the uses on the dock platform

(4) Includes a design that facilitates a future bicycle/pedestrian bridge connection

(5) Maximizes views and physical connections to the shoreline

(6) Includes revised shielding around the substation that will minimize potential adverse impacts to Bay views, and creates a sense of public connection to the proposed public access, while maintaining public safety

(7) Designs public areas and amenities to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise, and designs the wharf promenade and plaza areas to be adaptive to potential intermittent flooding by the end of the century

Ms. Gaffney showed a screenshot of the Sea Level Projected Impacts spreadsheet staff uses to evaluate proposed projects. She used the Alameda Landing Project data as a sample and reviewed the features of the spreadsheet. She stated the spreadsheet enables staff to look at different project lifespans, different risk categories, and different emission categories. She stated the cells in blue represent areas that are underwater. The number within those cells represents the amount of water in feet.

Ms. Gaffney stated spreadsheets are difficult to look at so staff often works with project proponents to present the information as cross-section drawings as part of the proposed project exhibits to demonstrate current water levels for mean higher high water and the 100-year storm on top of the mean higher high water. She noted that today's proposed project will not be impacted by the current 100-year-storm elevations.

(Board Member Tom Leader entered the meeting room. A quorum was established.)

Ms. Gaffney showed a cross-section of the current water levels. She stated there are climate change policies that say that the risk assessment should identify all types of potential flooding, degrees of uncertainty, and consequences of defense failure. To protect public safety and ecosystem services, all projects should be designed to be resilient to a mid-century sea level rise projection. If it is likely the project will remain in place longer than mid-century, an adaptive management plan should be developed to address the long-term impacts that will arise based on risk assessment using the best available science-based projection for sea level rise at the end of the century.

Ms. Gaffney walked the Board through sea level rise projection scenario presentation slides, which represent probable intermittent flooding associated with sea level rise, to facilitate the Board discussion about the proposed design and its ability for resilience and adaptation for sea level rise.

b. **Project Presentation.** Sean Whiskeman, Senior Vice President of Development, Catellus Alameda Development, LLC, introduced the design team. He stated Catellus has met with BCDC and city of Alameda staff a number of times since the July Board meeting to address concerns and revise the plan. He noted that a home builder had been selected for the residential plan since the July meeting. The home builder will be going through their own process with the city of Alameda's planning department. He assured the Board that the home builder has partnered with Catellus and the city of Alameda to work on interfacing the residential plan with the public park.

Mr. Whiskeman stated, although the home builder will be moving forward on a slightly different path, design principles have been established about that interface as well as how the bicycle-pedestrian bridge will interface into their project from the waterfront park.

Mr. Whiskeman stated the city of Alameda planning board unanimously approved the revised plan. The improvements will be self-funded and there are elements of the revised plan that are ready to commence construction.

Jason Victor, Managing Partner, Ken Kay Associates, the landscape architect for the project, stated the proposed project is framed in the context of the importance of the space as a public park. Discussions have commenced about reality, functionality, and maintenance of the proposed project since the July meeting.

Mr. Victor stated one thing that was glaringly missing at the July presentation was a clear delineation of the easement and constraint conditions on the property, which caused Board Members to question where buildings might be placed and about the access to the AMP riser station and other elements along the eastern side of the plan.

Mr. Victor provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the easement conditions, existing conditions, easement constraints, and changes made to the proposed plan since the July meeting, such as changes made to the circulation and connections through the residential plan, view corridors, public pocket parks, wharf deck, and waterfront park.

Mr. Victor stated the key tenets of the overall Alameda County Master Development Plan were retail context, commercial context against the waterfront plaza, the view corridor extension into Broadway in Oakland, the Western Greenway, and the four-and-one-half-acre park. He stated the Master Plan was clear on intent but not on the rules.

Mr. Victor stated the July presentation had information around the edges of the proposed plan but nothing in the middle of it (where the residential development is proposed), which was an issue in the Board's not understanding how the plan was fitting together. He showed slides of the residential plan and its context in the project for public access, connectivity, and enhancement of the principal elements trying to be achieved together.

