

# San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 510, San Francisco, California 94105 tel 415 352 3600 fax 888 348 5190

State of California | Gavin Newsom – Governor | [info@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:info@bcdc.ca.gov) | [www.bcdc.ca.gov](http://www.bcdc.ca.gov)

February 28, 2020

**TO:** All Design Review Board members

**FROM:** Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; [larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov))  
Andrea Gaffney, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; [andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov))

**SUBJECT: Approved Minutes of the February 10, 2020, BCDC Design Review Board Meeting**

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

Other Board Members in attendance included Board Members Cheryl Barton, Bob Battalio, Tom Leader, Jacinta McCann, and Stefan Pellegrini. BCDC staff in attendance included Clesi Bennett, Erik Buehmann, Morgan Chow, Walt Deppe, Andrea Gaffney, Nahal Ghoghaie, and Ethan Lavine. The presenters were Charlene Angsucu (San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department), Azzurra Cox (Gustafson Guthrie Nichol), Matthew Griffin (Kilroy Oyster Point Development (KOP)), Richard Kennedy (James Corner Field Operations), Katherine Liss (Gustafson Guthrie Nichol) Jonas Vass (KOP), and Jonathan Ward (NBBJ). Public comment via email was submitted by Ben Botkin (San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail) and Maureen Gaffney (San Francisco Bay Trail). Also in attendance were Shirley Balendo (A Philip Randolph Institute), Jackie Flin (A Philip Randolph Institute), Jill Fox (India Basin Neighborhood Association), Kurt Grimes (A Philip Randolph Institute), Billy Gross (City of South San Francisco), Lucia Lachmayr (resident, boat owner), Shirley Lau (local employee, water sport enthusiast), Dymond Letele (resident and student), Liann Pittman (resident and activist), and Philip Vitale (The Trust for Public Land).

2. **Staff Update.** Andrea Gaffney, BCDC Bay Design Analyst, reviewed the safety protocols, meeting protocols, and meeting agenda. She provided the announcements as follows: A second Bay Design Analyst has been hired by the BCDC and will start in March.

3. **Approval of Draft Minutes for November 18, 2019, Meeting.** Mr. Battalio referred to the first paragraph on page 6 and asked to change “66 inches of sea level rise” to “would be flooded” so the sentence would read “the beach and the areas shown below Mission Bay datum elevation 104 would be, at that point in time, flooded.”



Mr. Battalio referred to the first full paragraph on page 12 and asked to change the word “higher” to “in diameter or larger” so the sentence would read “Mr. Battalio suggested a custom, coarser sediment such as one millimeter in diameter or larger so that the wind does not blow the sand around.”

Mr. Battalio referred to the last sentence in the second full paragraph on page 17 and asked to move the words “concrete, stone, or grading” up to after the word “resilient” so the sentence would read “this is where a beach is more resilient than concrete, stone, or grading, in terms of access in the range of environments.”

Ms. Barton referred to the next-to-the-last paragraph on page 10, under Board Discussion, and asked to change the word “that” to “where” so the sentence would read “Ms. Barton stated the Tidal Shelves are an experiment where everyone can participate in watching sea level rise.”

Ms. Barton referred to the third paragraph on page 11 and asked to add the word “observatory” so the sentence would read “It is a place to exhibit not unlike the Exploratorium in its upper observatory room.”

**MOTION:** Ms. McCann moved approval of the Minutes for the November 18, 2019, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as presented, seconded by Ms. Barton.

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 6 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain with Board Chair Alschuler and Board Members Barton, Battalio, Leader, McCann, and Pellegrini voting approval with no abstentions.

4. **Briefing on Environmental Justice Bay Plan Amendment Implementation.** The Board received a briefing on the implementation of the Environmental Justice and Social Equity Bay Plan Amendment that was adopted on October 17, 2019. The briefing provided an update on short-term and long-term implementation, including the creation of guidance and trainings on how the new policies will be used.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Clesi Bennett, BCDC Coastal Planner, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the guiding principles, new policies regarding public access, implementation materials, Community Vulnerability Mapping tool, and changes in staff reports.

Nahal Ghoghaie, BCDC Environmental Justice Manager, continued the slide presentation and discussed priorities, implementation outreach and trainings, and longer-term environmental justice program goals.

b. **Board Questions.** Following the presentation, the Board asked a series of questions: Mr. Battalio asked if it looks like a lot of the vulnerable communities are disproportionately exposed to sea level rise.

Ms. Bennett stated the Adapting to Rising Tides (ART) program analyzed that in their most recent project, the ART Bay Area project. She stated definitive numbers will be provided when that report is published. She stated one of the key planning issues that came out of that report was early impacts at 12 inches for certain communities, specifically the canal district in San Rafael, West Oakland, Alviso, San Jose, and others.

Ms. Bennett stated the other thing the ART program looked at was the co-location of vulnerable communities and land contamination. She stated these communities were also found to be exposed to sea level rise.

**5. 900 Innes and India Basin Shoreline Park; San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department (Second Pre-Application Review).** The Board held their second pre-application review by the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department for a new shoreline park in India Basin located at the 900 Innes Avenue property in the city and county of San Francisco. The approximately 14-acre park would include shoreline pathways, new public piers, a public dock and boat launch facility, a large lawn, a gravel beach, a play area, renovated and reused historic maritime buildings, and other public amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Walt Deppe, BCDC Coastal Program Analyst, stated the Board heard their first pre-application review of this project on November 7, 2016, which was held in conjunction with the larger India Basin Shoreline Park phase of the full proposed project. He stated the November 7th meeting also included an India Basin Urban Design briefing and a review of the proposed India Basin Open Space and 700 Innes project. He noted that the Board will only be reviewing the 900 Innes portion of the larger India Basin Shoreline Park project today.

Mr. Deppe introduced the project and summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the revised design:

(1) Provides adequate, usable, and attractive public access that maximizes the public's use and enjoyment of the area.

(a) Includes a park that encourages diverse activities and creates a "sense of place," which is unique, enjoyable, and inviting to the public.

(b) Includes public access improvements that create diverse recreational opportunities for people of all races, cultures, ages, abilities, and income levels.

(c) Includes program areas that are distributed and designed to meet and balance the needs of the public.

(d) Includes adequate micro-climate considerations for all users, such as access to wind protection and shade.

(2) Includes connections to and through the public access spaces that are adequate and appropriate to maximize the public's use and enjoyment of the site.

(a) Includes connections to the Bay Trail and adjacent properties that are appropriate, usable, and enjoyable.

- (3) Includes an appropriate location and design for the proposed floating dock.
  - (a) Includes adequate support facilities, including in terms of parking, restrooms, and equipment storage for launching and landing hand-powered watercraft.
- (4) Addresses potential conflicts between sensitive habitat and public access uses.
- (5) Includes public access that is resilient and adaptive to sea level rise and flooding.

b. **Project Presentation.** Azzurra Cox, Designer, Gustafson Guthrie Nichol, introduced the project team. She provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the goals and timeline, demographic content, environmental justice goals, public engagement process, and community priorities.

Katherine Liss, Professional Landscape Architect (PLA) Associate, Gustafson Guthrie Nichol, continued the slide presentation and discussed the design progress, remediation plan, phasing, access and program, materials, planting and habitat, and resilient shoreline.

Ms. Liss reviewed the changes made to the design of the proposed site since the Board's last review in 2016. She stated the highest priority, based on community feedback, is access to and views of the Bay. She noted that the natural shoreline has never been cut back and does not contain any fill. It is important to preserve and enhance that feature with native planting and wildlife habitat.

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

Ms. Alschuler asked for further details on the bicycle route through the proposed site. She referred to a presentation slide and asked if the hashed line represents a new bicycle path.

Ms. Cox pointed out the proposed Bay Trail on the presentation slide and stated neither the Bay Trail nor a bicycle path currently exists. She stated the bicycle path is distinguished from the Bay Trail because it is primarily a bicycle path access to the bicycle lane, but noted that it is also a shared pedestrian path.

Ms. Alschuler stated, in the larger context of a transportation route that had pedestrians and bicycles on the map, there was a bicycle lane coming down Innes Avenue that stopped. She asked, in the larger picture, if the intent is for a bicycle lane to come down Innes Avenue and then continue to the water's edge so individuals could be on a protected bicycle route right to the Innes Landing area.

Ms. Cox stated the route is currently partially in place. The idea is that, from Hunters Point Boulevard, individuals would be on a protected bicycle lane and could go one of three ways – on to the India Basin Shoreline Park, down to India Basin Open Space, or, in the future, once the 700 Innes project site is built out, out onto the 700 Innes roadway connection.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the protected bicycle lane continues on Innes Avenue.

Ms. Cox stated it does not. The proposed bicycle lane is partially for protection at the area of the roadway that is curved and dangerous. Commuter bicycle traffic will be diverted from Hunters Point Boulevard down into the project.

Ms. Alschuler asked for verification that the safe bicycle connection will be built as part of the 900 Innes project.

Mr. Leader asked about the input from or discussion with the Bay Trail about the conflict of individuals moving down onto the piers versus bicycles racing through.

Ms. Cox stated the project proponents thought a great deal about that. She agreed that there will be a lot going on in that area with Bay Trail and the bicycle and pedestrian traffic. The project proponents have tried as much as possible to use the material and softer hues to signal that this is a different space and that this is a public space. She agreed that the area is a pinch point, but stated that pinch point helps to slow down the traffic.

Ms. Liss agreed that the turns help and added that the path widens in that area at 900 Innes to create more space to allow for the increased traffic.

