

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: 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: Approved Minutes of the March 11, 2019, 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 5:30 p.m., and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Other Board Members in attendance included Board Chair Karen Alschuler and Board Members Cheryl Barton, Bob Battalio, and Stefan Pellegrini. BCDC staff in attendance included Clesi Bennett, Andrea Gaffney, Yuriko Jewett, Ethan Lavine, and Brad McCrea. The presenters were Justin Aff (CMG), Tina Chang (Associate Capital), Dave Kaval (Oakland A's), Richard Kennedy (Oakland A's), Enrique Landa (Associate Capital), Angelo Obertello (CBG), Jeremy Regenbogen (Macchiatto), and Sam Yao (SGH). Public comment via email was submitted by Lauren Westreich (West Oakland Commerce Association). Also in attendance were Dave Campbell (East Bay Bicycle Coalition), Alternier Cook (West Oakland North Oakland Resident), Dennis DeFreidas (Community Member), Earnest Johnson (West Oakland Resident), Jorge Leon (Baseballoakland.com), Bill Percell (Save Oakland's Sports and West Oakland Commerce Association), Keith Salminen (A's Fan Radio), Art Shanks (Cyprus Mandela Training Center), and Delvin Washington (Resident, Planner).

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

Ms. Gaffney stated Chair Alschuler recused herself from Agenda Item 5, the Potrero Power Plant Station Mixed-Use Redevelopment. Ms. Gaffney proposed hearing Agenda Item 5 after Agenda Item 2, the Report of the Chief of Permits, and moving the approval of the minutes, Agenda Item 3, and hearing Agenda Item 4, the Environmental Justice Bay Plan Amendment Briefing, after Agenda Item 5, to allow Chair Alschuler the opportunity to join the meeting for the two briefings scheduled for today. Board Members agreed.

info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov
State of California | Gavin Newsom – Governor



DRB MINUTES
March 11, 2019

Ms. Gaffney welcomed new Board Member Bob Battalio. She stated Roger Leventhal has moved to an alternate Board Member position and alternates Ephraim Hirsch, John Kriken, Michael Smiley, and Steve Thompson have been moved off the alternates list. Ms. Gaffney thanked them for their service. She asked Board Members to submit names to fill the alternate Board Member positions to staff.

Ms. Gaffney stated the next Board meeting will be held on April 8th. The Board will review phases three and four of the Brooklyn Basin Shoreline Park project, review the Oakland Lake Merritt Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge project, and hear a briefing on the Fill for Habitat Bay Plan Amendment.

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

a. The Commission will review the Pier 22.5 Fireboat Station at the April 4th Commission meeting.

b. The Commission will review the Terminal One/Latitude Project at the May 2nd or 16th Commission meetings.

3. Approval of Draft Minutes for February 11, 2019, Meeting. Mr. Strang referred to his comment on page 14 that “there are individual elements in the site amenities that may be prefabricated.” He stated he wanted to clarify the intent of this comment. He stated there are six miles of levees that are being improved and prefabricated furnishings were presented to the Board as the primary landscape amenities. He stated what he was saying was that it is okay to have that as a component but, for a project of that size and length, there should be another strategy where the furnishings and amenities are integrated into the design of the wall. He suggested the language “Mr. Strang stated it seems like there are individual elements in the site amenities that may be prefabricated items that are placed perhaps carefully within the six miles of the project. In addition to these elements, he suggested an additional strategy where there’s a language of furniture that is integral to the wall or is recessed into the wall, in order to make something out of the reality of this incredibly long wall project.”

Mr. Strang referred to his comment at the top of page 15 that states “the two-to-one slopes are there and they are compacted to the extent that they need to be stable, while some of these native plants are beautiful, there should be a focus on problem-solving plants even if they are not native.” He stated it would clarify the intent of his comment by adding the sentence “in cases where soils are highly engineered, native plants may not be appropriate.” He stated it was not an anti-native-plant statement, but he was suggesting not to use native plants if they will not be successful.

Mr. Strang referred to his comment on the top of page 17 that “it would be a good investment if the waterside development helped solve another longer-range problem and if taking a step back would set the stage for future sea level rise.” He suggested adding “He stated that the point is that the 90-million-dollar project is largely solving an accreditation problem, not necessarily a physical problem. The question he asks is if there is a way to direct some of the funds into a longer-term landscape solution such as pilot projects that might advance the cause of a longer-term landscape-based solution.”

Ms. Alschuler referred to the third paragraph on page 19 and asked to add the word “water” to her comment so it would read “Ms. Alschuler asked about the water board that asked the project proponents to do pilot projects.”

Mr. Pellegrini referred to his comment on page 8 and asked to change the term “piping” to “pumping” so his comment would read “Mr. Pellegrini asked if the amount of pumping would be increased in the long term as the sea level rises.”