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

Ms. McCann asked if the Board should make suggestions on both of the alternative plans. Mr. Whiskeman stated the development plan submitted by the home builder for development plan application was the second plan in the presentation package. The home builder is currently receiving city comments and going through a refining process. Most of the refinements have to do with internal circulation; very little of the comments received have to do with the interface between the park and the residential plan. Additional refinements are to be expected as the home builder goes through its separate process.

Ms. Alschuler stated the presenter discussed how the second option would fit with the bridge. She asked how the first option would fit. Mr. Victor stated it is essentially the same. He referred to a presentation slide and pointed out the alternative alignment, but he stated both areas had the width necessary to allow the structure to come down through the

development. He stated the current design of the bridge would be approximately 35 feet above the waterfront park.

Ms. McCann asked if the bridge would begin ramping down at the end of the park. Mr. Victor stated the bridge would be 35 feet above the park and then would begin to ramp down within the residential development. There is currently no design for the bridge; project proponents are reserving areas for a future design.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Western Greenway corridor on the first plan is very different than on the second plan, particularly because a roadway path takes a little over half of the access corridor. She asked if there is changeability between the two plans. Mr. Victor stated Alameda fire and utility companies will give their input. All the input is being put into the development plan as it is going through the city process. These earlier versions are being shown to give the Board context.

Ms. McCann referred to page 15 and asked what the shape of the blue area coded as number 4, acrylic top coat, is derived from. Mr. Victor stated there was an idea to have a top-coat process applied to most of the surface concrete of the deck to even out its surface and create a texture in the plaza zone. That pattern is a communication line from the Bay Trail as it makes its way through the Dry Stack and the promenade zone. In some ways, this corridor line is there to help represent a flow of the pattern of traffic, of movement through that space.

Mr. Leader asked about the specified dimensions on the semicircle plaza that were from a previous agreement with the city of Alameda. Mr. Victor stated the Alameda Landing Master Plan is the overriding document of the city's approval of the broader Master Plan of the whole context of the Alameda Landing Project, which includes the Bay Port housing, the Alameda Landing retail area, and today's proposed waterfront project.

Mr. Victor referred to a presentation slide depicting one of the previous iterations of the waterfront area within the broader Alameda Landing Master Plan. In the original Master Plan, the waterfront plaza area contained a different context of use - mainly office and commercial spaces.

Mr. Victor showed a presentation slide of the principals that remained as the Master Plan evolved to residential - the connection to 5th Street, the commercial or retail space associated with the waterfront plaza, the four-and-one-half-acre park, the view corridor, the Western Greenway, and other things that are embedded in the language of the Master Plan such as the 100-foot water's edge to buildings against the promenade and the scale of the plaza, which was 75 feet at the top and 200 feet at the bottom.

Mr. Leader stated the waterfront plaza is numerically specific at 210 feet by 145 feet. Mr. Victor stated the guidelines were to make the plaza 200 feet wide. The numbers represented on that plan are more representative of the geometry of the area.

Ms. Alschuler referred to page 12 and asked how much of the green space on the presentation slide is the four-and-one-half-acre park. Mr. Victor stated there is a red outline on the slide that does not show up clearly but is the definition of the four-and-one-half-acre public waterfront park. That red outline contains the public pocket parks, the plaza, the parking area with the AMP substation excluded, and the dock.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the other north/south view corridor and the Mitchell Avenue Greenway view corridor are separate. Mr. Victor stated they are separate and additional.

Mr. Leader asked about the widths of the Bay Trail along the left side by the promenade and by the waterfront plaza. Mr. Victor stated it is not technically the Bay Trail, although it is currently posted that way at the site. He stated Ms. Gaffney's Currently-Designated Bay Trail slide shown earlier today showed the current gaps in the Bay Trail.

Mr. Victor showed one of his presentation slides and pointed out the small buildings, which will contain offices associated with the Dry Stack. He pointed to the trail that runs along the edges of the proposed property and stated it necks down to a connection between those buildings. He noted that there are dimensional constraints such as the need to move a transformer, but he stated the intent is to get to Bay Trail standards as quickly as possible.

