

# San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

July 1, 2016

**TO:** Design Review Board Members

**FROM:** Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)  
Rafael Montes, Senior Engineer (415/352-3670; rafael.montes@bcdc.ca.gov)  
Jaime Michaels, Chief of Permits (415/352-363613; jaime.michaels@bcdc.ca.gov)

**SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of June 7, 2016 BCDC Joint Design Review Board and Engineering Criteria Review Board Meeting; and Draft Minutes of June 7, 2016 Design Review Board Meeting**

1. **Call to Order and Attendance.** BCDC Regulatory Program Director, Brad McCrea, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and noting the special circumstance of the joint review by the Engineering Criteria Review Board (ECRB) and the Design Review Board (DRB), which to his knowledge has not occurred in BCDC's history. Some members of the DRB and ECRB did jointly convene with other engineers approximately 20 years ago in meetings put on by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission when they served on the Engineering Design Advisory Panel (EDAP) to review the proposed design of the East Span of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay. BCDC Executive Director, Larry Goldzband, then took the opportunity to present a resolution of appreciation and gratitude to Design Review Board Member Steve Thompson for his more than 30 years of volunteer service to the Commission. BCDC Bay Design Analyst, Ellen Miramontes, and BCDC Senior Engineer, Rafael Montes, then explained how the meeting would proceed and noted that Design Review Board Chair, Karen Alschuler, would serve as Chair for the briefing on the Bay Area Resilient by Design Challenge and Engineering Criteria Review Board Chair, Roger Borchardt, would serve as Chair for the briefing on the Terminal One project located in Richmond.

Design Review Board Chair Alschuler called the meeting to order at approximately 1:20 p.m. Other Design Review Board members in attendance included, Cheryl Barton, Ephraim Hirsch, Tom Leader, Jacinta McCann, Stefan Pellegrini, Gary Strang, and Steve Thompson. BCDC staff in attendance included Larry Goldzband, Marc Zepetello, Brad McCrea, Rafael Montes, Ellen Miramontes, Todd Hallenbeck, and Ethan Lavine. Engineering Criteria Review Board members in attendance included, Chair Borchardt, Professor Mary Comerio, Mr. Richard Dornhelm, Mr. Jim French, Professor Martin Fischer, Dr. Lou Gilpin and Mr. Bob Battalio.

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



**2. Bay Area Resilient by Design Challenge (Briefing).** The Design Review Board and Engineering Criteria Review Board received a joint briefing on the Bay Area Resilient by Design Challenge. Project representatives at the briefing included Gil Kelley and Diana Sokolove with the San Francisco Planning Department and Competition Director Margie O’Driscoll. Mr. Kelley, who is currently serving as Chair of the Bay Area Resilient by Design Challenge Executive Committee, provided the presentation, which concluded with a series of questions for both Boards’ consideration.

Mr. Kelley began by describing the overall vision of the Bay Area Resilient by Design Challenge (challenge or competition), listing the agencies and governments involved at this point, and the current efforts to raise funds in order to carry out the competition. He explained that the intention is for the competition to be multi-disciplinary and draw upon experts in the fields of design, engineering and science to provide future visions that are both visionary as well as implementable.

Mr. Kelley explained that ten teams will be selected to then move through a collaborative research and design process. Key constituencies they would like to involve in competition efforts include: philanthropic funders, non-governmental organizations, thought leaders and academics, corporate partners, government, neighborhoods and communities. Five to six million dollars are needed to fund the competition, which they aim to kick off in January 2017. They expect for the competition process to be active January through December 2017.

One very important aspect of the process will be to directly engage communities around the Bay. The teams will spend the first six months engaging with communities and conducting extensive research prior to any design work. A regional focus will be very important along with a focus on equity. Mr. Kelley referred to the Rebuild by Design competition held in New York City following Hurricane Sandy and shared some images from the winning results for inspiration.

Mr. Kelley then posed a series of questions that covered the following: what professional skills should be required on the teams; what professional skills should be represented on the jury; names of potential jurors; evaluation of the proposed competition timeline; an appropriate stipend amount; what should be the winning criteria; and what are appropriate deliverables for each phase of the competition.

a. **Board Questions.** DRB Member McCann asked how the project sites would be selected. Mr. Kelley explained that the competition did not wish to pre-select the sites although it would ensure there would be geographically representative projects including the East Bay, South Bay, San Francisco shoreline and North Bay at a minimum. The intention is to allow great flexibility on the size of the sites selected.