MOTION: Ms. McCann moved approval of the Minutes for the February 11, 2019, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as **revised, seconded by Mr. Strang.**

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 5-0-0 with Board Chair Alschuler, Board Vice Chair Strang, and Board Members Barton, Battalio, and Pellegrini voting approval with no abstentions.

4. Environmental Justice Bay Plan Amendment Briefing

a. **Staff Presentation.** The Board received a briefing on the status of BCDC’s Bay Plan amendment to address environmental justice and social equity, including progress to date and project timeline. Clesi Bennett, BCDC Coastal Planner, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the project goal, amendment process to date, public access and environmental justice issues, and public access policy concepts.

Ms. Bennett asked three questions for Board discussion: (1) How can the DRB address issues of environmental justice and social equity? (2) How can the BCDC best ensure that public access areas are inclusive for all communities? and (3) How could the public be more integrated into the DRB’s process?

b. **Board Questions.** Following the briefing, the Board asked clarifying questions on the material presented:

Ms. Barton stated this is a focus of the Resilient by Design competition. She noted that the Board had not heard the results of the competition.

Ms. Alschuler stated that is a good point because there were hundreds of additional people mightily engaged in issues of the Bay who had not been before, who had not had access to speak, and now had the opportunity to give their ideas on resiliency. She stated the need to keep that going by using the knowledge that individuals have now and keeping the interest and commitment of individuals to jump in and think about solutions. She stated keeping that alive is important, but she had been worried for the last year that it had been lost since the Board had not heard anything.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board can begin to imagine what it might mean to do the three things asked in the staff questions. She asked if there were written materials to assist the Board in their review. Ms. Bennett stated there are just concepts at this point.

Ms. Barton stated environmental justice and social equity and the answers to the staff questions are things that need to be embedded in the process of putting a project together. She stated it is too late by this point in the process. The Board could advocate for that happening, but where it engages developers, the public, and designers of all kinds, it needs to be brought forward earlier in the process to become a requirement or expectation. She stated the amendment should go into the Bay Plan with gusto and celebration with communication that it has done so.

Ms. Alschuler stated the time spent in the workshop made her look at what the Board does. There are opportunities to make changes in how the Board operates, the information it receives, and the topics it discusses. She stated it would not be good for environmental justice and social equity questions to come up for the first time then. It is very important that it starts to happen sooner.

Ms. Barton stated, if it will be embedded in the design work and projects, it must be embedded from the beginning. It cannot be a tacked-on idea that individuals run into halfway through the process.

Mr. Pellegrini agreed with the idea that the Bay Plan map could be a place where guidance could be provided for certain geographies or certain things where it might need to be addressed. One of the things that comes immediately to mind is educational spaces or spaces that are conducive to public education and interpretation. He stated the Board sees a little of that, particularly in sites of historical interest.

Mr. Pellegrini stated questions that should be explored are what the story of the people is who worked at the waterfront, the environmental degradation that occurred there over many years with the filling of the Bay, how should that be interpreted, what is there in the future, and is there a role that the Bay Plan can play in providing a framework.

Ms. Alschuler suggested that those stories grow to be about the people around the Bay.

Ms. Barton stated one of the most powerful diagrams she saw coming out of the early Resilient by Design Challenge was the overlay of the ecological vulnerability and socioeconomic status. She noted that those layers are the same in many cases. She stated just to have that diagram broadcast or made more public would help individuals visualize the issues.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board worked for years to get basic map references that could be used in meetings that would be consistent around the Bay. This suggests a number of other layers of information that are not available.

Ms. Bennett asked if a layer like that that includes perhaps socioeconomic information as well as contamination information could be useful for the Board in reviewing projects.

Ms. Barton stated it would need to be made available early enough in the process. Once the project proponents present, the projects are already half-framed. If the project proponents have not had access to that information, it would be more challenging for the Board to ask them to go back to the drawing board while looking at a new map of information. That information must be embedded in the process from the beginning.

Ms. Alschuler stated there is a policy that talks about places that do not have many public access areas or do not have as much open space. The Board has never looked at filling in the missing items into the community. If that is the policy, the Board would have to know more about what is happening.

Ms. Barton stated where the project is and how the project scores on equity and social justice could be included in the Board meeting packets. It would be good to see a trigger on the potential issues each project may face.

Mr. Strang suggested assembling case studies for the Board's review of good examples of projects where development has occurred and goals have been achieved. It is hard to visualize what success would look like. He noted that, although the recommendations are followed, the project still may not be successful because the demographic changes that have occurred cannot be erased. He stated the importance of agreement among the Board on what to aim for. It should not be memorializing a community that was once there.

Ms. Alschuler stated there is another level of responsibility. If the Board cares about these issues, more members of the public will attend meetings. It would be good for the Board to hear from the public who have had the chance to engage.

Ms. Bennett agreed and stated there was discussion at the workshop about the Board meeting after working hours, which is great for some people but there were ideas brought up about whether the meetings could be held near or at the potential project being discussed.