Ms. Alschuler asked if there is another access route to drop off supplies and service equipment for the large events depicted on the presentation slides other than walking or biking them in.

Ms. Liss stated there is. The Bay Trail is 15 feet wide at its minimum. The idea is that there would be a vehicular access route to allow service vehicles access to the event areas.

Ms. Cox suggested that it would be easier to see how that would work on a slide of the broader plan. She pointed out the parking lot, the Bay Trail, and an area that would allow service vehicles to access the event space, the piers, and the maintenance yard.

Ms. McCann stated she loved the concept diagram with the connection uphill into the community. She stated her understanding that it is beyond the purview of this project but asked if progress is also being made on that connection.

Ms. Cox stated that that was the primary design concept that has been validated during the community planning process. She stated there was a Transportation and Equitable Development Plan meeting in December. The overwhelming consensus was that the most important aspect of ensuring equity in access is making the pedestrian paths accessible, safe, and inviting.

Ms. Cox stated organizing the advocacy has been happening around that topic. She stated, even though it is outside the purview of the proposed project, the project proponents are getting individuals on board who will be necessary to make those connections happen.

Ms. McCann referred to Exhibit 20 and stated it looks like, in the 100-year flood event in 2020, a segment of the Bay Trail overtops the path. She asked if she is reading that correctly.

Ms. Cox stated the project proponents are working on the temporary connections. Part of that is the property line; the existing grading in that area is low. Solutions must be found to make that connection to the other side, but it is a challenge due to the way the property line ends in that location. She stated the project proponents are working with the remediation team to try to figure that out as part of the remediation project.

Ms. McCann asked for verification that the surface material on the path is gravel.

Ms. Cox stated the surface material on the path is concrete.

Ms. Barton asked for further details on the remediation plan and what the remediation is being done for.

Charlene Angsuko, Project Manager, San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, stated the remediation of the proposed 900 Innes project is to remediate soils and sediments with elevated concentrations of metals, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPHs) that have resulted from the historic Scow Schooner Boatyard operations at the site.

Ms. Angsuko stated, since the 1800s, the site has operated and functioned as a working boatyard. It was not until the late 1990s that those operations ceased. She stated there are many contaminants that are associated with waterproofing vessels and using copper.

Ms. Barton asked if the contamination is both in the water and on shore.

Ms. Angsuko stated it is. She stated the contamination continues near shore and upland, but the upland was essentially the site prep. She stated the bulk of the concentrations are along the near shore but, as work was being done on vessels, the contaminants would run down the slope into the water.

Ms. Angsuko stated the cleanup is being overseen by the Regional Water Quality Control Board under the voluntary Site Cleanup Program.

Ms. Barton asked for verification that the contaminated material will be removed and then replaced with clean material.

Ms. Angsuko stated that is correct.

Ms. Barton asked about the volume of material estimated to be removed.

Ms. Angsuko stated it will be approximately 7,000 cubic yards of sediments. The upland area will be approximately 11,000 cubic yards of sediments. She noted that not all the material being removed is hazardous waste. She stated the site will be scraped using an abundance of caution and will be backfilled with appropriate material.

Ms. Alschuler stated it is good to hear about this work being done. She asked if the plan is to make this an educational effort as part of the equitable development plan and the environmental justice goals for the site.

Ms. Cox stated it is. She stated education is being embedded in many parts of this project. In terms of remediation, there are limits as to how individuals can engage with the site, but community feedback was not to cover up the negative history of contamination but to include it in part of the broader story.

Ms. Cox stated using remediation is a way to tell the story of the organizing that happened to make this project a reality – the environmental justice organizing that community members did in the 1970s – which is part of this broader, longer story. Also, education in terms of skill building and entrepreneurship is being built into it. She stated there will be education regarding the land, plants, and habitats. There is definitely an opportunity for education.

Mr. Pellegrini discussed the access across Innes Avenue. He stated there is an existing crosswalk near there. He asked if there is pedestrian control on that crosswalk at the bus stop, such as a pedestrian-activated beacon, or if there are plans to install or introduce something as part of the opening up of this portion of the shoreline.

Ms. Cox stated, as part of the larger group of advocates, the idea is to provide signalized crosswalks at that intersection and eventually further around the corner. She stated Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) is looking at using this as a way to test quick-build improvements that are as simple as painting bright stripes. She stated there may not be a signal yet, but there are quick and inexpensive ways of slowing traffic and signaling that this is a pedestrian space. She stated the project proponents will continue to work with MTA on this issue.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the frontage improvements along Innes Avenue on the public face of the park. He asked if the current sidewalk in that area will be widened.

Ms. Cox stated the main design elements are the food pavilion, which is the new building that project proponents see as framing the entrance and providing a bookend. Also, what project proponents are calling the “Innes edge,” which is a viewing desk and platform, will act as an entry point and also will activate the sidewalk.

Ms. Cox stated the plan is to put in street trees. She asked Ms. Angsuko to add further details in answer to Mr. Pellegrini’s question.

Ms. Angsuko stated there are a few development agreements that have been approved for the neighborhood and community, in part associated with some of the other developments. She stated, long-term, there will be a transformation of Innes Avenue, but there is a timing issue. There are developer commitments to improve the flow of traffic and amenities along Innes Avenue. She stated, over the next few months and years, there will be a piloting of certain safety measures for pedestrians and cyclists.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the width of the sidewalk along Innes Avenue at the entry to the project.

Ms. Cox stated that is part of the overall transportation improvement plan. It will not be a part of this project but will come later as part of a continuous network. She stated the trees are part of this project's proposed improvements but the widening of the sidewalk will be part of future systemic changes.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the cross-ramp that provides an accessible path down to the shoreline. He asked about the anticipated slope condition.

Ms. Cox stated the slope is approximately 4.7 percent. She stated there will be an accessible ramp with handrails at the top at 8 or 8.3 percent, which will transition into an accessible route, which will be 4.7 percent.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the entire India Basin Open Space Shoreline will remain under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department.

Ms. Cox stated India Basin Shoreline Park, 900 Innes, and India Basin Open Space are currently under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department. Further along, the PG&E shoreline will remain the PG&E shoreline, and Heron's End Park will remain the Port of San Francisco's property, which is currently managed by the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if it is anticipated that this site would be managed in concurrence with how other recreation and park spaces are managed in terms of booking a site for an event or the operating hours of the park.

Ms. Cox stated this is under discussion with the community at this point. She stated the idea and the preference is that the site would remain accessible without any gates or fencing. The vision is that it will be truly a community asset. She stated the answer to the question about hours will be up to the community.

Ms. Barton stated, in the previous presentation in 2016, there was an emphasis on habitat restoration. She asked about the pet policy and if that issue had been resolved.

Ms. Cox stated the pet policy issue has not yet been resolved; it will require further discussion. She noted that the design does not include a dog play area.

Ms. Barton asked about the source of the irrigation water for the park.

Ms. Cox stated it will come from the California Public Utilities Commission. She stated the hope is to create a way to reuse some of their water in the future, such as in a purple pipe for recycled water to be used for irrigation.

Ms. Liss stated part of the reason native plants were used in the design is that they are resilient to some degree to water fluctuation.

Mr. Leader asked for further details on how it will work for facilities that need vehicle loading and unloading, including the café.

Ms. Cox stated the Shipwright's Cottage and the Food Pavilion will have access to Innes Avenue. The Shop Building will have other vehicular access down from the Bay Trail.

Mr. Leader asked for verification that there is surface access off of Innes Avenue.

Ms. Cox stated there is. She stated curbside access is needed for the upper levels, which have support needs.

Mr. Battalio asked about access in terms of the floating dock and about the programming for individuals who need to hand-carry their water craft.

Ms. Cox stated the boat launch will be part of Phase 2, although there is a gangway and a floating dock at the end of the proposed site. It is meant for pedestrian access to bring individuals out so they can experience the mud flat even more, not for boat launching.

Mr. Battalio asked for more detail about Phases 1 and 2.

Ms. Gaffney stated, the first time this project came before the Board for review, it was a single project that had not been split into two phases. Since the project proponents are moving forward with their permits and they would like to build Phase 1, the Board is reviewing Phase 1 today.

Mr. Battalio asked for verification that the section of the Bay Trail that is included in Phase 1 is included in the design.

Ms. Cox stated it is.

Mr. Battalio asked why the piers slope down as seen on presentation slide 21.

Ms. Cox stated it is an intentional design feature because it is up at 15 and it is sloping down to approximately 13. The idea is, when it slopes away, individuals see less of the pier and more of the Bay. It opens up the view.

Mr. Battalio referred to the presentation slide with the table of elevations and asked for verification that the table is a shorthand version of the sea level rise design criteria for the different elements.

Ms. Cox stated it is.

Mr. Battalio referred to the Sea Level Rise Projections slide where it says "per SFPUC 2014 and San Francisco Sea Level Rise Action Plan," and asked for verification that it is not necessarily the State of California's 2018 guidance. He asked if the project proponents had looked at the contemporary guidance.

Ms. Cox stated they had. She said she was surprised because she was certain the consultant was using all that information. She stated it perhaps is incorrectly referenced.

Mr. Battalio stated the SFPUC was before the 2018 guidance. The slide is not clear; it does not say what the sea level rise scenarios are. It would be helpful for the Board to know those scenarios.

Mr. Battalio asked about the vertical datum used. He stated the reason he asked is because presentation slide 21 lists the mean high water at 5.9 feet and slide 20 lists it at 5.75 feet.