DRB Member Hirsch asked how the sites for the New York competition were selected and also whether the teams would be able to focus on a specific infrastructure, such as the BART tube. Ms. O’Driscoll explained that the sites for the New York competition were selected based on whether they had been identified as “national disaster areas” during Hurricane Sandy. For this

competition, the site selection would occur by working with communities and government to determine where the most vulnerable areas are. Mr. Kelley further mentioned that there had been some discussion about including coastal communities outside of the Bay, but there have been divergent opinions on this. He underlined the importance of a clear governance structure for the competition given the decision-making process for matters such as this that will need to occur with all the different entities involved.

ECRB Member Gilpin asked about lessons that have been learned by other vulnerable cities around the world such as Venice and New Orleans. He noted that Hurricane Sandy elicited an immediate response, whereas less immediate sea level rise can be more controversial.

ECRB Member Fischer stated that in his role as a professor at Stanford University, he needs to be able to explain things quite simply to his 20-year-old students. He supposed they would ask why the current shoreline is not sufficient today, what should be done about it and then they would proposed to use the money to do that today rather than on a competition with future visions. Mr. Kelley explained that there are vastly different levels of understandings regarding sea level rise. While some people immediately understand the need to elevate sites or infrastructure, many do not and, as such, we need “to encourage the thinking that we can design whole community areas rather than project site by project site” as is done today.

ECRB Member Battalio stated that it is important for the competition to articulate that one of the competition purposes is to fill this gap in the current planning and permitting context that does not allow for and encourage designing whole community areas but rather just project site by project site. He also asked how the baseline conditions would be handled, commented on impacts that people have on the environment versus the impacts of physical and biological processes, and stated that the simple “bathtub” model of sea level rise should not be used. Mr. Kelley acknowledged that dynamic modeling rather than static will be important.

ECRB Member Battalio stated that the sea level rise modeling approaches for the teams should be clearly defined. He further stated that the competition should define the climate scenario and specify particular time periods and/or sea level rise heights.

ECRB Chair Borchardt stated that it will be important to gather the vulnerabilities early on in the process. Mr. Kelley explained that local public works directors would be involved and that their on-the-ground knowledge would be incorporated.

**d. Public Comments.** There were two public comments:

(1) Gregory Greenwood, Public Works Coordinator for Construction and Engineering with AT&T, asked how many city engineers and planners from around the region would be involved in the competition process. Mr. Kelley explained that there are already representatives from the Cities of Richmond, San Francisco, Oakland and San Jose involved and that there would be as many involved as possible.

(2) Jeff Kilbreth, who serves on the Richmond Planning Commission, stated that he was very interested in the competition for many reasons including that Richmond has a lot of land area that will need to be addressed in the face of sea level rise. He commented that holding a competition is a great way to provide education regarding climate change since “so many opinions and imperfect knowledge” exist on the topic. He believes the challenge should be used as a “teaching opportunity.”

e. **Board Discussion.** DRB Member Hirsch commented that BCDC was originally formed to save the Bay and now the challenge is to save the land.

DRB Chair Alschuler asked for both Boards to turn their attention to the list of questions they had been provided by the competition organizers.

ECRB Member Battalio suggested that the teams should each have members skilled in geomorphology, ecology and coastal engineering. He also commented that there should be specific ecological objectives in place such as indicator species that are used as a baseline.

DRB Member Barton stated that it would be very important to begin the competition with a certain level of information and that the categories of science should be narrowed down to specify certain types of science.

ECRB Member Fischer stated it would be important to be able to quantify the impacts of the solutions proposed.

ECRB Member French suggested that a risk analyst be included on the teams in order to provide an integrative evaluation of the risks.

DRB Chair Alschuler commented that it will be very important to include professionals that really understand how to implement the proposals including legal experts, policy experts, public land owners and developers. She further stated that a public health expert should be included.

DRB Member Hirsch commented that there should be an evaluation of “sacrificial land.”

ECRB Member Comerio emphasized the importance of social science so that the teams really understand “what the community thinks.” She suggested that sociologists and/or community planners be included.

ECRB Member Battalio stated it will be important to look at how equity and value can be transferred across boundaries.