Ms. Barton suggested lunch meetings because that is when some individuals can get out.

Ms. Alschuler stated one of the things the Board would want to know when reviewing projects is, when looking at public access to the Bay, also looking back into the nearby communities.

Ms. Alschuler asked where the Bay Trail signs are that were discussed during project review and if they reach back into the places where people live who are not yet coming to the Bay. That is really about public access.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the idea of doing environmental justice or social equity training for the Board has also been discussed.

Mr. Battalio stated one comment he would make from being involved in waterfront projects is to integrate the public in the project planning process. He suggested asking project proponents for documentation as to the type of outreach that was done and if they looked at opportunities and strengths and integrated them into their design as a type of quality assurance on the community outreach process.

5. Potrero Power Plant Station Mixed-Use Redevelopment (Second Pre-Application Review). Ms. Gaffney stated Karen Alschuler recused herself from the discussion and decision-making with regard to this agenda item pursuant to Board policy.

The Board held their second pre-application review of a proposal by the California Barrel Company, LLC, to redevelop a 29-acre site at the location of the closed Potrero Power Plant Station, at the terminus of 23rd Street, on the southern waterfront of the City and County of San Francisco. The proposed project would consist of a mix of land uses, including residential, hotel, commercial office, life/science, retail, parks, community facilities, light industrial, and assembly. Public access improvements would consist of approximately nine acres of parks and open spaces including a waterfront park featuring Bay Trail access, over-water observation areas, a floating recreational dock, and other public amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Yuri Jewett, BCDC Shoreline Development Permit Analyst, stated the initial DRB review of this project was in April of 2018. Project proponent responses to Board comments from the April meeting are included in Appendix A, which was included in the meeting packet.

Ms. Jewett provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of key elements for public access for this project:

(1) There is a possibility of the existing Unit 3 building being transitioned to a hotel that will offer the public a vertical access opportunity to view the Bay. She showed a video of the Unit 3 building and surrounding area.

(2) There is a possibility to tie into existing public access provided by the adjacent property owner shown by the yellow line on a presentation slide.

Ms. Jewett summarized the issues in the staff report including whether the project:

(3) Accommodates the expected level of public access from new residents, employees, and visitors to this segment of the shoreline.

(4) Takes advantage of the Bay setting and provides for adequate opportunities to get close to and experience the water.

(5) Designs public access areas in a manner that “feels public” and makes the shoreline enjoyable to the greatest number of people.

(6) Provides a sufficiently broad range of water-oriented recreational activities for a diverse population, including people of all races, cultures, ages, income levels, physical abilities, and interests.

(7) Ensures that café seating and public seating is available to the public.

(8) Ensures that the adjacent public access remains inviting to the public during private events at the Turbine Plaza.

(9) Includes kiosks in locations that do not impede visual access to the Bay.

(10) Incorporates site remnants into the Waterfront Park to tell the story of the history of the site.

(11) Provides clear connections for all users to the Bay from Illinois Street.

(12) Minimizes the potential for conflicts among pedestrians and cyclists within the shoreline open space area.

(13) Includes additional opportunities to provide interim access closer to the shoreline and Bay waters as part of the proposed adaptation and resiliency measures.

b. **Project Presentation.** Tina Chang, Director of Project Management, Associate Capital, the developer of the project, introduced the project team. She provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the site history and a larger overview of the design framework.

Justin Aff, Associate, CMG Landscape Architect, continued the slide presentation and discussed the design of the Waterfront Open Space and reviewed the changes made to the design since the Board's first pre-application review in April of 2018.

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

Mr. Strang stated the blue sheet in the meeting packet states there are nine acres of open space, while elsewhere in the packet it states there are six acres. Mr. Aff stated it is closer to six acres.

Mr. Strang referred to page four in the meeting packet and asked if the rooftop athletic field in the upper left corner of the framework is shown outside the site boundaries. Mr. Aff stated it is within the site boundaries. He pointed to the location on the Plan Overview presentation slide and noted that the slide is the current rendering.

Mr. Strang stated one of the Board comments from the meeting in April of 2018 was about shoreline continuity. He asked if the shoreline walk and promenade provide the continuity. Mr. Aff stated that is correct.

Mr. Strang asked if there have been resiliency measures incorporated into the plan that would allow for a softer edge at the waterfront.

Angelo Obertello, Principal, Carlson, Barbee, and Gibson, Inc., (CBG), the Civil Engineer for the project, stated it is a difficult portion of the site. There is an incredible amount of storm surge from storms coming from the south. That protection along the waterfront is necessary. The point of the dock was to give the opportunity for the public to get closer. It is easier to bring the public closer in areas with more protected shorelines like Crane Cove Park and Warm Water Cove, but the proposed site is positioned further out into the Bay.

Mr. Strang asked about the original shoreline and how much of the site is fill. Mr. Aff showed a presentation slide of the historic site. The lower right side of the slide included the site overlaid with the original shoreline. He stated it was a rocky promontory. It has always been raised above the water.