Ms. Cox stated that has also bothered her but different numbers were used for the remediation project that was going through at the time. Now it has become more consistent. She stated the 5.9 number is a carryover from the most recent mean high water line but it should use the previously presented number, which is 5.75 feet. She stated those numbers will be clarified in the next presentation.

Mr. Battalio asked staff to include what the sea level rise scenarios are, what the reference is, and what the criteria are.

Ms. Cox asked if the Board would like to see the elevation being used, a list of where the criteria are from, and the inches increased.

Mr. Battalio agreed but stated it could be in feet or meters.

Mr. Deppe stated he tried to call that out on page 7 of the Staff Report. He stated, for Ocean Protection Council (OPC) state guidance, 2050 medium-to-high risk scenario and high emissions is 1.9 feet, which is consistent with the numbers the project proponents show on their presentation slides. He stated, for 2100, it is 6.9 feet for that scenario.

Mr. Leader asked about the lime green area to the right of the Shipwright's Cottage on a presentation slide.

Ms. Cox stated the reason it is shown that way is because it is the extent of the 900 Innes project, but once the remediation is complete, this area will be regraded and stabilized or planted in some way. She stated no more of the area needs to be disturbed for the 900 Innes project. Later, as 700 Innes is constructed, this will become the roadway. There is no need to invest in planting that area.

Mr. Leader asked for verification that, although the driveway that is there is quite steep, there will be a flatter version after regrading.

Ms. Cox agreed.

Ms. Barton asked about a graphic that shows the constructed housing development project.

Ms. Cox stated there are depictions in the prior design slides.

Ms. Alschuler asked where the dashed line for the Bay Trail was, which also has the piece that will potentially be inundated at some future time. That land is part of the 700 Innes and India Basin Open Space area. She asked if there is a chance it could be modified.

Ms. Cox stated, in the future, once 900 Innes is constructed, the Bay Trail will start at 15 and slope up so it will not be inundated in the future phase, but the interim connection to the India Basin Open Space Park may be.

Ms. Alschuler stated it was also mentioned in the materials that there is a relationship for covering shared maintenance costs between the 900 Innes and the 700 Innes projects.

Ms. Angsuko stated, as part of the development agreement that was executed between BUILD, Inc., a real estate group and developer, and the city and county of San Francisco, it calls for the establishment of a Community Facilities District that would generate funding for the maintenance of the four parks. That is the reason for the maintenance building in the middle – to serve the multiple sites.

Ms. Alschuler asked if it will be available with the 900 Innes project.

Ms. Angsuko stated it will become available when the BUILD, Inc., project comes online. She stated there will be more maintenance to do with the BUILD, Inc., project.

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

(1) Jackie Flin, Executive Director, A Philip Randolph Institute, San Francisco, one of the many community partners on this project, stated she has been tasked with an awesome opportunity to include equity in every lens of this project, not only in design but in the programming of the park in the future.

Ms. Flin stated she was in attendance to provide community members with the opportunity to come and talk about how they have had meaningful connection with this project. She stated she continues to open an opportunity and a space for individuals to come in and not only provide feedback but to give context and identity in a site that has been inaccessible for so long.

Ms. Flin stated 900 Innes is a location that was not accessible to many members of the community for so long that it is difficult to get individuals to come down, but, once they get there, they experience their shoreline in a very different way.

Ms. Flin stated she heard Ms. Barton ask about the context of neighborhood. She stated that is important to think about. In Mr. Deppe's opening presentation, the housing and the surrounding neighborhood that exists adjacent to this project could be seen. She stated one of the things that is interesting is, in an aerial view, none of that area was designed to access the park. The communities were purposely planned with one way in and one way out. It is important to keep that in context when discussing equity and access to the park.

Ms. Flin stated the issue of transportation has come up. It is currently an issue that impacts that shoreline, but the public housing that has been historically on that shoreline that served as former barracks for the naval shipyard is where individuals have lived for generations. It is important to keep that in context when talking about connecting the community to this park.

Ms. Flin stated community members not only want to contribute to this park but want to do many other things within the community that make their participation meaningful. She thanked the Board for their time and efforts to ensure that these parks are built and are assets to the community.

(2) Kurt Grimes, Program Manager, A Philip Randolph Institute, San Francisco, stated this is such a complicated plan and yet it is simple at the same time. He stated he engages his community in a variety of ways, such as inviting them to meetings, inviting them to visit the site, and putting events together that engage the community on this site. He stated he advocates for his community because a good, clean, accessible park is something that is vital to the vibrancy of a community. He stated this plan has allowed the community to have a conversation every month for the past six months.

Mr. Grimes stated he agreed with Mr. Pellegrini that safety is an issue along Hunters Point Boulevard.

Mr. Grimes stated this conversation is about equity. Equity is a big part of what will make this plan successful because it allows the community to have a say in a development that is going to be just for them. He stated the Bay view is changing; this is the last section of affordability in San Francisco. With housing prices approaching \$1 million, there needs to be a place for the community across the street from this project to have a place that they can access before everything is gone.

Mr. Grimes stated this is also an opportunity for youth to learn. He stated the need for the design team to create things for the community that are right and just, such as ensuring that pedestrians have safe access to this a good, clean space. That is what this project is currently doing.

Mr. Grimes stated this park is needed and the community needs the Board's support to ensure that this happens.

(3) Liann Pittman, resident and activist, stated she works with children, seniors, and members of the disability community. She stated she considers India Basin Shoreline Park as a landmark for the community of the Bay view. She stated she has fought over the years for safe crossing stop signs near schools and boys' and girls' clubs, many of which have been approved.

Ms. Pittman stated it is important to keep this park and to make it safe. She suggested including street lighting to help alert traffic of pedestrian crossings. She suggested including a building to help tell the stories of the history of the location. She stated there is a lot of history in this location that can be preserved to share with future generations. It can be a place where schools take children on fieldtrips. She stated there is a lot of potential in that landmark that has been there so long.

Ms. Pittman stated the community wants this location to improve. The local children and families deserve to enjoy the park, the wetlands, and the community that they live near.

(4) Shirley Balendo, A Philip Randolph Institute, San Francisco, stated she has seen changes in the community over the years and, working for A Philip Randolph Institute, she sees further changes that are needed for the community. She shared her experience of living in the neighborhood and having only one park. This project will help teach children about history,

economics, and business, and can be a place for the community to come together for different projects and activities. She stated she would like to see this project come together for the benefit of the children.

(5) Jill Fox, resident and Chair, India Basin Neighborhood Association (IBNA), an all-volunteer organization founded in 1994, stated, in 1999, when the boat repair at 900 Innes went out of business, she had a dream of a park in that location. She stated IBNA has led a 20-year effort to get the Shipwright's Cottage made the San Francisco Landmark #250, which saved it from demolition and development, and to acquire the historic boatyard as a city park.

Ms. Fox stated, although IBNA wants the park to move forward, there are adjacent neighbors who have concerns about the design. She stated IBNA asked the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department to address these concerns but they have been ignored. She asked the Board not to approve this project until community concerns have been addressed.

Ms. Fox stated the community wants to maintain the open views between the neighborhood and the water. There is a lot of development going on and, in the next few years, all of Innes Avenue will be built, including, further down the street, where there are 14-story buildings on Innes Avenue with few corridors to view the water and certainly nothing like the 900 Innes site.

Ms. Fox asked that the food pavilion not be put in the currently-designed location but that it be put elsewhere. She stated the BUILD, Inc., project has a food court, food pavilion, and marketplace in their design at the curve close to the project site. The community thinks that is a better site for a building.

Ms. Fox stated the community does not want to commercialize this park. It is special, historic, and environmentally fragile, and it needs to be kept a park.

Ms. Fox stated many activities on Innes Avenue are not safe because Innes Avenue is a busy street.

Ms. Fox addressed some of the Board's questions about the bicycle trail. She stated it will be a Class I bicycle trail, which is not ideal, but the bicycles need to get off Innes Avenue because it is unsafe and will continue to be even more unsafe as the population increases.

Ms. Fox stated the community wants to encourage alternative transit. The switchback is needed to be viable for a Class I bicycle trail that can also be used by strollers and be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible.

Ms. Fox stated the community wants individuals to enjoy the historical buildings and Shipwright's Cottage in the boatyard. She suggested that the new boatyard design will incorporate all the building footprints, docks, pads, and marine ways, including their siding and materials, so that, even though they are new buildings, they can look old, which helps encourage an understanding of the important history that went on there.

Ms. Fox stated the community wants the water tower that was there and was illegally demolished around the year 2000 to be restored. It can also be used as a rainwater catch system to use that water the way they did in the 1860s by capturing the water and using it on site. It can be an interesting iconic element that would help advertise and become a symbol for the waterfront park.

Ms. Fox stated featuring the historic look and feel will honor the individuals who built important boats here for over 100 years and who were very much in touch with the water and the environment.

Ms. Fox stated the need to ensure safe, 24-hour access from the street down to the bicycle trail and the Bay Trail. That is an important part of the alternative transit to keep individuals in touch with the environment, more than just having a busy street with a bike lane next to it.

Ms. Fox asked the Board not to approve this project until community concerns are addressed. She stated members of IBNA will follow up with comments in writing.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board is not an approving body but is focused on public access and advising staff and the Commission about projects. She stated Ms. Fox touched on a lot of the Board's interests.

(6) Philip Vitale, The Trust for Public Land, spoke in support of this project. He stated The Trust for Public Land is a partner in this project. It has a mission of creating a park or open space within a 10-minute walk of everyone. He stated he is excited by this opportunity to expand the park system and to make this park a reflection of the community. He stated the equitable development plan goes beyond community engagement on any other project he has done.