DRB Member McCann commented that it may be helpful to have one set of baseline data so the teams do not end up with possibly ten different opinions for some of the baseline information.

DRB Chair Alschuler stated that the predictive modeling that follows the development of potential solutions should be accomplished through a “consistent number-crunching” approach.

Mr. Kelley commented that the benefit of a competition is that it is possible to “ask the unthinkable questions and then blame it on the experts.”

ECRB Member Fischer advocated for a bigger academic role in the competition. He explained that current research being conducted at U.C. Berkeley and Stanford could contribute information and also the academics would be able to learn where more research is needed. Additionally, he mentioned that students are in an “enviable position of being able to ask the really big questions.”

ECRB Member French stated that regulatory and legislative expertise will be an important skill to have on the teams. He also stated there should be explicit performance criteria developed. What would success mean?

DRB Chair Alschuler asked the Boards to consider the questions related to the jury process.

ECRB Comerio reiterated that academics should be represented.

DRB Member Pellegrini stated that for the first phase of the competition the Advisory Group should have very broad representation including professionals from academic, government, engineering, design and science fields. Then for later phases of the competition, when the results of the competition are evaluated and the winners chosen, this group of jurors or advisors should be a subset of the group from the first phase and include local representatives that are very knowledgeable about the areas being addressed.

DRB Member McCann commented that it is important for the challenge to be both visionary and implementable and that the jury should have representation from both sides of this. Mr. Kelley commented that an important part of the process will be to send the message to government agencies that “they are not there to say no.”

ECRB Member Comerio recommended that a city planner named Larry Suskind of MIT would be a good juror.

DRB Member Hirsch recommended U.C. Berkeley Professor Elizabeth MacDonald as a potential juror.

ECRB Member Fischer stated that a main focus of the competition should be on how the communities will benefit.

Ms. O’Driscoll explained how the stages of the competition are envisioned: in the first stage, a jury would choose seven to ten teams; in the second stage there would be an extensive collaborative research process and the sites would be identified; and in the third stage following the collaborative design process, a jury would choose the competition winners.

DRB Member Thompson noted that it would be difficult to choose the appropriate talent for each team in the first phase without knowing the specific topics that might be addressed in the design phase.

ECRB Member Gilpin stated that a coastal archaeologist should be included on the teams as this will be an important expertise to have included.

DRB Vice Chair Strang noted that Professor Christophe Girot, who is the Chair of the Landscape Architecture program in the Architecture Department at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich, would be a good juror.

DRB Chair Alschuler mentioned that it would be good to have jurors that have been involved in other design competitions.

DRB Member Hirsch commented that it could be appropriate to consider \$100/hour for 1,000 hours to equal a stipend amount of \$100,000.

DRB Member Leader stated that it is very important to consider the fundraising period as “Phase 0” as the organizers are striving to motivate donors. He commented that often it takes catastrophe, such as Hurricane Sandy, to “get people out of their chairs” and since sea level rise is a slow moving catastrophe it will be important to conjure images that catch people’s attention and also to lay out all of the social, economic and environmental benefits that potential sea level rise responses could bring.

ECRB Member Comerio commented that it will be important to allow for the teams to adapt their professional makeup if they find they don’t have all the expertise needed after the first phase.

DRB Member McCann mentioned that the timeline of the competition should be no longer than 14 months or so in order to “keep the process fresh” for the communities involved. She also commented that some particular disciplines will be needed more than others at certain points through the competition.

DRB Member Pellegrini stated that holding an exhibition at a Bay Area museum and publishing a book with the competition results could also serve as part of the reward for the teams that participate.

ECRB Member Comerio commented that only the teams with the “most incredible” results should be honored rather than declaring all teams as “winners.”

f. **Competition Organizer’s Response.** Mr. Kelley thanked the Boards for their input and mentioned that the competition organizers would likely return to the Boards for more advice as the competition takes form and begins to unfold.

3. **Terminal One, City of Richmond, Contra Costa County (Pre-application Briefing).** The Design Review Board and Engineering Criteria Review Board received a joint public briefing on a proposal to construct approximately 323 residential units and public access improvements at a 13-acre site, located south of Brickyard Cove Road, west of the Richmond Yacht Club, and east of Dornan Drive and the Miller-Knox Regional Shoreline Park, in the City of Richmond, Contra Costa County. As currently proposed, the public access improvements would include: a 5.5-acre waterfront park atop the existing pile-supported wharf, a project gateway and entry plaza, public parking, and a 14-foot-wide Bay Trail spur from Brickyard Cove Road along Dornan Drive.