Ms. Alschuler stated the trail eventually crosses over other lines in the pavement that look like they are recalling the rail lines. Mr. Victor stated the rail lines are one of the functional issues of bicycling and walking. He stated there was a specific process in building the deck. They built the deck with a pan or bathtub left out to where they put the track rails in and then poured a second layer of concrete on top of those. There are two pours of concrete within the span of those rails. After many decades of use, the edges and how the concrete interfaces with those rails is one of the worst conditions overall.

Mr. Victor stated the idea is to pull the rails and the concrete in that trough out and reuse them. He stated that is the only place on the deck where there is a pre-built trench for utility and electrical lines. The primary line of lighting has been established there to take advantage of using that zone for utilities.

Mr. Victor stated the pattern of where those rails were will be brought back with pavement markings and storytelling to communicate what those things were, while, functionally, it will have a safe, even edge and provide important utility pathways.

Ms. McCann referred to the 75-foot-wide 5th Street view corridor on page 15. The concept drawing emphasizes reinforcing that corridor with physical paving and patterns. She asked about the details to the roundabout being offset from the center of the view corridor.

Mr. Victor stated some of the easement lines do not show up strongly on the graphic. He stated the offset of the roundabout was to get the dimensionality of the turning radius to work in that space and to keep the architecture as close as possible to the frontage to frame that space. The retail building is as far north as possible in the context of the easements.

Mr. Victor pointed out the nook and retail building on a presentation slide. He stated there is not much leeway east and west to move that building. The thought process was the engagement of that retail building into the context of the public realm, keeping it close to the sidewalk and activating that corridor. It pushed the center of that circulation element over because of the need for a turning movement to work through there.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the city plans to present or provide comment about the city of Alameda's commitment to maintain the project site and the long-term operations of this area.

Kathleen Livermore, City of Alameda, stated she spoke with Andrew Thomas, City of Alameda, earlier today. She stated he wanted to ensure that the BCDC understood that the project proponent was responsible for creating the condition at the outset for the various properties within the city of Alameda. Agreements have been made between the city of Alameda and the Parks and Recreation Department, but the city is not committed to anything that would happen in the future in relation to sea level rise. Anything related to adaptation should be clarified at the outset.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the developer stays responsible for the adaptation.

Mr. Victor stated, regarding maintenance, this will be a public park. Alameda Landing Waterfront Mixed-Use Development is a fiscally neutral project. It was the first in the city of Alameda. The property owners will be taxed. An assessment district has been established within the development parcels of which the residential properties would participate as well as the other commercial and residential areas within Alameda Landing. They generate a Municipal Services District (MSD) tax, which is set aside for park maintenance and police, fire, and city services, including the waterfront park. This is one of the reasons why it is important to ensure that the waterfront park is built to park standards - that the city of Alameda knows how to maintain and the cost to maintain. It continues in perpetuity.

Ms. Alschuler stated the city of Alameda will do the work of maintaining the site but the costs are covered by the residents and business owners. Mr. Victor agreed and stated it is a fiscally neutral project.

d. **Public Hearing.** One member of the public provided the following comments:

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

"The project area is one of those spaces where we have worked with Alameda staff on the future realignment of the Bay Trail which will not be finalized until the city completes its bicycle plan update. As such, we are treating this area as future Bay Trail. From the Bay Trail perspective, our preferred Bay Trail alignment through the project area and the adjacent properties would be along the shoreline of the Estuary.

"The proposed plans appear to show a distinction between what is considered promenade and what is considered Bay Trail. We would request that this entire wharf/promenade area be identified as the Bay Trail and be open to bicyclists and pedestrians as the public will not distinguish what is and isn't Bay Trail in this space. In addition, what is currently shown as Bay Trail is not adjacent to the shoreline. Since the primary concept of the Bay Trail is to provide a shoreline path adjacent to the water, the promenade should be identified as Bay Trail as well.

“The promenade area is shown as pedestrian only. In order to fulfill the goal and mission of the Bay Trail as a waterfront trail that provides a “Bay” experience for both bicyclists and pedestrians, the promenade should allow for slow bicyclists or the bicycle focused part of the proposed Bay Trail should be aligned closer to the Bay waters in order to provide a “blue water” experience. As currently shown on the exhibit sections, the proposed bicycle oriented “Bay Trail” is located as far as 32 feet away from the water’s edge.