Mr. Strang asked about buildings to be preserved. At one point, the materials state that some of the buildings will be preserved, including Unit 3, and at another point it states it may not be feasible to preserve Unit 3 and that, in that case, the stack would be preserved. Mr. Aff stated that is correct.

Mr. Strang stated the Board commented at the April meeting that, if the main internal open space was moved to the north, it would have more continuity and more connection to the waterfront. Mr. Aff stated his understanding that the comment had to do with aligning the open space with the interior space he pointed to on a presentation slide to allow a better view of the water. The implication was to have something with views all the way through but the PG&E switchyard blocks the view through there.

Mr. Strang asked if there was also a question about the space between Block 9 and Unit 3, which is interior space. Mr. Aff stated the location referred to there is the Turbine Plaza, which is governed by the existing form of the former power station. The area between those two spaces is the space where the turbine currently sits. The proposal is to repurpose the space between the two areas and make that a plaza. The intent is to preserve it as it is seen today.

Mr. Obertello added that what is seen as opaque on the presentation slides actually has large voids through it that could be opened up through that space.

Mr. Strang asked if the space would be the same if Unit 3 did not survive the design process and became part of Block 9. He stated the diagram shows only one building mass over the Block 9 area. Mr. Aff stated the open space would be picked up through a consolidation of the space on the water side, which is what the diagram currently shows.

Mr. Strang stated his assumption that the through-block connection would not necessarily remain there. Mr. Aff agreed and stated there would still be an atrium space through it.

Mr. Obertello stated the project team feels increasingly confident that the former power station along the waterfront will be part of this project.

Mr. Battalio asked if the lowered height of the floating recreational dock was lowered to 11.5 feet to meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards within the length allowable. Mr. Aff stated it was.

Mr. Battalio asked if that might change upon closer review. The long, narrow float combined with the southerly waves might tend to roll. Also, the gangway would be fairly heavy and would move a fair amount. He stated the downtown ferry terminals, which were built for public access by ADA standards, take a different approach where they put a series of ramps on a float and include a shorter articulating gangway.

Mr. Aff stated he would have to defer this question to the shoreline engineer.

Mr. Battalio stated it is fine since the design is conceptual but encouraged further consideration on the dock and its operational conditions. He stated it may work as depicted in the concept drawings but he was concerned about the complex motions that would occur with the southerly waves as this would cause the dock to be unusable at times.

Sam Yao, Senior Principal, Simpson, Gumpertz, and Heger (SGH), Coastal Engineer, stated SGH is the designer for the floating dock, the gangway, and the pile-supported platform. He stated Mr. Battalio's comments are well taken. He stated Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) went through a design review with the Port of San Francisco and made similar comments.

Mr. Yao stated SGH is going through a sophisticated analysis of the wave and floating structural interactions and time histories. Once the analysis is completed, the design parameters and dimensions will be adjusted.

Mr. Yao stated, regarding the lower platform of 11.3 elevation, there is a size constraint in the location but the pile and deck designs will adopt adaptive engineering. He stated, with sea level rise, the pile and deck will be designed to support a platform above to raise the deck in the case of sea level rise. He stated there will be a light platform with the deck on top of a platform. The deck was designed for extra loads on top.

Mr. Battalio asked if public access will continue at the same trail elevation cross-shore through the development or if it is only the outer part that is set high for sea level rise. Mr. Aff stated the grades move generally up from that point. There are existing grades around the stack that are lower but may be built up. He stated it may be lower than the Blue Greenway in the first block of the stack but there is opportunity to go either way.

Mr. Battalio asked if there is an accessway that would be functional and meet the same sea level rise criteria inland or if it is only on the outer perimeter. Mr. Aff stated the same elevation goes all the way back through so there will always be access at the higher level.

Mr. Obertello added that the elevation along the shoreline will be built up and then will go up from there to maintain positive drainage to the Bay. The only low-lying area would be potentially directly around the stack, which is an existing condition.

Mr. Battalio referred to the presentation slide of the historical view. He stated the waves can be significant along the shore. He asked if the project proponents considered more towards accommodation rather than protection such as a notch or indentation in the shore to provide room for a beach, for example, which would provide a different type of access, although some upland area would be lost.

Mr. Aff stated there were issues of remediation on the site. There are large areas that would be challenging to begin to dig away at the water's edge since it would be better not to stir up unwanted elements.

Mr. Battalio pointed to a hatched area in the upper right corner of the historical slide that looks like it might be a pond or wetland area. He stated it appeared that between the headlands there is a little embayment, which might have had sand or gravel that would make it a nice way to get down to the water. He stated it is, unfortunately, in the middle of the site.

Mr. Aff stated the remediation challenge of the site dictated what the shoreline would have been based on previous use. He stated the need to stay within that boundary for the proposed project.