It should be noted that ECRB Member Battalio recused himself from the Terminal One discussion to comply with conflict of interest rules.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Todd Hallenbeck introduced the project and summarized issues identified by staff, including: visual impacts of the project on adjacent scenic roads and public parks; structural integrity of the wharf and resilience of public access areas to sea level rise; appropriateness and viability of the proposed landscaping; scenic quality proposed road; adequacy of the public parking; and historic character of the site.

b. **Project Presentation.** Project representatives John Briscoe, Cleve Livingston, and Scott Cataffa, described the project including the project planning process, the project context and a detailed description of the project. The project has engaged local community members and the current iteration of the project design reflects those local conversations.

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

DRB Member Leader commented that the Richmond design review board has reviewed this project several times and that the project applicant has been responsive to suggested design changes.

DRB Member Hirsch asked if the applicant knew how far the wharf piles went into the Bay floor. Mr. Cataffa responded that while a visual inspection has been completed, further analysis is needed. Mr. Cataffa explained that this information will be used to confirm if the current design is appropriate.

DRB Member McCann asked for additional detail about bicycle circulation on the project site. Mr. Cataffa provided additional information related to the locations of bike parking and bike lanes in relation to the Bay Trail. Mr. Cataffa commented that a separation of bike and pedestrian access is proposed at the waterfront park for safety reasons.

DRB Member McCann asked if the project applicant studied reducing the footprint of the wharf. Mr. Cataffa responded that early on the project team considered opening up sections of the pier, but have not incorporated that into the design. Mr. Cataffa explained that this might be revisited as the structural analysis is completed.

DRB Member Hirsch asked about the usage of the Terminal One warehouse plaque in the entry plaza. Mr. Cataffa responded that the plaque is planned to be used in the entry plaza and that there is an additional plaque inside the warehouse that might also be incorporated.

DRB Vice Chair Strang asked about the location of the shoreline. Mr. Cataffa responded that the shoreline is underneath the wharf structure along with a rock revetment. Mr. Strang suggested that the character of the proposed street might be considered in a more casual way to blend the development with the waterfront park. Mr. Strang asked about the required soil depth needed to support the proposed landscaping and cautioned the applicant that the weight of the soils might be a concern given potential seismic hazards.

DRB Chair Alschuler asked the project applicant to provide graphics and visuals related to the size and scale of the buildings, particularly as they relate to visual impacts from nearby parks. Chair Alschuler asked about the choice to include single-family homes and what consideration had been given to clustering the homes. She also expressed concerns that the Bay Trail was being placed away from the shoreline. Chair Alschuler indicated she was unsure what the memory of the original building would be in the proposed plan. Mr. Cataffa responded that a portion of the warehouse foundation would be used to raise the level of the park approximately 24-inches and provide space for soil. Chair Alschuler expressed that the Design Review Board would be interested in hearing more about resilience to sea level rise. She also asked who would be responsible for maintaining the waterfront park. Mr. Cataffa responded that City of Richmond owns the property, but that the project HOA would pay for the maintenance costs of the park. Chair Alschuler asked to what extent the project provided water access. Mr. Cataffa mentioned that there would likely be no additional access provided through the adjacent private marina, but that the nearby Ferry Point beach Water Trail access would remain and that the project would help connect the Bay Trail to this water entry point.

DRB Member McCann asked about parking available to the residents and guests of the development. Mr. Cataffa and Mr. Livingston responded that the two parking podiums would provide all the parking for the residents and guests of the development and that they would access that parking through Brickyard Cove Road. Mr. Livingston explained that this would de-emphasize automobiles from the public access sections, free up Shoreline Drive for public parking, and alleviate congestion on that street. Mr. Livingston explained that the proposed project restricts parking to the eastern and western reaches so that they would not block views along Shoreline Drive with parked cars.