“In the interest of providing consistent width/capacity through the entire project site up to the edges of the adjacent properties, it would be helpful to design the trails to have a consistent width and facilities for the spaces currently called out as promenade and Bay Trail to the edge of both the western and eastern adjacent properties. Currently, the eastern part of the site is designed only to connect the 18-foot-wide path identified as Bay Trail but not for the promenade. At the least, it would be helpful to leave enough undeveloped space to potentially continue the promenade and trail to the eastern property at some point in the future when it becomes feasible.

“The proposed project proposes a lot of activities adjacent to the proposed promenade and trail, and the project should ensure that the design minimizes or eliminates any potential conflicts between pedestrians/bicyclists and the adjacent activities. In addition, it is unclear whether the eastern side of the proposed public access space provides a clear path for the 18-foot-wide trail to pass through. It currently shows many amenities spread throughout the open space area, some of which appears to be in the middle of the trail pathway.”

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board responded to questions from the staff report as follows:

(1) **Physical and Visual Access.** Given the conceptual residential site plans and development principles:

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

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

Mr. Leader stated he had asked about the 18-foot part of the Bay Trail along the promenade to the west because it feels like it has a good proportion of landscape improvements and amenities to the width of the promenade more to the east where it goes around the plaza. More to the west feels wide because of the two rails, which push the park back. He suggested using the rails as part of the necessary dimension of the Bay Trail and pushing the planting closer to the water to better proportion the landscape to the walkway where it feels pinched.

Ms. Alschuler stated Mr. Strang asked in his letter how well the landscape sitting in a box over the deck will survive, if it will be a usable green area, and if the city of Alameda is ready to do the maintenance that will be required. She asked if there was a solution that would allow it to be greener.

Mr. Leader stated, if it is conditioned by what it is sitting on, it would need to build up enough soil. There may not be enough soil to grow large trees but other things can be grown there that would have a difference of scale and a feeling of a park space. Since it cannot go down, it can go up. A three- to four-foot-high planter wall is unfriendly. He suggested adding a seat, steps, or a terrace to ease the transition at the northwest corner where it is shrubby and grassy.

Mr. Victor stated one of the factors in the amount of green is the reality of maintaining plant material long-term in a fairly shallow planter. It is not the ideal condition. It can work but it would be maintenance-intensive. Another factor is the weight consideration.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the current design depth of the soil and how high the walls will be. Mr. Victor stated the walls are about 18 inches tall. Some have benches integrated into them. That is the minimum depth to incorporate drainage and enough growing medium for smaller-scale plant material such as grasses and sedges. The strategy was to spend very little weight on the majority of the wharf deck.

Mr. Leader suggested encroaching with something that is thin and light, such as turf. Mr. Victor pointed to areas on a presentation slide with pockets of artificial turf. He stated artificial turf is suggested as a way to keep the weight down, although the city of Alameda would rather have live turf.

Mr. Leader suggested live turf in six-inch soil. It will require irrigation but would be worth it for the experience of the park.

Ms. Alschuler stated Ms. Barton suggested plant materials in her letter and to simplify the palette with drifts of the same plants.

Ms. McCann stated, taking all those constraints into account, one thing that could help would be at the eastern end more has been made out of secondary paths and additional green bands. The promenade activity dissipates toward the west. She suggested doing something that echoes the eastern end at the western end as an end point or a turning point. She suggested juggling the widths of some of the green areas in between.

Ms. McCann agreed with Mr. Leader about decreasing the depth of the soil. She stated growing native grasses or groundcovers would require only a shallow soil.

Ms. Alschuler stated the design works to provide views to San Francisco in the middle of the site between the warehouses. She noted that there are incredible views of San Francisco on the promenade where most of the public will be. She suggested designing a way for individuals to stop and be protected from the elements to enjoy that view. It is an important place and a turning point where individuals will connect back to Mitchell Avenue, but it is currently not given prominence in that way.