Ms. Barton asked about the phasing plan and that the project will occur in seven overlapping phases, each lasting three to five years. She asked how the open space will unfold throughout the phasing. Mr. Aff referred to the Project Phasing Plan presentation slide and stated the beige areas were Phase 1. The entire waterfront park will be built during Phase 1. Power Station Park, the interior spaces at the east end, and Stack Plaza will also be built during Phase 1.

Mr. Aff referred to another presentation slide and stated the red line around the diagram indicates what will be built during Phase 1.

Ms. Chang returned to the Project Phasing Plan slide and stated that the area in front of Block 4 is being done in coordination with the Pier 70 project team so it will potentially be completed during a later phase to ensure a seamless, cohesive connection to the Pier 70 site.

Ms. Barton asked about the considerable grade change between the two sites. Ms. Chang stated the project proponents will coordinate with the Pier 70 project team.

Ms. Barton asked for verification that the parks will be completed during the phase of the section each one is in. Ms. Chang stated they will.

Mr. Pellegrini stated staff noted that the Turbine Plaza could be a publicly-accessible space and also could be secured or sectioned off for private events. He asked about the project proponents' perception of what that might look like.

Ms. Chang referred to a presentation slide map and stated the project proponents wanted to provide an open connection as much as possible but there are existing structures at the site shown in the slide as piles. Project proponents determined that this might be an opportunity to provide an architectural response to the landscape. She stated the Design for Development document explains that there are controls that govern exactly the amount of coverage the Turbine Plaza could have - 65 percent of the entire space must be open at all times and only 35 percent could be covered.

Ms. Chang stated the space is also intended to be open, aside from the private events that would be enclosed.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the area that would be enclosable for private events was noted by the square shown on the presentation slide.

Ms. Chang stated she would characterize it by two different types of enclosures: the enclosure above Turbine Plaza that is the architectural piece and the potential to be transparent, and the entire area that could potentially be closed off from the sidewalk of Delaware Street and back to a location she pointed to on the slide.

Mr. Pellegrini asked how the existing ground plane of the building would be resolved with the new finished floor elevation if the existing power station is retrofitted. He asked if the project proponents anticipate providing guidance particularly from the standpoint of historical interpretation about how that would be done.

Ms. Chang stated test fits are still being done to determine exactly how to treat the grade change. There are options to raise the floor to meet the raising of grades all together but there are also options to explore about the possibility of stepping down. This design detail has not been fully resolved yet. Project proponents are trying to find ways to stay true to the historic character.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the interpretive program and the public art program are the same, complementary to each other, or different from each other, and if there are locations that would be desirable for public art that would be separate from the interpretive program.

Ms. Chang stated they can best be described as complementary. The site is rich in its history and should be celebrated. There are creative opportunities where interpretation and public art can mix to create something special in this location, but this aspect has not yet been fully designed.

Mr. Strang asked staff if there is time to include a brief presentation on the interpretive approach since the team is present. Ms. Gaffney agreed to a brief description if it would help the Board review the project.

Jeremy Regenbogen, Macchiatto, stated Macchiatto is also doing the interpretive program for Pier 70. The question posed is noteworthy because some of the same aspects are being encountered at Pier 70. He stated, while trying to avoid being overly prescriptive in terms of how interpretation is handled, there will be similarities in the treatment. What Macchiatto is attempting to do is to take a more artistic approach to interpretive moments and not include the standard waysides and text-heavy elements seen in many interpretive environments.

Mr. Regenbogen referred to a presentation slide and stated the diagram to the right is illustrating a diagrammatic approach to treating the interpretation as a hub-and-spoke model, the hub being centers that provide a depth of interpretive information that spoke out to smaller interpretive moments throughout the site. He stated this is the same system being applied at Pier 70, which is also being translated into Crane Cove Park to some degree.

Mr. Regenbogen stated the methods to be looked at down the road for how interpretation occurs will likely overlap to some degree with artistic statements when artists are brought in. There are opportunities to have interpretive moments tied with them but at this level of development those moments are not being overly prescribed.

Mr. Battalio referred to the double retaining wall diagram, where there is an existing L wall with another L wall stacked above it, and stated this is another conceptual area that might change once the details are considered.

Mr. Aff stated there is an existing retaining wall there. He stated he was not sure that will remain; a new wall may need to be constructed since it is an original masonry seawall.

Mr. Yao added that the assessment concluded that the wall is not stable. The plan is to remove the existing wall and construct a new seawall.

Mr. Strang asked about the degree to which the proposed site is accessible to nonmotorized boats and kayaks. He stated there usually is parking or a sequence of access for individuals who may be arriving in vehicles to launch their craft.

Mr. Aff stated the desire for this to fit into the general network of accessibility. He stated Crane Cove Park, which is a six- to seven-minute walk away, has some of the best possible kayak accessibility and has a safer, easier launching area. He stated, by contrast, there are not many places for motorized or sailing vessels to come in - that is what will be provided at the proposed site. Project proponents are trying to fit it into the network that is generally there to allow for that to occur.