Mr. Vitale stated he is excited to see how this project not just engages the community in design, but reaches beyond the park boundaries – how it addresses access, housing, jobs, and representing the culture there. This project will be an amazing asset for the community.

(7) Dymond Letele stated her school is up the street from 900 Innes. She stated it is important to have this space for the community to be together, share, and connect and to see the beauty of District 10 and not be restricted to the environmental issues that are faced every day. She stated this could be an educational area for the youth where they can learn about the landmarks in District 10.

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

Mr. Botkin notes that, while the pier dock is not meant to be a launching facility, it may be a landing site to paddle over to. He suggested taking the opportunity to incorporate short-term boat storage so that, if it is a destination dock that could be paddled over to, individuals could have the ability to pull their water craft out in order to visit the site.

Mr. Botkin did not think it was a logical site for water access necessarily, but it could be a water-based destination point.

(9) Andrea Gaffney read the written comments submitted by Maureen Gaffney, Senior Bay Trail Planner, San Francisco Bay Trail, as follows:

Maureen Gaffney noted that the interim trail on the southeast side is dimensioned at 8 feet. She suggested that it be the full 12- to 15-foot dimension, if possible, because it is a connection piece that connects to an existing Bay Trail facility at India Basin Open Space.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if there is a sense that regrading will be necessary to accommodate that wider width in the interim.

Ms. Cox stated they will have to look at it to make that determination.

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

Ms. McCann stated the design is excellent and the progress from the last review in 2016 is terrific. She stated it is unusual to see a design that is reflective of the stakeholder partners and a process where many members of the public provided their comments tonight about the way in which the process has been undertaken. She stated it can be seen in the design that that has grown in a great way from the stakeholder process. She stated there is no single design hand; it is a true collective design that is going in a great direction.

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

(1) Does the proposed design provide adequate, usable, and attractive public access that maximizes the public's use and enjoyment of the area?

(a) Would the proposed design for the Park encourage diverse activities and create a "sense of place," which is unique, enjoyable, and inviting to the public?

(b) Do the proposed public access improvements create diverse recreational opportunities for people of all races, cultures, ages, abilities, and income levels?

(c) Are the program areas distributed and designed to meet and balance the needs of the public? Are there any additional considerations to making the waterfront an inviting space for the public to enjoy?

(d) Are there adequate micro-climate considerations for all users, such as access to wind protection and shade?

Ms. McCann stated project proponents are doing an excellent job on access. Stakeholder input today indicated that safety is a key priority.

Ms. McCann stated her interpretation of the plan and the sections indicates that there is a good open view corridor from Innes Avenue down to the Bay. That is critical for the local community and it has been a priority to keep that view from the beginning. She commended the project proponents for keeping a good, strong view corridor to the water.

Ms. Alschuler asked Ms. McCann if she had thoughts on the stairs on either side framing two site buildings that set up the view.

Ms. McCann stated the framing of the view corridor with the two buildings, not just the physical framing but the active uses in those two buildings, bookends the park. She stated it is a critical layer; clearly, there has been a lot of community engagement on this. The uses in those buildings are excellent. They have been developed with a lot of thought and interaction. She stated she liked that those uses frame the view corridor and she liked the way the site steps down and the corridor expands and opens up. She stated she liked the subtlety of the sloping piers. It is an interesting idea.

Ms. Alschuler stated there is an issue of balance between opening up the view and what happens on the edges to set that up. She stated it is good to have active uses there where there are eyes on the park, but it is important for the design to be adaptable. It is seen all over the city in every location that it is difficult to hold onto food uses. The space will need to be flexible.

Ms. McCann stated the success of the park will depend on great events programming and having the right stakeholders to continue to hold a series of events at the site. That needs to continue for the park to realize everything that the community hopes it to be.

Ms. Barton stated part of that programming and connecting individuals to this site must be traffic or safety management because it sounds like it is behind schedule.

Ms. Alschuler stated the routes and the connections need to be discussed in more detail. Innes Avenue is hard to imagine after thinking about this rather small park. She stated interim uses and access onto the site will be critical. She suggested that the project proponents work with the city to use that whole area such as painting it so the crossing is obvious for the whole length of the park. She stated it will help tell traffic to slow down and that pedestrians will be there.

Ms. Barton stated painting options have been tested and used successfully in several places.

Mr. Leader stated the project proponents have put thought toward the types of events that can be done. A variety of activities could be done and activity is needed along the edges looking down. The area below has a lot of open, programmable space on decks and piers and there is programming complexity coming out of the public process.

Mr. Leader stated it needs to be demonstrated specifically how those things can be delivered because things are vague right now. He suggested real, credible-to-the-community specificity about what those are, how they will work, and the stories that will be told. There is a detailed, specific history at this site in terms of boatbuilding and the things done then. There is also detail on specific stories that the community would like to have told, as well.

Mr. Leader commented on the decks and piers. One pier has the shop as an identity-builder, but the other one does not seem to have that same potential yet. He suggested introducing something about boat building or boat repair that would help give a name to that pier, as well.

Mr. Leader stated funding for staff and management would be key. Someone, such as a ranger, needs to run the Shipwright's Cottage and other facilities, tell the stories, and maintain the schedule. He stated the project may not be as much of a success without great events happening at the bottom area of the project.

Mr. Leader stated a circuitous route to get vehicles to the area to unload may be a deterrent. He stated, if there was an easier way to get to the unloading area, it might be used more often.

Ms. Alschuler stated the connection may be with the 700 Innes project and the circuitous route is just to be used in the interim. She stated a road will be put in next to the site that could be used as a drop off or turnaround area.

Ms. Alschuler commended the project proponents for Exhibit 15, pier event options. It is important to show the area being used in different ways to help get a sense of scale.

Mr. Battalio suggested that the design include more natural area.

Mr. Pellegrini commended the inclusion of drawings that communicate the design process. They are helpful in communicating intent. He stated the buildings that are added to the site have a wonderful transparent jewel box quality. There is a need to balance that with questions about durability and maintenance.

Mr. Pellegrini urged a continuation of the idea that the buildings on this site can feel public, open, and transparent, even when they are closed. Allowing individuals to see down into the structures from above as opposed to big roof forms will go a long way towards making the site feel public. He stated his hope that that concept will continue as the design is developed.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the maintenance question is an issue.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested thinking about durable materials, even down to where an edge needs to be put along the marsh or dock.

Ms. Alschuler emphasized the importance of the programming and telling the story about environmental justice and the history of the site.

Ms. Alschuler stated 30 percent of the population is under ten years old; that is unusual, especially in San Francisco. She suggested programming with a diverse family use and safety focus that fits with that, along with time-of-day sharing and management, which are critical.

(2) Are the connections to and through the public access spaces adequate and appropriate to maximize the public's use and enjoyment of the site?

(a) Are the connections to the Bay Trail and adjacent properties appropriate, usable, and enjoyable?

(b) Does the Board anticipate conflicts or congestion points along the Bay Trail, and what measures could be taken to avoid or minimize such conflicts?

Ms. Alschuler stated the need to look at not only the site but how it relates to the surrounding area because it is clear that what is critically important is to connect to this community. The tests that were done with the new criteria for the Community Vulnerability Index suggest that it is critical to connect.

Mr. Leader stated his concern about drop-off areas and service vehicles.

Mr. Pellegrini stated there is curbside access today that would be there in the future. He stated there could be a drop-off but individuals would have to find their way down while carrying their belongings. Additional study might be needed on that to understand the feasibility of making access more convenient from the Innes Avenue side.

Mr. Leader agreed that making access more convenient would encourage activity.

Ms. Alschuler agreed with recommending a feasibility study both in the interim and long-term because it is a large space that has the capacity for many individuals who have to have water, service, and the ability to get there, drop things off, and pick things up.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about lighting. This is another layer that needs to come down on this scheme. He stated how it might access these areas both from the street and from the parking areas along the Bay Trail and how that is introduced into the landscape would be important to better understand.

Ms. Alschuler stated the parking area is quite a distance but the bus stop is right there.

Ms. McCann stated the way that circulation is organized inside the site works well. She agreed with Mr. Pellegrini's earlier comments about safety, pedestrian crossing, loading and unloading, time controls on the curb, and the color of the curb in that zone.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested changing how materials are treated at the ground plane. He stated, traveling from Innes Avenue down to the water, the Bay Trail passes across the site. He suggested treating the ground plane in a way that suggests that access down to the water is primary so that individuals on the Bay Trail coming across the big public access space encounter a material change at the Bay Trail level to help them understand they are entering a park environment.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested an indication at the ground plane that communicates to cyclists that they should behave differently – that individuals might be invited to linger and that it is not a through-space in that environment. He suggested that putting some thought to the ground plane materials and how they transition to the docks might help lessen conflict in that area.

(3) Is the location and design of the proposed floating dock appropriate?

(a) Are there adequate support facilities proposed, including in terms of parking, restrooms, equipment storage for launching and landing hand-powered watercraft?

Mr. Battalio stated the floating dock is cool and the long gangway probably makes it ADA accessible. He asked what happens to the dock at low tide. He stated he liked the water access as something that individuals can do, but did not quite understand what the marine rail was.

Ms. Gaffney stated the marine rails were identified as contributing factors in the Environmental Impact Report.

Mr. Battalio stated Marine Rails 1 and 2 are listed on the table on the presentation slide of the sea level rise criteria with elevations of 10 and 15. He asked why they are included in the sea level rise criteria.

Mr. Battalio stated the question about access for launching and landing small watercraft was brought up earlier. He stated his understanding that there will not be a separate launching or landing facility so storage or vehicular access will not be required. This type of programming makes it simpler. The idea is that individuals landing and leaving the short-term visitor boat dock, visiting the site, and returning to their boat can be easily accommodated.