Ms. McCann stated there is a shade structure on the westernmost public park just north of that. She suggested moving that element further towards the end to create something there because the public park will be a lovely place in itself with enhanced treatment. She suggested juggling what is already there to help at the end point.

Ms. Alschuler agreed that the port view is an important location for individuals to stop and enjoy the views.

Ms. McCann stated the revised plans have done something good in bringing the access path at the 90-foot mark along the residential. It is a real enhancement. It clarifies what happens in that ten feet knowing that it is 100 feet that the Board should be dealing with, but, with the pocket parks, that tradeoff works well. The revised design is much better.

(c) Are the public access areas (Waterfront Plaza, the Waterfront Wharf Promenade, the Western Greenway, and the pocket parks) designed in a manner that “feels public” and makes the shoreline enjoyable to the greatest number of people?

Mr. Leader stated he asked about the dimensions of the waterfront plaza because it feels quite large. He stated, along with that, the pergola feels quite thin, unsubstantial, and narrow. He suggested maintaining the outside line and doubling the width of the pergola to make the plaza smaller than the 200 feet. He stated it would help if individuals could both sit inside the pergola and walk in front of it to get additional wind protection there and potentially shade on a hot day. Just that much encroachment would improve the proportions of that space.

Ms. McCann stated the concept has progressed a lot. There is much that is working well now. She stated her comment is just a refinement because so much work has been done to reinforce the view corridor. There is something that seems to diminish from the effectiveness and strong geometries and the paving when transitioning through the roundabout. It is shifted to the left with the midline of the viewpoint going down and is strongly reinforced by the paving pattern that extends into the plaza. Because the geometry cannot work precisely, she suggested softening the geometry of the gray paving bands, such as thinking about a different type of pattern, not necessarily taking the literal width of the road because that is what makes this seem off with the roundabout.

Mr. Leader agreed that it leads to expectations within the circle.

Ms. McCann suggested doing something more subtle - turn it down, do not replicate the 75-foot width, and go back to the importance of the 5th Street view corridor. She recommended further refinement of the patterns.

Mr. Leader suggested moving the circle over; then, the retail space would not have to be square but could be thinner. He agreed with Ms. McCann’s comments about softening the contrast, making it more carpetlike and more to scale rolling out to the edge.

Ms. McCann stated she appreciated the explanation for the blue area in the presentation slides, but when the shape of the blue area is put with the semicircle pergola and the 75-foot band, it might be more than is needed.

Mr. Leader stated it would be clearer without the acrylic coating.

Ms. Alschuler agreed and stated there are many successful places around the Bay where the memory of the rail lines have been able to happen without creating problems for bicyclists or pedestrians.

Ms. Alschuler asked for comments on the Western Gateway connection down to Mitchell Avenue.

Ms. McCann stated the contrast between concept one is a greenway in the northern section with the road only going halfway up. Concept two takes that access road further around. She stated it could be debated whether that access road enhances individuals' ability to walk through and feel safe. She stated she leans toward concept two, although she normally would argue for more green spaces. She stated having the road access will make the area more appealing.

Ms. McCann stated, associated with that, the east/west view corridor in concept two is in a much better location.

Ms. Alschuler agreed. She stated it is difficult to believe that the area in concept one goes through.