ECRB Member French asked if the Bay Trail is acting like a levee for the housing development. Mr. Cataffa responded that while the finished floor elevation is actually above the height of the Bay Trail, and the property slopes up to Brickyard Cove Road, the Bay Trail does function as a levee for the site. Mr. French mentioned that the wind comes predominately from the southwest, rather than the west, and project applicant might consider that in planning the landscaping. Mr. French asked about the elevation of the waterfront park and its vulnerability to sea level rise. Mr. Cataffa responded that the park elevation is approximately 15 feet and would be above the elevation susceptible to sea level rise. Mr. Cataffa explained that perimeter decking may be raised based on the results of the structural study. Mr. French asked about the seismic stability of the sub-structure and the ability to accommodate the planned landscaping. Mr. French mentioned that the seismic deformation of the project site would effect the piles and wharf.

DRB Member Hirsch asked what will be done if the structural analysis reveals the wharf is not able to accommodate the landscaping. Mr. Cataffa responded that it would be a negotiation with the City as to what would be done to rehabilitate the wharf, and that they have a certain budget to upgrade the site.

ECRB Member Comerio asked about the possibility of leaving the warehouse intact. Mr. Cataffa responded that the project team did explore opportunities to keep the structure or repurpose it, however, given its size and height; they were unable to fit it into the planned programming for the site.

ECRB Member Dornhelm suggested that the project team consider not only sea level rise but also the associated wave run-up and total water level estimates for the structure and public access areas to allow for adaptive management of the site.

ECRB Member Gilpin suggested that a ground water analysis would be important for the geotechnical analysis. Mr. Cataffa responded that groundwater was considered in the initial study.

DRB Member Leader mentioned that the Rosie the Riveter memorial is the first in a series of historic shoreline projects developed in Richmond and suggested that the site could continue this historical story.

DRB Vice Chair Strang asked to what extent the project would need to construct or repair adjacent shoreline protection structures. Mr. Cataffa mentioned that the existing grade of the project site slopes up to Brickyard Cove and that the entire project site is ringed by levees.

DRB Vice Chair Strang asked how the north-south pedestrian access would be oriented with the parking podiums and suggested that the applicant bring in graphics to show that connection. Mr. Cataffa responded that the pedestrian path is at grade and that they would be able to provide additional graphics for the next round of review.

DRB Chair Aschuler asked about the connection of the waterfront park to the Miller-Knox Regional Shoreline Park. Mr. Cataffa responded that they are exploring those options with the Park District representatives.

DRB Vice Chair Strang commented that he was “struggling” with the existing configuration of the single-family homes along Shoreline Drive and these homes serving as the “backbone” of the roadway. Mr. Strang suggested considering the Shoreline Drive as part of the Bay Trail and requested additional sections and graphics related to this for the next review.

d. **Public Hearing.** There were four public comments:

(1) Brian Lewis, Brickyard Cove for Responsible Development (BCARD), explained that BCARD is an alliance of four nearby HOA’s and the Richmond Yacht Club. Mr. Lewis shared concerns about visual impacts on the Bay from the Miller-Knox Regional Shoreline Park. Mr. Lewis presented a packet of materials that depicted the planned buildings from various vantages around the site, highlighting the “walled off” nature of the planned development. Mr. Lewis acknowledged that the project applicant has been responsive to many comments from the community but explained that the height of the buildings is too tall and will impact views. Mr. Lewis explained that the applicant has talked about having parking for the City’s police and

fire boats, which requires a floating dock and new Bay fill. Mr. Lewis mentioned the EIR suggested the project could be adversely impacted by sea level rise, which is not consistent the BCDC policies. Finally, Mr. Lewis mentioned that the City does not have funds to repair the pier and this would be the responsibility of the HOA. Mr. Lewis stated there are several projects planned for Richmond and the design of Terminal One could be precedent-setting.

(2) Michael Leterer, also with BCARD, explained that BCARD is not opposed to development of this site, only opposed to the dense high-rise development currently proposed for this site. Mr. Leterer explained that he is especially concerned in light of the lack of proposed public amenities (e.g. commercial facilities, public transit) and also because of the visual impacts of putting a large dense project along the Bay. Mr. Leterer explained that there is a concerted effort by the City of Richmond to develop over 30 miles of shoreline and that the Richmond Planning Department has actively discouraged lower density development, which Mr. Leterer feels would be more appropriate. Mr. Leterer asked the Boards to help decide the role of BCDC in determining which type of development “we should allow along the Bay.”