Mr. Leader asked if it was concluded that kayaks should not land there.

Mr. Battalio stated he did not see a problem with kayaks being allowed to dock on a short-term basis.

Mr. Leader stated adding a primitive rack or something to help kayakers land there would be great.

(4) Does the proposed project address potential conflicts between sensitive habitat and public access uses?

Mr. Battalio stated his comment also applies to Question 1. He stated the natural areas of the marshes and shores are constrained. There is a road, a bicycle trail being pulled off the road, and new piers that are nice but they are people-centric. He stated, at sea level rise, the marshes will be underwater more and will be trying to move upslope and there is little space for that. He asked to what extent the community is interested in providing natural area experiences and to what extent this park does that. He asked if the marshes and shores were an important part of the programming.

Mr. Battalio stated this is a congested site and the design tries to get a lot out of it. It seems like the natural environment is more squeezed than ideally it would be.

Ms. Barton stated the need to look at the area as a whole. There is a huge interest in birding, but this central core area is more of a human habitat. She stated some natural environmental elements come and go along the shoreline.

Mr. Battalio suggested filling into the Bay and extending the marshes out into the Bay. He stated it is nice for individuals to get away from all the noise and have the opportunity to listen to nature.

Ms. Barton agreed. She stated it would have to be protected going forward. Too much development would begin to encroach on the natural environment. Part of this is watching the edge of the development. The Board asked these questions in 2016, specifically about what happens with sea level rise. She stated what happens is that the habitat disappears.

Mr. Battalio stated his understanding that a shore existed in this location before but the area is constrained all around. He stated it would be nice into the future to still have some wetlands or emergent vegetated marsh.

Ms. Barton pointed to an area where they are scheduled on a slide and stated it would be good to see what is happening on a regional map.

Mr. Battalio stated his understanding that there will be many access needs, the multipurpose bicycle trail will be moved out from the road, and walking trails will be put out beyond that. He stated these design features will compromise the natural area. The emergent marsh vegetation and the transitional, slightly-higher vegetation that is currently included in the plan will be squeezed out.

Mr. Pellegrini stated there is a question about how public it can be and where access needs to be restricted in order to allow the habitat to recover and remain in place once it is recovered. He stated, although this was discussed at the 2016 review, it is unclear that there is an area that is more or less at the existing grade. He stated the idea is that it will be receded and allowed to grow the natural groundcover again. He asked to what degree that needs to be fenced off in order to make that happen.

Ms. Alschuler stated two paths were discussed in 2016. When the Board asked about it in 2016, the discussion was about natural materials but there was also mention of the job site feeling like a Victorian garden. She stated those things do not fit together. She asked if it is a matter of its elevation or irrigation methods. She asked if the Board needs or wants to be specific about that to give the most benefit to the habitat.

Ms. Barton stated one issue with habitat is about pets. This needs to be considered.

Ms. Barton stated there is a small habitat and a natural shoreline that is available and will need to be protected, if it is to be instructive in that way. She stated, if the habitat will be let go on this site, the habitat will have the broader areas in other locations around the Bay.

Ms. Barton stated, regarding the Victorian Garden, of the type of plant materials that are workable here, native plants are always discussed first, but the term “adaptive plants” makes the most sense because there will be residual soil issues and irrigation and water content issues. She stated it is fine to include the idea that there will be adaptive plants, which can also include native or Victorian plants. It needs research from the beginning so everyone is not disappointed and it does not become too expensive.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the basic areas that require adaptive plants, where freedom can be given beyond that, such as because of this site, its remediation, or its connection to other areas.

Ms. Barton stated there is a wonderful idea about gardens that bring individuals to a site. She stated all sites are different. It is important to understand the water and the soil so the right plants are selected to deliver those gardens and so those plants will survive and thrive.

Ms. McCann referred to the color-coded planting exhibit and stated her interpretation is that the Victorian-inspired planting palette was at the higher levels adjacent to heritage buildings. That is appropriate.

Ms. Barton stated it is appropriate as long as the plants are maintained. She stated the importance of researching and fitting the plants appropriately to the locations, whatever plants are incorporated into the design.

(5) Is the public access designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise or flooding?

Ms. Alschuler stated what is seen from looking at the sections is that the site will evolve and become smaller over time or seasonally and there is not an attempt to try to stop that from happening.

Ms. Barton agreed and stated the design is light on the water and the land, which is what is beautiful about it. It will allow that process to happen.

Mr. Battalio stated the sea level rise criteria, as discussed earlier, looked reasonable for a park. He stated the only issue is the shoreline squeeze.

f. **Applicant Response.** Ms. Cox responded positively to the Board’s discussion and suggestions. She stated the project team will take the Board’s comments into consideration and will come up with an improved design.

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

(1) Generally, design improvement is good.

- (2) Program is responsive to outreach.
- (3) Primary concerns: safety, access, and family-oriented.
- (4) Address diversity.
- (5) Show more about the view corridors.
- (6) Consider the views as the design of the park continues to develop.
- (7) Ensure that the buildings are used and programmed.
- (8) Events will be key to the success of the park.
- (9) Traffic management should also be included in programming.
- (10) Include a robust programming and management component.
- (11) Ensure that there is high-quality maintenance.
- (12) Look at temporary improvements for Innes Avenue to slow traffic down and invite individuals out to the water.
- (13) Balance programming with opportunities for recreation.
- (14) How will different events work in the space? Get down to those details and show how it will work.
- (15) Identify which events the community wants.
- (16) Tell the stories of the history of the site through interpretation, including the restoration and environmental justice issues, community diversity, and history of the boat works.
- (17) Find something to identify the pier that does not have the shop building on it to make it more distinct.
- (18) Revisit the service routing down to the waterfront. If the Griffith Avenue alignment will alleviate this, then ensure to address that. How will it work in the interim?
- (19) Natural areas constrain shoreline. How will that marsh edge adapt over time? What is the relationship between that natural edge and the public access? How will that boundary or that edge be detailed?
- (20) Ensure that the dock extends out past the mudline.
- (21) Provide an opportunity for Phase I water access for hand-launched craft.
- (22) Explain what happens with sea level rise and how the marine rails will be impacted.
- (23) Connections to the community.
- (24) Access to the water side needs to be prioritized over Bay Trail access. Down is primary.

- (25) Have an interim plan and a long-term plan.
- (26) Lighting is important. Develop that as an integrated experience into the plan.
- (27) Prioritize the ground plane material treatment in inviting individuals down to the waterfront over transverse Bay Trail access, if an understanding is reached that there will be no fencing or restrictions of access to the area.
- (28) Differentiate the area where there is a mixing zone.
- (29) Invite individuals to slow down.
- (30) Ensure, when further developing the buildings on the site, that they feel public, even when they are closed.
- (31) Maintain the jewel box quality and characteristic.
- (32) Ensure that the edges and fences are open details where boundaries will be respected that tie into pet policies. Where are pets allowed? Where can individuals watch birds?
- (33) Approach the planting from an adaptive planting palette that is responsive to the adjacent context as the planting areas move down to the waterfront.
- (34) Maintain a resilient design.
- (35) Recognize that the area will change over time. Celebrate that; do not fight against it.

The Board did not request another review of this project unless major changes are made to the design. The Board asked the project proponents to continue to work closely with staff to ensure that their comments and suggestions are carried out as the project is further developed.

**6. Oyster Point Phases 2-4, City of South San Francisco, San Mateo County (First Pre-Application Review).** The Board held their first pre-application review of a proposal by Kilroy Oyster Point Development for the final phases of the Oyster Point Specific Plan to redevelop the Oyster Point peninsulas. These phases will involve the construction of several office buildings, a parking structure, enhancement of the Bay Trail, and additional shoreline amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Morgan Chow, BCDC Coastal Program Analyst, introduced the project, showed a video from a recent site visit moving from the southwestern end to the northern edge of the project site, and described points of interest as the video played. She summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the project:

- (1) Provides adequate, usable, and attractive public access that maximizes public use and enjoyment of the area.
  - (a) Includes a design for the Park that encourages diverse activities and creates a “sense of place,” which is unique, enjoyable, and inviting to the public.

(b) Includes public access improvements that create diverse recreational opportunities for people of all races, cultures, ages, abilities, and income levels.

(2) Includes public access amenities that are sited and designed to maximize public use.

(a) Includes Activity, Coastal, and Science Rooms that are an appropriate enhancement to the peninsula open space. Includes Activity, Coastal, and Science Rooms that are distributed and designed to meet and balance the needs of the public.

(b) Includes adequate micro-climate considerations for all users, such as access to wind protection and shade.

(c) Includes amenities and renovations that expand the enjoyment of the shoreline experience.

(d) Includes parking areas that are suitable for the park. Includes ample parking that will be reserved for and used by the general public visiting the park and/or beach area.

(e) Includes a tree palette that is complimentary to the existing vegetation and tidal marsh adjacent to the site.

(3) Includes an arrangement of the various facilities proposed within the Park, including trails, meadows, lawns, beach, BBQ areas, and other amenities, that result in the best possible configuration in terms of circulation, views, enjoyment, and safety.

(a) Provides for adequate circulation through the peninsula for a variety of users.

(b) Alleviates conflicts or congestion points, and includes measures to avoid or minimize such conflicts.

(c) Preserves and enhances important views to the Bay.

(d) Includes sufficient and welcoming invitations and experiences of the public's movement through the campus to the waterfront.