Ms. Alschuler stated the road closest to the water in concept two has garages on both sides, whereas the garages were only on one side in concept one. It is important that the revised plan solves that for the walkways in the middle that the Board did not understand at the July meeting. She stated it is good that those are not garage-facing paths. If it was all garages, it would not feel public.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he agreed with the suggestion to shift the east/west street northward to align with the view corridor. It also would set up a better development pattern on the western portion of the site, which is important looking down the road. He stated this project has an opportunity to create a beautiful street there - a classic Alameda tree-lined street that in the future would want to be continued toward the west.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the other thing he liked about it is it shortens the distance to the promenade along those north/south segments as though the northern blocks are additional fingers of the promenade that come down. He stated there is room there to better transition the promenade space and the landscape that is happening on the promenade with what would happen in that north/south space. The geometries today are not completely figured out because the site plans may be produced by different individuals. Integral to thinking about a successful promenade is thinking about seamless transitions in the north/south direction.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the other thing that is intriguing to think about is that the alleys are 26 feet wide. He stated that may be shown because that is where fire access from the rear is necessary because the buildings have no road on the other side. Where the buildings have access from two sides, they are much narrower at 20 feet. The extra six feet of pavement is at odds from a hierarchy standpoint. It would be interesting to understand if there are ground treatments or paving treatments or things that could be done with the ground plane to communicate to the public what is the street and what is an alley - that the streets are meant for the public. The alleys are somewhat wide at 26 feet. They may clarify the primary hierarchy, which is the north/south streets between 5th Street and the two streets that intersect and the east/west corridor. Those should be on a higher level of accessibility than the alleys and pedestrian paths.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board is asking the project proponents to look at the plan again to see if several of the 26-foot streets could be reduced to 20 feet, and to establish a clear hierarchy of site circulation for cars, bikes, and pedestrians.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he preferred the future bridge easement design landing between 5th Street and the western or south corridor. He stated he liked the idea of creating a central median that can be planted with trees as another indicator as a short-, medium-, or long-term connection down to the water. He stated he was a proponent of that strategy over the one where it is running more in a central alignment.

Ms. McCann stated concept number two has several advantages. Board Members agreed.

Mr. Pellegrini stated one thing he is not a fan of is outside the Board's purveyance - the single family detached homes will have a different scale than the long buildings that create a street wall. If large streets are being set up that are well-defined by trees and buildings, it might make sense to have like-natured buildings on both sides of the street.

Mr. Victor stated the two concepts presented illustrate principles that will be used by the home builder but there is flexibility built in. What is better or worse about each plan may not translate into something that staff can control. The project proponents will discuss it strictly in terms of connections and views. If there are aspects in the use that are problematic, the purview will be limited in terms of the ability to shape what the grid will look like.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested, if the east/west street is positioned in such a way that it cannot urbanistically set up the future development in this part of Alameda, that it would be worth paying attention to the design of how buildings face that street on either side, given an understanding that the rest of the street grid and how these things may actually build out would become less important.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board noted that it is good that there are no garages coming off of those streets and that there is an additional green space that comes from being on the side to those units. Maybe it is using that green to define this and have a sense of connection with visual connections to the water, and the sense that it might relate to the pocket park in terms of the landscape that is there. It is something that makes it feel like one corridor all the way to the water because the water is not seen from Mitchell Avenue Greenway. It needs to feel like this is an important green street that is leading somewhere. She suggested reinforcing the four routes to the water.

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

Are there opportunities to avoid or reduce conflicts among the uses on the dock platform (water shuttle, public dock, kayak launch)?

Ms. McCann stated the kayak parking is clear.

(e) Does the Board have any advice on the proposed design principles that would better facilitate a future bicycle/pedestrian bridge connection?

Ms. Alschuler stated there is not a good sense of how the scale of the bridge connection will feel or how residents may feel about it since a concept drawing of this area has not been presented. She stated there are many places along the Bay where bicycle/pedestrian connections should be made.

Ms. Alschuler stated where the bridge sets down will be important so many individuals can enjoy it.

Ms. McCann emphasized the importance of trees along the view corridor and preserving a view line next to the bridge. There is a lot going on in that corridor but the trees are important because the structure is going to be running between residential dwellings. Tree canopies will greatly help the scale.

(f) Given the conceptual residential plan, does the design of the Western Greenway maximize views and physical connections to the shoreline?

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board discussed that it may be a good idea to have the road but do it in the context of a great Alameda street.

(g) Does the revised shielding (e.g., low wall, planting) 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?

Ms. McCann stated there has been a lot of effort to improve the substation area. It is improved as much as it can be.

Mr. Leader commended the applicants for their diligence to meet Board recommendations.

2. Sea Level Rise Resiliency and Adaptation

(a) Are the public areas and amenities appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise? Have the wharf promenade and plaza been designed to be adaptive to potential intermittent flooding by the end of the century?