(3) Jeff Kilbreth, with the Richmond Planning Commission, felt the developer’s proposal to make the finished floor elevation 14 feet above sea level, was reasonable. Mr. Kilbreth expressed questions about how to make the basement parking structure resilient to sea level rise. Mr. Kilbreth explained that Shoreline Road curves along the shoreline up to Brickyard Cove, which is at 15-18 feet in elevation. Mr. Kilbreth asked if the currently proposed road elevation of 12 feet was safe and resilient to sea level rise and implored the ECRB to consider these issues.

(4) Lee Huo, with the Association of Bay Area Governments and Bay Trail, explained that Bay Trail staff have been involved throughout the entire process and feel there are good opportunities for public access. Mr. Huo explained there is a difference of opinion about what constitutes the Bay Trail in this region. Mr. Huo explained that the existing Bay Trail goes along Brickyard Cove Road and that there would be re-alignment associated with this project. Mr. Huo explained that the Bay Trail is dedicated to both bicycle and pedestrian access and would prefer that the Bay Trail be located as close to the shoreline as possible. Mr. Huo explained that for other segments of the shoreline, the Bay Trail is a multi-part trail that can accommodate different users, and would like to see a redesign of the wharf to allow for both bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Mr. Huo also explained that he would like to see the other proposed segments of the Bay Trail located as close to the shoreline as possible. Finally, Mr. Huo also expressed concern that there be sufficient queuing space for pedestrians and bicyclists to allow safe refuge off the street before crossing at the intersection of Brickyard Cove Road and Dornan Drive.

#### f. **Boards’ Summary and Conclusions**

1. **Project applicant will need to bring back additional structural analysis of the wharf.** The ECRB would like to see this additional analysis as it relates to current conditions, ability to support the planned design, and ability to withstand seismic hazards.

2. **Project applicant will need to bring additional graphic exhibits showing the visual impacts of the development and orientation of housing units.** The DRB would like to see additional graphic exhibits that highlight the potential visual impacts from surrounding areas as well as the visual character of Shoreline Drive.

3. **Project applicant will need to present further analysis related to the resilience of the project site and public access areas to sea level rise.** Further analysis will need to be presented related to the elevations of proposed public access, resiliency to sea level rise, and adaptation strategies to sea level rise.

**Adjournment of DRB and ECRB Meeting.** ECRB Chair Borchardt adjourned the joint portion of the meeting at approximately 3:30 p.m. At this point, the ECRB Members left the meeting and the DRB Members remained to begin their regular meeting.

### Design Review Board Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Attendance.** Design Review Board Chair Alschuler called the meeting to order at approximately 3:40 p.m. DRB Vice Chair Strang recused himself for this portion of the meeting while all other DRB Members in attendance remained.

2. **Approval of Draft Minutes for the May 9, 2016 Meeting.** The Board approved these minutes with no revisions.

3. **Seaplane Lagoon Ferry Terminal (First Pre-Application Review).** The Design Review Board reviewed a proposed ferry terminal that would be located along Ferry Point Road at the eastern end of the Seaplane Lagoon as part of the mixed-use Alameda Point development. The project would include a ferry terminal and associated landside improvements, including a waterfront pedestrian promenade, a bike lane, a transit kiosk, and a parking lot.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Ethan Lavine introduced the project and the issues identified in the staff report, which focused on: the adequacy and desirability of the public access areas, particularly those proposed as interim improvements; circulation of pedestrians, bicyclists, and ferry riders within the project area; the potential for the project to affect views of the lagoon; and the vision presented by the project proponent for future public access improvements when the project area is ultimately redeveloped into a commercial center within the Alameda Point development.

b. **Project Presentation.** Jennifer Ott of the City of Alameda, the project proponent, began by explaining the role the ferry terminal in the development of Alameda Point. The City considers the project to be a priority because adding additional modes of transit on and off the Island, as the bridge and tunnel crossings to Oakland are operating at capacity. Additional public transit capacity is needed to accommodate the new residents that will live on the western end of the island. In addition, the ferry terminal will allow for workers from outside the City to access the planned commercial district that is planned for development directly inland of the site of the ferry terminal. The reason that permanent public access and infrastructure

improvements are not being constructed along the shoreline immediately is that it will take some amount of time for the commercial center to be developed and for the City to attract businesses. The redevelopment of the area will trigger the construction of permanent shoreline improvements. Ms. Ott also explained that the City's planning process for Alameda Point determined that the eastern edge of the Seaplane Lagoon, where the ferry is located, would be more densely developed and would feature a hardscape shoreline. A more open and passive waterfront is being planned for the northern and western edges of the Seaplane Lagoon.