(4) Includes public access areas and amenities that are appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise.

b. **Project Presentation.** Jonas Vass, Senior Vice President of Development, Kilroy Oyster Point Development (KOP), summarized the background of the project and introduced the project team.

Richard Kennedy, Senior Principal, James Corner Field Operations, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the context, existing site conditions, and a detailed description of the proposed project, including the canopy plan, planting palette, sea level rise, pedestrian circulation, and Phases 2, 3, and 4.

Jonathan Ward, Design Partner, NBBJ, continued the slide presentation and discussed the arrangement of the buildings and why they have been positioned that way, the science room concept, site and architecture relationship, public connectivity and visibility, and wind mitigation.

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

Ms. Alschuler stated the park, marina, and ferry will have a large-scale attraction to that location. She asked why individuals would come to this site, what the destination would be for families and other visitors, what they would do at the site, and if the project proponents have thought about active recreation for individuals working at the site.

Mr. Kennedy stated it is mostly gathering spaces and hanging spaces at the proposed site. He stated there is an idea that, in the rooms that flank the Bay Trail, they alternate between picnic areas and exercise equipment to draw individuals out of doors and out to the Bay.

Ms. Alschuler asked for verification that the site would include fitness gyms.

Mr. Kennedy stated one indoor fitness gym is included in the plan.

Ms. Alschuler stated this is a population that works incredible hours and are there all the time. They could benefit from a fitness gym, outdoor fitness equipment, and picnic areas.

Mr. Kennedy stated amenity pavilions have been included in the design, which have their own expression. He pointed out the two-level indoor gym to be built in Phase 2. He stated putting health and fitness at the center of one of the science rooms is important both for the employees and for the public.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the gym was the oval building depicted on a presentation slide.

Mr. Kennedy stated the gym was in Building A-1. He displayed a slide of the overall plan and pointed out the gym, food and beverage facilities, and the main amenity attractions that will bring the workforce out of the buildings for the lunch hour or at the end of the day, but also bring the public from the waterfront into the interior spaces.

Mr. Kennedy stated what makes the site a destination is the opportunities to take a stroll, go to the beach, grab a bite to eat at one of the cafés, or bicycle through a connected Bay Trail experience. There are no radical big moves of attractions. It is low-key. The design creates many addresses where individuals can perch and gather in small groups or larger groups where the workplace can have meetings outdoors.

Mr. Kennedy stated the site is peppered with furnishings to invite light activity such as at the beach. The design has a relatively informal series of collections that are varied enough that individuals can find their favorite spot to pull off to the side, relax, or grab a bite to eat. This is a major transformation of use from what there is today. It is not urban; it is not so dense that these spaces can afford to be large.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the materials suggest that the site will accommodate 7,000 to 10,000 employees and a fairly quick build-out with Phase 1 happening in two years and Phases 2, 3, and 4 continuing after that. He asked about the anticipated rate of how the project will emerge over time and what it would take to get to full capacity.

Mr. Kennedy stated Phases 1 and 2 are relatively commensurate in size and Phases 3 and 4 are slightly smaller because they contain two buildings instead of three. He stated each phase, which will happen over a two- to three-year period, will accommodate a workforce of approximately 2,000 to 3,000 individuals.

Mr. Kennedy stated Phases 1 and 2 accommodate a workforce of approximately 3,000 individuals each, and Phases 3 and 4 accommodate a workforce of approximately 2,000 individuals each for a total of approximately 10,000 individuals.

Mr. Kennedy stated there will also be individuals who are working on the cove and in areas closer to Highway 101 that are also under construction or being inhabited. He stated the Phase 1 Waterfront Park will be an attraction. He stated there will start to be a comingling of the workforce within this project, the other Oyster Point developments, and the public who will begin to see this as a destination.

Mr. Pellegrini asked for verification that the reconstruction of the Bay Trail and the public access to the shoreline will follow Phases 3 and 4.

Mr. Kennedy agreed.

Mr. Pellegrini stated it appears this is a potentially long-range project with a build-out of 1.7 million square feet that would follow market demand, but the improvements along the shoreline would follow the phases.

Mr. Kennedy stated approximately 40 percent of the 1.7 million square feet build-out is part of Phase 2, which is much larger than Phases 3 and 4, and would not affect the existing Bay Trail.

Mr. Kennedy stated Phase 3 includes building the leg around the point and the adjacent Bay Trail. It will take approximately two and a half years to build out and requires the Bay Trail to be diverted.

Mr. Kennedy stated the timeline is predicated on market conditions. If it keeps leasing the way it currently is, it will happen very rapidly, meaning one year between each phase. If the market slows, the phases would also start slow.

Mr. Kennedy stated Phase 4 is the last leg around the point, the Bay Trail will be diverted during construction, and then reopened. That work will be done concurrent with the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the timeline for the reconstruction of Oyster Point Boulevard.

Mr. Kennedy stated the reconfigured Oyster Point and Marina are currently being built. The plan is for the road to open possibly this summer. The road will be completed and the existing Bay Trail improvements and the beach will be completed prior to the end of 2021. He stated the last leg to the turnaround will be done during Phase 3.

Mr. Pellegrini stated each phase of the building program is connected to whatever future user would occupy that phase. He asked to what degree those footprints are flexible to suit the needs of future users.

Mr. Kennedy stated the design is life science targeted but it is adaptable for various users.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if there is any question or concern that the non-Bay Trail publicly accessible spaces would change in configuration as a result of the desires of the individual user.

Mr. Kennedy stated that is not the idea. The project is under a separate application with the city of South San Francisco on the precise plan. He stated the broad strokes are currently being worked on.

Mr. Battalio asked for verification that all the buildings are outside of the BCDC jurisdictional band.

Mr. Kennedy stated they are.

Mr. Battalio stated, as far as public access goes, especially the near-term sea-level rise analysis seemed reasonable, but the 5.5 feet in 2100 is lower than the state's current guidance for the medium/high-risk scenario. It should be more like 6 to 7 feet by year 2100. He speculated that the largest issue is associated with the finished floor in the buildings.

Mr. Kennedy agreed.

Mr. Battalio asked about what is happening in the rocky area that is shown at Item 11, marsh, on Presentation Slide 20. He stated it looks like there is a trail that dead-ends out towards the water, which is cool. He asked what happens between Items 11 and 12. He stated the rendering indicates that the area is rocky. He asked if a space for wetlands could be designed in that area because something natural in that area rather than the hardscape would be good.

Mr. Kennedy stated Item 11 is the existing tidal marsh. He stated everything north of Item 11 and west of the marina is quite shallow. That comes to a certain point and then the riprap wall grows from there. He stated the rock is quite high in that location, either because the site was built up relatively high when it was constructed or because it has not settled because of the bedrock. He noted that the rock is already close to where it needs to be according to the 2100 sea level rise guidance.

Mr. Kennedy stated the south area is a little shallow so, in the 2100 projection, it does overtop in the Item 12 location. The elevation will be built up but only from the riprap up. He noted that repairs to the riprap are not planned.

Mr. Battalio asked if there was an opportunity to do something different there.

Mr. Kennedy stated the Bay Trail meanders back and forth, weaving its way through the site, but there is a little prong that comes out and points right over the marsh directly to San Bruno Hill. There is an overlook there. It will be a scenic moment to perch above the marsh and see the view.

Mr. Battalio stated there is an opportunity in that low-energy area to provide space for the wetlands to migrate with sea level rise.

Mr. Battalio stated his understanding that the beach is above the Bay.

Mr. Kennedy agreed. He stated it is more of a beach-like deck.

Mr. Battalio suggested considering coarser sand due to the windy location to keep it from blowing around.

Mr. Kennedy agreed and stated the same issue has occurred at the Presidio.

Mr. Leader stated the elevation of the Bay Trail is good until 2050. He asked what will happen to the Bay Trail after that.

Mr. Kennedy stated a plan of adaptation would have to be developed, managed either by the way the coastal rooms are adapted or the way that the Bay Trail was made. The same is true for Phase 1. That is something that needs to be articulated in the permitting.

Mr. Kennedy stated, given the square footage that is being created, the project site has been designed to keep vehicles out of the development. He noted that everything west of Oyster Point Boulevard is pedestrian. Part of the network of circulation is that there is emergency vehicle access to all buildings using pedestrian surfaces and the Bay Trail. He stated, in addition to the wind assessment that led to the arrangement of the buildings, the emergency vehicle access is quite a puzzle to work out. The net result of having it fully pedestrianized is good.

Mr. Battalio asked to discuss the Bay Trail elevation relative to sea level rise. He stated it looks like it would be inundated at a two-year storm in the year 2100, according to the staff report.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the amount of public and publicly accessible open space has been quantified, and if the differential between what is there today and what is being proposed in this development has been quantified.

Mr. Kennedy stated it has been done. He pointed out the information on an exhibit.

Ms. Alschuler stated her understanding that the existing Bay Trail is approximately 2,500 linear feet long and 8 feet wide.

Mr. Kennedy stated that is from the center line.

Ms. Alschuler stated it becomes approximately the same amount of linear feet but 20 feet wide. When the linear feet are made 20 feet wide as opposed to 8 feet wide, there are more square feet of hardscape, which is the next total on the presentation slide. She stated that ends up being even.

Mr. Leader stated that must be in addition to the Bay Trail.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the hardscape includes the Bay Trail.

Mr. Kennedy stated the Bay Trail is in Public Use Hardscape, but that is not only Bay Trail. The Bay Trail is only quantified in the top line, linear footage and width. The Public Use Hardscape is everything within the Bay jurisdiction that is hardscape.