Mr. Strang stated it is good to know that the area has been tied into a larger system. Mr. Aff stated staff has pushed the project proponents to think network-wide. The goal for the future is that the proposed project, Pier 70, and Crane Cove Park will be part of a greater neighborhood with great accessibility but where the developers will be long forgotten.

Mr. Pellegrini asked how the new elevation, which is generally around 17, carries across the Pier 70 site. He asked if it generally reestablishes the same grade or if there are transitions that need to be designed to get between the proposed project and Pier 70.

Mr. Obertello stated the existing height of the project site is higher than the Pier 70 site. There is a natural grade differential. Pier 70 is elevating their site and the project proponents are coordinating with them to create a seamless edge and transitions from the project site elevation down to the Pier 70 elevation. There currently is an approximate two-foot grade differential along the shoreline, which can be accommodated in a fairly short distance with ADA compliance.

Mr. Aff stated the project proponents host monthly tours at the project site. He invited the Board to tour the site.

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

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

Mr. Strang stated it has come up a couple of times about the softer edge and access to the water. It sounds like these are related comments, they have been studied in detail, and the applicant sticks by their recommendations. He stated he wanted to note that the Board had brought that up a number of times and that anything that can be done to advance the case there would be appreciated.

Mr. Strang stated the Board comments from the last meeting indicated that there was a thought about the perception of privatization and trying to make the site feel as open and as welcoming as possible. He stated staff questions one through six can be grouped together. Those questions relate in some way to the public experience, the sense of openness, and the facilities that are being offered to the greater public. This is an area of focus and something to keep in mind as the project goes forward. If, for example, Block 9 were to be developed instead of Unit 3 and the atrium were to go away, that diminishes the access permeability of the open space to the waterfront and would further give the impression of being a private enclave.

Mr. Strang suggested focusing on those first six questions.

Ms. Barton stated it is more coherent than it was previously, which is what the Board asked for.

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

(1) Physical and Visual Access

(a) Is the proposed public access—in terms of area and the amenities provided—sufficient to accommodate the expected level of use from new residents, employees, and visitors to this segment of the shoreline?

Mr. Strang stated he would answer this question in the affirmative.

Ms. Barton stated it is generous as an edge. There are private uses going on, which is not atypical of San Francisco waterfronts.

Mr. Pellegrini agreed with Mr. Strang and Ms. Barton that increasing the permeability and public access around the old power station is valuable and is central to the experience that a user would have in the public space in this location.

Mr. Pellegrini expressed concern over the to-be-determined nature of how some of the public spaces between Unit 3 and Block 9 might be used. It is worth questioning the baseline that would be provided such as if there is a time of day that will allow more openness or if certain passages through areas that might be closed off to public access could be found so that the permeability could still be retained.

Mr. Strang agreed and added, along with permeability, the irregular edge along the waterfront seems like a positive attribute.

(b) Does the design of the public space take advantage of the Bay setting, and does it provide for adequate opportunities to get close to and experience the water?

Mr. Strang stated he would answer this question in the affirmative.

Mr. Battalio stated he brought up the idea of having a more accommodative sloping shore or beach but the applicant's explanation that they did not want to disturb or expose the contaminated soils makes sense.

Mr. Battalio stated the recreational dock is an interesting idea. Exactly how it would be configured is unclear but could be worked out with staff. He stated, instead of formalizing forever the edge of the fill in the Bay, it would be nice, going into the future, to allow some irregularity, although this may not be the spot to do it. He stated the applicants mentioned that they had alternative, more protected access locations nearby and were working with the port on connectivity. He stated the applicants provided good explanations to his questions.

(c) Are the public access areas designed in a manner that “feels public” and makes the shoreline enjoyable to the greatest number of people?

(d) Mr. Strang stated the shoreline is very accessible.

(e) Will the proposed public access facilities provide a sufficiently broad range of water-oriented recreational activities for a diverse population, including people of all races, cultures, ages, income levels, physical abilities, and interests? Are there additional amenities needed to achieve this type of access?

Ms. Barton stated it has come together very well and, even within that, there is quite a diversity of things to do along the water with vantage points along the water.

(f) Does the Board have guidance on the configuration or interface of café seating and public seating to ensure the public seating is available to the public?

Mr. Strang stated this question has been addressed to some extent.

(g) The hotel use envisions being able to hold private events in Turbine Plaza. Are there any design considerations to ensure the adjacent public access remains inviting to the public during private events at Turbine plaza?

Mr. Strang stated this question has been addressed to some extent.

(h) Does the Board have advice on proposed location and size of the kiosks in relation to visual access to the Bay?

Mr. Strang stated he was unsure about the locations of the kiosks. Ms. Jewett referred Board Members to Slide 14 of Potrero Power Plant Exhibits, Potential Locations for Mobile Carts and Semi-Permanent Kiosks.