Following Ms. Ott's presentation, Ari Daman of April Philips Design Works, the project's landscape designer, walked the Board through the design of the proposed ferry terminal and the landside improvements. The design considers how multiple types of users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, residents of Alameda Point, and others, will access the ferry terminal. The pedestrian promenade's design is inspired by the former use of the site as a Naval Air Station, and is meant to look like a taxiway. There are six nodes where the promenade is painted and numbered (1-6). These nodes serve a dual purpose by providing wayfinding for riders looking to find their car in the 400-stall parking lot across the street, as well as places to rest on benches and enjoy views of the lagoon and the San Francisco skyline in the distance. At present, the site is at an elevation above the 100-year flood plain, and above the high king tide. If the site were not raised, it would be vulnerable to inundation from rising sea levels in the future, but this is not anticipated to be a threat within the next 10 years. After 10 years, it is anticipated that the ground level will be raised. The ferry terminal itself, which is a permanent improvement, is built at a higher elevation to accommodate future sea level rise. It will be designed with a roof structure to protect ferry riders from the elements. This roof structure has not yet been designed.

c. **Board Questions.** During and following the presentation, the Board asked several questions.

Mr. Hirsch asked why the tidal datum shown on the elevations of the shoreline were several feet lower than was presented at April's DRB hearing on the adjacent "Site A" development. Mr. Daman explained that the difference is due to the fact that Site A development involved raising the site's grade, whereas no such changes are proposed as part of this project due to the interim nature of the shoreline improvements.

Mr. Hirsch asked for more detail about the design of the structure of the ferry terminal itself. Mr. Daman said that the terminal design hadn't yet been completed.

Ms. McCann asked if there would be lighting on the site as part of the proposed project. Mr. Daman responded that the lighting plan had not yet been developed, but that there would likely be some to provide for public safety, but less than might ultimately be provided given the interim nature of the improvements.

Mr. Pelligrini asked if it might make more sense to relocate Ferry Point Road inland as part of this project, rather than waiting for the ultimate redevelopment of the site into a commercial district. Doing so, he said, would allow for the sort of development closer to the shoreline that might serve visitors and help to activate the space. Mr. Daman responded that

the concept for the project is to reuse the existing infrastructure as much as possible. Raising the road to the ultimate grade of the site would be expensive, and it would be complex before the design of the new district is settled.

Ms. Alschuler asked to know the dimensions of the various elements of the proposed ferry terminal. Ms. Ott responded that the pier itself is 20 feet wide by 88 feet long with two rows of benches on either side. These benches would be open for the public to enjoy at all times. The width of the gangway is 18 feet. The float is 42 feet wide by 115 feet long. Ferries could dock on either sides of the float, and the terminal could accommodate two ferries at a time. Ms. Alschuler asked if there is the potential that the ferry service will be expanded in the future. Ms. Ott and Kevin Connolly of WETA responded that there is the hope to expand the service in the future. At first, one boat will service the terminal, and will run only during peak weekday commuter hours. This schedule is similar to the one in Richmond. The Main Street ferry terminal in Alameda would remain open.

Ms. Alschuler asked for more details on the nature of the commercial development proposed for the shoreline once it is redeveloped. Ms. Ott responded that closer to the lagoon, there would be visitor-serving commercial uses, such as retail and cafes. On the other side of Ferry Point Road, the focus would be on developing employment-generating uses. There would be greater densities closer to the shoreline to take advantage of that site. Farther back from the shoreline, lower density light industrial uses may be allowed.

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

Ms. McCann indicated that she liked the graphics that were to be painted on the ground along the pedestrian promenade. She suggested that other simple elements such as flagpoles would be inexpensive ways to create a sense of place in keeping with a low-cost approach to the interim shoreline improvements.

Mr. Pellegrini said it is exciting to see this portion of the lagoon finally open to the public. He expressed some concern that people would be funneled to a “dead end” at the ferry terminal because there are not connections to the south or east.