Mr. Kennedy stated the proposed project has 20,000 square feet of Public Use Hardscape and an additional 100,000 square feet of parking, effectively, whereas the total hardscape within the public use area of the project is all public use, which is 95,000 square feet. He noted that the Bay Trail is a subset of that. The area of Bay Trail has not yet been quantified.

Mr. Battalio asked how the storm drainage will work.

Mr. Kennedy stated all the areas identified with a red outline on the presentation slide are bioretention areas. Everything is being collected and retained on site.

Mr. Battalio asked if there are storm drain outfalls.

Mr. Kennedy stated there are existing outfalls; the design does not add any.

Ms. Barton asked if the BCDC jurisdictional line rises with sea level rise.

Ms. Gaffney stated the jurisdiction is measured at the point in time that the applicant applies for the permit. The jurisdiction moves as the mean high water moves.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the experience of making the loop through the site. A family would want to go to the big park. She stated they could then bicycle around the site but there are not many pleasant loops to ride. They could ride to the end and then turn around and come back. They could go to the middle crossing between Phases 3 and 4, but that leads to the parking garage and the adjacent site, which is not yet developed, but they could go down and come back by way of Oyster Point Boulevard. She stated the ride to the first crossing between Phases 2 and 3 may be the most attractive because that at least goes to the beach.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out the main loop for touring this project in isolation. The idea is to provide access to the Bay Trail, which already exists today. He noted that the main loop includes the Bay Trail. He stated this parcel slices diagonally in a certain location he pointed out on the presentation slide. He stated the reason this wide zone takes a bend and connects in is because of the emergency vehicle access. He stated the Bay Trail is being connected in that location and that stays continuously. He stated this loop around the square northern piece of the peninsula is the main loop.

Mr. Kennedy stated a larger loop, a kind of master loop, would be to go around the full edge of the peninsula and wrap all the way to the tip of the peninsula where there is a cross path that comes back. Visitors to the site will be able to navigate that master loop. He noted that a shortcut would be to go through the promenade, head directly to the beach, and go out to the peninsula. He stated the public would most likely stay on the water side rather than go into the interior of the site.

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

(1) Lucia Lachmayr, resident and boat owner, stated this is a beautiful project. She stated she has a boat at Oyster Cove Marina and has gone to the initial planning phases back when they did them. She stated she is concerned because some things are not what they were before for the Oyster Cove Marina community.

Ms. Lachmayr stated her concern that the boats in the pictures have been erased, the name "Oyster Cove Marina" has been changed to just "Marina," and no facilities for the live-aboard community have been included in the plans. She pointed the Oyster Cove Marina out for the Board on a presentation slide. She stated the live-aboard community is concerned because more and more restrictions are being placed on them; the community is concerned about being displaced.

Ms. Lachmayr stated her appreciation for the wide variety of spaces but asked for more open spaces for wildlife to be incorporated into the design because much of the green space has been taken away.

Ms. Lachmayr stated the roadways are already congested. She stated her concern about adding 7,000 workers to the daily commute in the area. She suggested widening Oyster Point Boulevard to accommodate the increased traffic.

Ms. Lachmayr stated the individuals who live aboard are generally older adults. She noted the distances that would be required to walk at the site. She stated it not only is an ADA issue but a humanitarian one.

Ms. Lachmayr stated there are 70 vehicle parking spots reserved for boat owners. When she first attended a community engagement meeting, she was told there would be many spots. She stated 70 spots will not accommodate who goes there occasionally. She stated, on a weekend or on a sunny day, the small number of spaces will not work.

Ms. Lachmayr stated boat owners need facilities as well, particularly for boat owners who get soaked while boating in the Bay, especially sailors. Sailboats do not have a built-in shower. She stated she uses the showers on shore but she stated it does not seem that the project proponents are thinking about the marina.

Ms. Lachmayr stated the low footprint that was mentioned at the beginning of the presentation seems like it is a high footprint to her, especially for the quantity of services that are available there. She stated police do not have access to the site to patrol in non-emergency situations as they normally do at the front of the marina.

Ms. Lachmayr stated she doubted that individuals will go to the big public parking garage and then take their families and walk down the steps to go bicycling. She stated they just pull up now and park and bring their families out. There are no big open spaces like there is currently for playing frisbee. There is also a lack of garbage and recycling bins.

Ms. Lachmayr suggested xeriscape landscaping that requires little or no irrigation.

(2) Shirley Lau, local employee and water sport enthusiast, stated she works for Kaiser, which is on the Marina, paddles at the Oyster Point Marina, and comes to the proposed site seven days a week. She stated she has been following this project because it is important for her and her community. She stated her concerns are similar to the concerns of the previous speaker.

Ms. Lau stated one of her concerns is the traffic. She stated it takes her at least 20 minutes to travel the one mile to the freeway on her drive home after work because there are only two lanes going each way. She stated it would be difficult to add another 7,000 individuals to the roadway who will be employed at the proposed site, especially during an emergency situation. She suggested making another way in to provide an alternative access route.

Ms. Lau stated Ms. Alschuler asked what would bring individuals to the site. She stated the proposed site is currently a hidden gem. There is a lot of fun to be had in this area. She stated there are swimmers at the beach, individuals playing with dogs, pedestrians and bicycles on the Bay Trail, and individuals paddling all the way around from Oyster Point Marina to Oyster Cove.

Ms. Lau stated the water sport community paddles quite a distance. They also go down to Sierra Point and the San Francisco International Airport. The proposed site has been the paddling community's hub as a great place to park their boats. She suggested that, in the future, if possible, this will be a great site to run international races because the hotel will be built in the next phase, which will bring revenue and opportunity for individuals to come in and enjoy this area. She stated this is why she is concerned about the single way in and out of the area and how that will be impacted now and in the future.

Following the public hearing, the Board asked a series of additional questions:

Mr. Battalio stated it is interesting that it sounds like the marina has some access but no landside facilities. He asked if there is a relationship between the Oyster Cove Marina and the development.

Matthew Griffin, Senior Vice President of Northern California, KOP, stated the current marina has been left off of the design at this time. No changes are currently being proposed.

Mr. Griffin stated there are three parking lots with surface parking – two that are adjacent to the Bay Trail and one in the middle – that accommodate the parking obligation.

Ms. Alschuler stated that is also the public parking.

Mr. Griffin stated that is correct. The parking has been combined for Bay Trail parking and marina parking in those three surface parking locations.

Mr. Kennedy stated the marina has not been left out but the presentation slide colors are washed out. The intent is for the marina to remain another part of the waterfront experience, but its activity and life is separate from the life science campus. It has a different user base.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the total number of parking spaces in the three surface lots.

Mr. Griffin stated there are a total of 70 parking spaces in the south, center, and north surface parking lots.

Mr. Battalio stated, based on public comment, the traffic is bad. He asked if widening the local road would help.

Mr. Griffin stated the traffic is part of the Environmental Impact Report planning. He stated the specific plan entitles this much development and the proposed project is consistent with the specific plan. He stated the transportation measures and impacts are being studied.

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

(1) Does the proposed project provide adequate, usable, and attractive public access that maximizes public use and enjoyment of the area?

(a) Would the proposed design for the Park encourage diverse activities and create a “sense of place,” which is unique, enjoyable, and inviting to the public?

(b) Do the proposed public access improvements create diverse recreational opportunities for people of all races, cultures, ages, abilities, and income levels?

Mr. Leader referred to Ms. Alschuler’s question about the destination that will draw the public out to the site, in that it is all fairly passive and provides passive activities. He stated he wished the programming of the building-oriented amenities could provide more public access. He gave the example of cyclists utilizing the restaurants and the fitness club on weekdays. He stated fitness clubs are also open on weekends.

Mr. Leader stated the hardest thing will be to draw individuals to the site on weekends. There are a lot of materials here that could also be public space, if they were not intended to be separated from the activities along the waterfront. It seems like an opportunity lies there.

Mr. Leader stated he was also struck by the fact that the marina is not part of the consideration. He stated he understood why, but stated there may be an opportunity for one of the gangplanks to cater to the marina that might also be interesting to

the public in general, such as a grocery store or taco bar or something where individuals can stop along there on the weekends and have lunch.

Ms. Alschuler suggested making it a fantastic place for the Water Trail to have a stop where individuals would gather, easily raft their boats, and eat lunch.

Mr. Leader agreed that there is room for that to fit, depending on the design.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he was struggling with the fact that the Board knows something about the census tract and understands that this is a quality section of the Bay Trail and that it gets used, but the Board does not know additional information about the potential groups that could be drawn in and how they could be drawn in. That would be useful information to help make this decision.

Mr. Pellegrini stated it is still unclear about who the potential user is at the proposed site and how the spaces could be crafted for the off-peak and weekend times.

Ms. Alschuler stated there is a regional ferry stop in this location.

Mr. Pellegrini stated it may be useful for the project proponents to explore weekday and weekend scenarios to point out how the spaces might be used when they are occupied by the individuals who are office or office-related users, and what might happen on weekends when there is a different population that might be invited into these spaces.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the parti is strong; this is not an easy site to have a strong parti emerge. That should be commended. There is a clear increase in the public and publicly-accessible space that is coming in with a huge increase in the amount of program, and that also is commendable.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the user access and the user experience still raise questions. He stated he envisions a beautiful corporate campus environment but that is not a destination for the weekend.

Ms. Alschuler stated maybe it is important to see what Phase 2 does. She suggested that the design demonstrates that individuals can make that loop around, they can end up at the beach, and go from one of the larger parts of the public space to another larger part of the public space. She stated the design currently does not have the sightline that it should because of the looming parking garage. She stated it would be a big addition to the public experience if that could be an attractive feature.