Ms. Alschuler stated she appreciated staff putting the sea level rise diagrams together. She noted that the proposed project will be subject to low-lying areas on either side of the site that are not under their control, as shown in the Flood Explorer.

Ms. Gaffney stated staff is looking for guidance on the proposed design, the resilience of the materials, and the resilience of the planting and seating areas from design, management, and materiality perspectives. She asked if there are design considerations to be made when thinking about the maintenance of long-term viability of these spaces that could be periodically inundated.

Ms. McCann stated it looks like the proposal has accounted for sea level rise for the next 30 years. When thinking about the life cycle of shrubs, groundcovers, and other landscape materials going beyond 30 to 40 years; a renovation, repairs, or replacements may be expected, perhaps even several times during that period. It was fantastic to see the more catastrophic projections. In this case, the proposal accommodates a responsible reaction to sea level rise through 2050. Given the other variables seen in the care of open space and the maintenance of materials, it doesn't make sense to build for 2100 at this point.

Mr. Leader agreed that 2050 is reasonable to this kind of project design. After that, market forces may change this area again to the extent that it does not seem reasonable to ask them to go up another foot on all their pad levels or to add more height and weight to the existing wharf. It has struck the right balance for protection but someday there will be a problem.

Mr. McCrea stated the guidance from the policies that the Commission adopted on climate change as it relates to public access is that the project should achieve resiliency through mid-century. Everyone seems confident that the proposed project will do that but beyond that, through the end of the century, the project should demonstrate that it has the capacity to adapt to the threats in sea levels. The question may be whether the project proponents can show that this public access area will remain viable at the end of the century. The Board could consider the likelihood that it will be if the projections are correct but there is a high likelihood that there will be some moderate flooding.

Mr. McCrea stated the Commission would appreciate feedback on what the project proponents could or should be doing, including the developers and the city of Alameda, and what the space that will be maintained long-term will be doing at the end of the century.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board needs to know that there will be a public way along the water. She stated the Board saw that in the lagoon across the way. No one is building it now but there were ways of building it. The Board is not asking the project proponents to put it in now or spend the money now necessarily if there is a solution other than raising the area.

Mr. Pellegrini stated there are a couple of things. There is the new pedestrian path that is approximately one foot above the Bay Trail elevation that is along the front of the buildings and that potentially could be widened, expanded, or decked over in the future. The next line of public access would be along the east/west view corridor through the middle of the residential development. The east/west street could potentially be a future public access that is closer to the shoreline. Those elevations are probably considerably higher than the sidewalk.

Ms. Alschuler suggested testing whether an adaptation or other change can be imagined now for the public walkway.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the analysis shows that, even in the long-term, the issue that will exacerbate the use or make these difficult is not necessarily the consistent flooding, but the presence of groundwater and brackish water directly underneath the soil level, which will mean that the plants will need to be changed out and more pumping may be required and other things that may make it more inconvenient to live in this location but it seems like there are two places where the public access could migrate back as the conditions along the shoreline become less favorable.

Mr. Leader asked if the assumption is that the existing wharf structure is viable all the way to the end of the century.

Ms. Alschuler stated those diagrams are missing.

Ms. McCann stated there was a question about the lifetime of that structure. In thirty- or forty-years' time, it might be reaching the end of its life. She seconded Mr. Pellegrini's point that the introduction of the path next to the housing is an important move. There could always be some type of low wall of protection that could be retrofitted along an access point like that. If the wharf's lifetime is exceeded, there might be changes to that over the next 50 or 80 years as well. The principles of public access must be maintained and ways found for that to 2100. The analysis is helpful about the potential extent of the issue in 2100 and the frequency of flooding, but a couple of ways have been discussed which would protect public access in 2100 within all the unknowns at that time.

Ms. Alschuler stated staff needs to work with the project proponents to ensure that there is a plan for adaptation.

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Victor stated there were many questions and comments about the residential plan. He stated those questions and comments will be taken back to the planning department and discussions will be held with the home builder. The plan will be refined and will keep getting better.

Mr. Victor asked Bill Kennedy, Construction Group Vice President, Catellus Alameda Development, LLC, to respond to the sea level rise questions and comments.