Ms. McCann said that clustering public access improvements such as bike parking, drinking fountains, places to sit, etc. in space around the terminal would make it a more welcoming and desirable place for people to visit. She identified several very interesting, but nonetheless lower-cost features, that the project proponent might want to consider on an interim basis, such as pop-up retail spots and lunchtime food trucks.

Ms. Barton cited the Temporary Transbay Terminal as a good example of an interim transit facility that feels fairly active and well used.

Ms. Alschuler indicated some surprise as to the siting of the ferry terminal on the lagoon. She had anticipated it would be farther north, closer to the future downtown core of Alameda Point. She said that ferry terminals can greatly enliven a space, and that the project proponent might consider whether the location could be moved farther north. At this point,

Kame Richards, a member of the public and of the Alameda Community Sailing Center, raised his hand and mentioned his organization's efforts to develop a sailing center in the area north of the ferry terminal.

Ms. Alschuler commented on the width of the proposed pedestrian promenade. She said the width was adequate, but that it would be important to ensure that the seating elements were placed so that they didn't encroach too much on the walkways and cause conflicts for pedestrians, and particularly for users in wheelchairs.

Ms. McCann urged that a shelter be provided over the ferry terminal. She said that the shelter would have minimal impacts on views, particularly in a location with such wide-open expanses. Mr. Pellegrini added that in the future it would be helpful to see what kind of views exist of the fleet of ships to the south. The ferry terminal pier might provide a place for people to go to get even better views of the ships.

Ms. McCann said it would be possible for the project proponent to do some fun things at this site with bicycles, in particular, to set up a local bike share so that people could take a free bike ride down to the ferry. This would help them cover the roughly three-block distance between Site A and the terminal much quicker.

Ms. Alschuler urged the project proponent to think about what its response would be if the site were not redeveloped in ten years as planned. She said it might be appropriate for there to be a commitment to develop the permanent public access improvements and any necessary flood control measures at that time, irrespective of what happens with the future development.

Mr. Peligrinni suggested that it would be worthwhile to consider relocating Ferry Point Road farther inland now, in order for the development of visitor-serving commercial uses to be developed within the next 10 years and prior to the development of the enterprise district. Having these uses would activate the space and make it livelier. Ms. Barton commented that this would be a lot to ask of the project proponent to provide if it wasn't yet ready to develop the whole district. In the future, Mr. Pelligrinni would like to see the future alignment of the road overlain on the site plan to better understand how the site would be reconfigured.

Overall the Board is supportive of the proposed project. They did not request a second review, but asked the project applicant to look closely at their suggestions.

e. **Applicant Response.** The applicant responded positively to the Board's discussion and suggestions. She indicated her team would look at the idea of placemaking around the terminal. They do intend to have temporary pop-up events like food trucks and retail to expand the activity in the area just to the north of the terminal. There is also to be a local bike share with a fleet of 45 site bikes that will be provided by the developer of Site A. There will also be a shuttle bus running every 15 minutes from the Site A development to provide a direct connection to downtown Alameda and BART for residents and ferry riders. In response to the comment that the terminal might be sited closer to the downtown core, she said there were several reasons they had chosen to locate it directly adjacent to the future enterprise district.

First, according to experts, most people are willing to walk farther from their home to public transit than they are from their job to public transit. This was a major consideration in placing it closer to the job center than to the mixed-use residential areas. Second, having the terminal farther south on Seaplane Lagoon reduces the length of the ferry trip and thus would help to cut down on commute times.

Mr. Daman spoke to the comments regarding the potential to relocate the road inland immediately and perhaps allow for the construction of permanent retail closer to the water's edge prior to the full redevelopment of the site. He explained that ultimately, the grade of the entire site will need to be raised. Therefore it would take a great deal of engineering work to move the road to the east now. The decision to take advantage of the existing infrastructure in this design was to minimize costs. Moving the road would also require bisecting the parking lot.

Mr. Connolly added that canopies over ferry piers and floats are greatly preferred by WETA users. He does not feel that there is the potential for the canopies to take away from the view. In Richmond, WETA has gotten the request to add additional canopy area.

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board did not make concluding remarks, except to say that the Project Proponent should work closely with the staff to ensure that their comments and suggestions are carried out as the project is further developed.

5. **Adjournment.** Chair Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JAIME MICHAELS  
Chief of Permits