Ms. Alschuler suggested ensuring that this site is great and the buildings are not off-putting to the public by the way they are put in. She suggested including a recreation destination where individuals would want to pull off to get some exercise.

Mr. Leader stated he is worried that the fitness center is buried deep inside the site. There are landforms lifting up close to the shore. He asked if there was some recreation component that could be out there. There is plenty of program and design here to be attractive to the public; it is just a question of how it is arranged or oriented that feels more public than it does right now.

Ms. Barton agreed and added another question of how the public will come to the programming and then leave. It is not only the responsibility of the developers; it is the responsibility of the city. She asked how the city is adapting to this.

Mr. Pellegrini paraphrased what Ms. Alschuler was suggesting. He stated, from a parti standpoint, Ms. Alschuler was talking about the east-west connection between the beach on the Oyster Point Marina side and the prominent marina-oriented space on the west side and about experiencing that as a central spine that may have a more public definition to it. He stated that is where the main promenade space might be defined by buildings on the sides or some corresponding treatment of the parking garage as part of the ensemble.

Ms. Alschuler agreed and added they would be like crumbs along the path to make it interesting.

Mr. Pellegrini stated, at the same time, the Board also saw that it is one of the areas where, environmentally, pieces of that are places to move through and not to linger.

Ms. Barton stated the Board was talking about people coming and going. She asked what the city is doing from a transit standpoint at this site.

Billy Gross, Senior Planner, city of South San Francisco, stated east of Highway 101 currently has approximately 28,000 jobs and no residential areas. The employment population is expected to double to approximately 54,000 employees east of Highway 101 by 2040. The city is currently going through a General Plan update.

Mr. Gross stated, from a transportation standpoint, the city is looking at what can be done. He stated traffic is bad during peak hours and getting worse, but there is easy access on Highway 101 on weekends or at off-peak times. The city is improving the Caltrain station. There currently is only one stop per hour, but the hope is to increase the stops up to four each way.

Mr. Gross stated, until the Caltrain station is completed, Commute.org does shuttles. He stated, although SamTrans does not serve this side, they are looking at their business plan, so there could be bus service. The city is also looking at increasing the Commute.org service to run more often throughout the day rather than just at peak hours.

Mr. Gross stated South San Francisco has a shuttle that primarily is in the west side but can possibly be increased to access some of the project points, as well, to help downtown residents access the project site. The city is also considering more east/west connections.

Mr. Gross stated the city collects traffic impact fees and is considering working with property owners to create a Community Facilities District in East 101. He stated access is a huge part for the city and everyone who is developing in the East 101 area because, if that part does not work, then all the successes that were achieved could potentially go away. He stated the problem is not easy, but all entities are trying to work together to help bring solutions.

Ms. Barton asked what the ferry service is doing to help alleviate the problem.

Mr. Gross stated there currently are two ferries that come in the morning. The plan is to increase that to three next year. Genentech has their own ferry that comes from the East Bay. Some of the other biotechnology developers are looking at options and considering things that they can do. He stated everyone is trying to work through some of the problems together, but there are no quick solutions.

Mr. Gross stated the city controls everything east of Phase 1. There is a hope for a hotel at that future hotel site that could be entitled this year. He stated the city agrees that the proposed site is an underused. It would be nice to be able to bring more people out. He stated the city will not be as involved in Phases 2, 3 and 4 because those are private spaces, but will be programming more of the Phase 1 spaces because the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department staff can help do some of that. He stated the design creates a lot of additional improved open space compared to what is currently there.

Mr. Leader stated it seems that the shoreline area is being provided for access. There are a lot of activities on the eastern spur of the point, such as a wind surfer launch, fishing pier, guest docks, and the ferry terminal. He stated, in context of the whole project, aside from the traffic issue, maybe it does not need to be a destination so much. It can just be a place where people can circulate.

Ms. Alschuler stated individuals will go to the public areas first but it is important that they get to experience the whole site and to see back to the city of San Bruno. She stated the Board will probably see this project again.

Ms. Gaffney asked the Board to broadly discuss the first three staff questions and to briefly touch on resiliency and adaptation.

Ms. Alschuler suggested thinking about something unusual that can be shared with the public that can be the key to unlock the site.

Mr. Leader stated there are more public amenities on the other side, but the key connection through in the interim will allow this loop to happen. He stated it is fair to ask for one serious public amenity that would operate on the weekends for individuals and then leave it up to the project proponents on how best to do it.

(2) Are the proposed public access amenities sited and designed to maximize public use?

(a) Are the Activity, Coastal, and Science Rooms an appropriate enhancement to the peninsula open space? Are they distributed and designed to meet and balance the needs of the public? Are there any additional considerations to making the waterfront an inviting space for the public to enjoy?

(b) Are there adequate micro-climate considerations for all users, such as access to wind protection and shade?

(c) Considering the planned development intensity and the beach/park priority use designation, do the proposed amenities and renovations expand the enjoyment of the shoreline experience?

(d) Are the proposed parking areas suitable for the park? Does the project include ample parking that will be reserved for and used by the general public visiting the park and/or beach area?

(e) Is the tree palette complimentary to the existing vegetation and tidal marsh adjacent to the site? Are there any concerns about wildlife compatibility with the proposed shoreline planting?

Ms. Alschuler stated it is an interesting plan with the different kinds of rooms. She asked if there is anything specific about the science and activity rooms and how they relate to the Bay Trail.

Ms. Alschuler stated only 70 parking spaces seems to be a problem if it is also the marina and Bay Trail parking, since the Bay Trail will have enhanced access. The parking should be carefully reviewed by staff.

Ms. Alschuler stated the tree palette would have to be hardy and adaptable. It is largely on the other side; maybe over the western edge is a place where they could be more protected. It depends on what is planted.

Ms. Barton stated there is a bird issue to consider with the buildings.

Mr. Pellegrini asked to consider windbreaks.

Ms. Barton stated the buildings are big windbreaks. There has been a lot of thought that has gone into wind attenuation and microclimate.

(3) Does the arrangement of the various facilities proposed within the Park, including trails, meadows, lawns, beach, BBQ areas, and other amenities, result in the best possible configuration in terms of circulation, views, enjoyment, and safety?

(a) Does the design of the project provide for adequate circulation through the peninsula for a variety of users?

(b) Does the Board anticipate conflicts or congestion points, and what measures could be taken to avoid or minimize such conflicts?

(c) Does the proposed design preserve and enhance important views to the Bay?

(d) Are the invitations and experiences of the public's movement through the campus to the waterfront sufficient and welcoming to all?

Suggestions to this question are incorporated in the suggestions to other questions.

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

Ms. Alschuler stated the need to know that the project site is adaptable and still able maintain public access around the edge of the site in some way. That needs to be thought through.

Mr. Battalio agreed. He stated, looking at the staff report, it says that the Bay Trail would be partially inundated in the year 2100 with a two-year storm event. He asked how access would be adapted to be functional more frequently or not to be impacted that frequently, if the Board is concerned about that.

Mr. Battalio stated it seems that a two-year storm event is fairly infrequent. It might be manageable but seeing the trail underwater and having water all the way out to the Bay might not be what everyone wants. He suggested some sort of adaptation might be an element to put into the plan. It should not be that difficult to lift the Bay Trail.

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

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

Ms. Alschuler stated the overlay is to think about what makes it a destination for a variety of individuals, how it is safe and comfortable, the programming, focusing on Phase 2 to see how it can be done with the detail that would come in early, and using the water as much as possible.

Mr. Battalio stated he liked the thought about providing a public element on the weekends or whenever that would be unique. He stated the rest of the peninsula has a number of typical amenities. He asked what is unique about this site that could be built upon. He suggested a rooftop place to gather with glass to protect individuals from the wind. He stated there are a number of these in Seattle and other cities. The view from on top of these buildings might be nice.

Ms. Alschuler suggested a rooftop gathering place at one of the amenity buildings.

Ms. Alschuler stated there was an interesting thought about whether there would be a place for smaller boats.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board would like to review this project again to see the public activation plan, something in Phase 1 that invites individuals to the site, and activities for the public to engage in.

Ms. Gaffney asked what the Board will look for in the next review. She stated, typically, the project proponents present how issues have been addressed and provide an update on the overall development. She asked if the Board is looking for something that is more phase specific.

Ms. Alschuler stated what is missing is a sense that there is a destination where the public would feel invited and comfortable and that they are not invading a science room. The Board has provided approximately 15 suggestions that could be added without changing the building footprints or getting in the way of the project. The place where it is most possible to add the changes is in the Phase 1 connection.

Ms. Gaffney stated these issues can be addressed in the overall Phases 2, 3, and 4 development, and then get into more specifics about the mechanics of Phase 2 and how that will continue to invite the public.

Ms. Barton stated someone mentioned there is an interesting potential for a break between Phases 2 and 3 to make it clear that it is penetrable to the public. That would not impact the buildings or the layout. It currently is unclear. There should be something different about that and it would not impact any of the wonderful things that have already happened.

Mr. Leader stated it is not a huge lift. The design is a good scheme and looks great. It just needs a public activation plan by phase.

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

**MOTION:** Mr. Leader moved to adjourn the February 10, 2020, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Battalio.

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 5 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain with Board Chair Alschuler and Board Members Barton, Battalio, Leader, and Pellegrini voting approval.

There being no further business, Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREA GAFFNEY  
Senior Landscape Architect

Approved, with no corrections, at the  
Design Review Board meeting of  
March 9, 2020

**DRB MINUTES**  
**February 10, 2020**