Ms. Barton stated, although the timeframe meant by the term “semi-permanent” is unclear, the retail/food/beverage kiosks would activate the space.

Mr. Strang stated the kiosks are positive - they mediate the scale between the large buildings and the landscape. They seem like a good thing.

(i) Does the Board have any further thoughts on the incorporation of site remnants into the waterfront park to tell the story of the history of the site?

Ms. Barton stated the stack is the ultimate remnant that eclipses anything else.

Mr. Strang asked if the Board should consider other site remnants other than the stack and Unit 3. Mr. Aff stated there is quite a detailed salvage program. It needs to be taken apart to see how complicated it is and to look for artistic things. There are items that are beautiful, large, and heavy but also have various levels of toxicity. He stated the project proponents will go to great extents to reuse these things.

Ms. Barton cautioned against cluttering the site with stuff just because it is stuff. Mr. Aff agreed that a virtual junkyard of remnants from the past can easily be overdone. Some of the beauty of this site is its openness that leads individuals to the water. He stated no one will mistake the stack for the past of what this site used to be. The goal is to include additional artifacts to help tell the story but to leave the rest of it for the public to experience.

Mr. Strang stated it is a good approach to preserve the scale and feeling of the site over feeling obligated to preserve specific remnants.

Mr. Pellegrini stated, if the public access at the rooftop level becomes a part of this, then it will provide a way to visually connect the site to the other pieces of industrial heritage around the Bay. It will be an interesting way to help tell the story of Pier 70, which is next to this site, in relationship to Alameda. There will be a clear view all the way to Richmond and across the Bay Bridge. This view will provide individuals who are visiting the site with the opportunity to plug into pieces of the larger industrial history of San Francisco.

(2) Circulation

(a) Does the proposed project provide clear connections for all users to the Bay from Illinois Street?

Mr. Strang stated it seems that there is good access from Illinois Street and 23rd Street with the huge 300-foot-tall marker at the end.

(b) Does the design minimize the potential for conflicts among pedestrians and cyclists within the shoreline open space area?

(3) Sea Level Rise

(a) Are there additional opportunities to provide interim access closer to the shoreline and Bay waters as part of the proposed adaptation and resiliency measures?

Mr. Strang stated the Board has discussed this a number of times. It is something to keep in mind but must be left for the design team to do the best that they can to achieve that.

Mr. Strang stated how the railing for the retaining wall is designed is an important element in terms of the feeling of openness and accessibility. He stated some kind of Embarcadero-like detail, where there is a step down in the section for an ha-ha wall and the height of the railing is perceptually reduced, would be something to consider for visual access.

Mr. Pellegrini asked, related to the horizontal elevation of the Blue Greenway and the idea about adapting over time versus adapting all at once, at what point in the future the existing base flood elevation will be considered obsolete. He asked, if the site is being raised five feet, how many years into the future adaptation will become necessary.

Mr. Lavine stated updated information on sea level rise does not get better.

Mr. Obertello stated the approach is to go back to the climate change policies in the Bay Plan. Generally speaking, designs are created that go past mid-century to 2100 or beyond. Those projects include the ability to adapt to sea level rise and, generally speaking, somewhere along the way there will be triggers or threshold events in terms of flooding that will require assessment of ongoing viability of the site to provide the public access areas that have been proposed. He stated, when those triggers begin to happen, the project proponents will rely on updated science decades more advanced than is available today, which will show a different story.

Mr. Pellegrini stated sites like this that are not necessarily constrained by width could potentially raise the sites of development and provide public access and could raise the shoreline edge at a later date, where, instead of raising the entire site up to elevation 17 today, the sites that will be developed could be raised and the shoreline edge could remain below that as a short- or medium-term solution until the public access needs to be relocated.

Mr. Pellegrini stated four feet is not that much to warrant phasing out that infrastructure, but the relationship to the water's edge and getting down to the edge becomes slightly more limited due to that additional height. He stated he would not argue for one over the other but staff is asking that question of the Board for a reason. The areas that have a substantial width and can separate out public access and the future viable development of pads could consider a phased approach but he stated he would not necessarily advocate for that being a practical or reasonable solution.

Mr. Battalio stated that is a good point because how to design sea level rise into the future is still being worked out and there is no clear guidance.

f. **Applicant Response.** The applicant offered clarifying points to questions raised by the Board during the Board discussion.

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

Mr. Strang stated the Board does not need to see this project again and asked staff to continue to work with the project proponents to incorporate their comments and suggestions.

Ms. Alschuler joined the Board at the table.

6. Briefing on Proposed Oakland Athletics Ballpark and Mixed-Use Development at Howard Terminal

a. **Staff Presentation.** The Board received a briefing on a proposal to develop a ballpark and mixed-use development at the Port of Oakland's Howard Terminal, adjacent to Jack London Square, in the City of Oakland, Alameda County.