Mr. Kennedy stated sea level rise is always difficult. He stated Ms. Gaffney noted in her presentation that by mid-century, 2050, the project will be fine. He stated the proposed project site was tested up to 2070 and then the estimation curves vary dramatically.

Mr. Kennedy stated Ms. Gaffney's presentation included information from the 2018 OPC Sea Level Rise Guidance Document, which is used to analyze risks associated with sea level rise to 2100. He stated the sea level rise scenario represents a 0.5 percent probability that sea level meets or exceeds 5.7 feet above current levels.

Mr. Kennedy stated Ms. Gaffney also showed a presentation slide that showed a 1 percent occurrence that is the 100-year flood event. He stated, when those two numbers are put together, there is a lot of guidance in the policies that talks about a certain degree of reasonableness and risk-assessment. He asked the Board to consider the map that was not part of the official meeting but showed the 100-year flood event in 2100. He stated the project proponents have done a lot to address that condition.

Mr. Kennedy referred to Slide 35, which was part of Mr. Victor's project presentation earlier today. Mr. Kennedy stated Slide 35 was taken out of an earlier presentation to address the kinds of things that the Board brought up, such as the adaptive measures that would be put in place beyond mid-century. He stated the slide lists three options: an elevated walkway, signage to keep individuals away during the extreme two- to three-hour high-tide events, and venting portals through the deck placed where the air/water pressure underneath is the greatest.

Mr. Kennedy referred to Slide 34, sea level rise with adaptive measures, and stated those three options were included in the project. Slide 34 shows the elevated walkway, signs are not shown in the slide, and the venting can be installed at any time. He stated it makes more sense to wait to install the vents until the time gets closer to impacts so it can be seen where the vents are most needed.

Mr. Kennedy stated the project proponents believe adaptive measures have been incorporated into the design from day one by going one foot above the already-clear deck elevation.

Mr. McCrea stated there were comments from the Board that spoke to the long-term adaptation measure of raising the walkway further or potentially considering an alternative alignment. He asked if things like a higher elevation of the sidewalk will be supported in the future.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out the fill zone on a presentation slide. He stated one of the greatest challenges on this project is not shown in the constraints map but is one of the most difficult constraints - dealing with the soil pressures and loads immediately behind where the wharf will be cut. He pointed out the location where deep soil mixing improvements will occur to stabilize that portion of the fill.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out the existing grade under many of the warehouses on a presentation slide. He stated seven or eight feet of fill will be required already on top of the soil mix improvements. He stated the need to not add any more pressure than necessary in the fill.

Mr. Kennedy stated the possibility in the future, if this one-foot raised height was not enough, to integrate something into what the residential builder was planning to do for protection.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out the cut-off wall on a presentation slide and stated, although this was not discussed much, the cut-off wall is already protecting a section of the proposed project from water erosion. He noted that the cut-off wall was added to so that it includes the one-foot adaptive measure.

Mr. Kennedy stated the project proponents have included tools to use mid-century and three-quarter-century. The most appropriate tools can be further developed as understanding increases. Technology will also change over time.

Damir Priskich, Vice President of Construction, Catellus Alameda Development, LLC, stated there was a specific request that the Bay Trail extend for the entire width. He stated working with the city of Alameda and Andrew Thomas, the Bay Trail zone now goes from the edge of the wharf all the way back to the tips of planting.

Ms. Gaffney stated there were also comments about the bicycle circulation being inland and having the ability to ride bicycles along the edge of the water. She stated, if there is an understanding that bicycles and pedestrians can navigate through both areas, that will address the issue.

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board did not summarize their conclusions. (Please refer to the Board Questions and Discussion.)

Ms. Gaffney asked the Board if they wanted to review this project again.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board appreciated the additional information provided. Seeing the evolution of the design was helpful. She stated the Board does not need to see this project again but asked the project proponents to look closely at the suggestions made by the Board today.

5. **Adjournment.** Ms. Alschuler asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION: Ms. McCann moved to adjourn the October 15, 2018, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Leader.

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 4-0-0 with Board Chair Alschuler and Board Members Leader, McCann, and Pellegrini voting approval.

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