Mr. Lavine provided a quick summary of the role of the Board for the members of the public who were present. He stated this project is different from others early on in that there are fundamental issues that would have to be resolved for the Commission to act to approve the project that will be presented tonight. The issues that would need to be resolved are two things:

(1) The project site, Howard Terminal, is designated by the Commission's Bay Plan and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) plan as a seaport plan port priority use area designation, which means that, until such time as there are amendments to these plans that would allow for a non-seaport use, the Commission would not be able to approve such a use.

(2) The project site is largely on a wharf. Large portions of wharf were constructed in the Bay in the 1980s and 1990s. The Commission issued permits to allow for this wharf and it is to serve as a port use. When the Bay is filled, there are a number of tests that must be satisfied. Generally, the use must be water-related and must be consistent with public trust.

Mr. Lavine asked the Board to consider this briefing as an informational item to see again in the future. He asked the Board not to provide detailed comments but only to provide general guidance on design considerations for planning, if desired.

Dave Kaval, President, Oakland A's, stated the desire for an open and transparent design process to ensure that the project is designed in a way that meets the needs of all key stakeholders.

Richard Kennedy, Field Operations, Oakland A's, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the site context, site and shoreline history, public engagement, site plan, open space and public access, and shoreline improvements and adaptation.

b. **Board Questions.** Following the briefing, the Board asked clarifying questions on the material presented for project proponents to consider during the design process:

Mr. Battalio asked about ferry or transit boat access to the project site. Mr. Kennedy stated there is an existing ferry terminal just off the site. He pointed to the ferry landing dock on a presentation slide. He stated boating activities would be possible along that edge.

Mr. Strang asked about the amount of square feet of associated development and the number of residential units planned

Ms. Alschuler stated the need to take on the responsibility for public access, including environmental justice and social equity issues. It would be important to consider the programming year-round.

Mr. Kennedy stated the public park on the roof of the ballpark will be open and available to the public 365 days of the year.

Ms. Alschuler stated the need to consider sea level rise and adaptation.

Ms. Barton stated the need to consider the responsibility for public realm management and care.

Ms. Alschuler added the consideration of what the proposed project means for the operations of the water-based industries and uses.

Mr. Battalio stated the need to consider the foundation and seismic response.

Mr. Strang stated the need to consider what the proposed project would mean to the surrounding neighborhoods. It would be important to learn about circulation, what other projects are aligned in this area, and how it all ties together.

Ms. Alschuler stated it would also be important to learn how individuals will get to the proposed site and what will affect their neighborhoods.

Chair Alschuler stated the importance of including scenarios of what happens over time - a day or a year - what the implications are for the different routes of access, and how it will be an incredible contribution to public access along the Bay.

Chair Alschuler thanked the project proponents for taking the time to present their conceptual ideas to the Board early in the design process. She stated the Board looks forward to more presentations as the design progresses and for having the opportunity to ask more questions and to make comments on the design going forward.

c. **Public Hearing.** Ten members of the public provided the following comments:

(3) Ms. Gaffney stated Lauren Westreich, Director, West Oakland Commerce Association, submitted an email in support of the proposed project.

(4) Keith Salminen, Producer and Co-Host of an internet podcast, A's Fan Radio, A's ticketholder, and long-time resident of the East Bay, spoke in support of the proposed project.

(5) Ernest Johnson, a long-time resident of West Oakland, spoke in support of the proposed project.

(6) Alternier Cook, a long-time resident of West Oakland and North Oakland Resident, spoke in support of the proposed project.

(7) Dennis DeFreidas, community member, spoke in support of the proposed project.

(8) Delvin Washington, resident, professional planner, spoke in support of the proposed project.

(9) Jorge Leon, baseballoakland.com and resident of Oakland, spoke in support of the proposed project.

(10) Bill Purcell, Save Oakland's Sports and West Oakland Commerce Association, spoke in support of the proposed project.

(11) Dave Campbell, Advocacy Director, Bike East Bay (East Bay Bicycle Coalition), spoke in support of the proposed project. He stated there are many barriers to this location that are important to review during the design process. The city struggles with this issue but this project has the potential to help overcome some of those barriers.

(12) Art Shanks, Executive Director, Cyprus Mandela Training Center (CMTC), spoke in support of the proposed project. He stated the CMTC was one of the first ten pilots in the United States awarded a grant to do brownfields cleanup. CMTC trains individuals to do work on projects similar to the proposed project. He stated this project is very important particularly when it comes to dealing with residents that can segue into meaningful employment through the apprenticeship program to do cleanup work on this project. It is significant that local apprentices can almost complete their apprenticeship program requirements while working at this one site.

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

MOTION: Ms. Barton moved to adjourn the March 11, 2019, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Pellegrini.

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 5-0-0 with Board Chair Alschuler, Vice Chair Strang, and Board Members Barton, Battalio, and Pellegrini voting approval.

There being no further business, Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREA GAFFNEY
Bay Design Analyst

Approved, as corrected, at the
Design Review Board Meeting of April 8, 2019.