

SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600 • San Francisco, California 94102 (415) 352-3600 • Fax: (415) 352-3606 • www.bcdc.ca.gov

October 27, 2016

TO: All Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Andrea Gaffney, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov)
Ethan Lavine, Principal Permit Analyst (415/352-3618; ethan.lavine@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: India Basin Open Space and 700 Innes Project; Second Pre-Application Review
(For Board consideration on November 6, 2017)

Project Summary

Project Proponent. BUILD, Inc.

Property Owners. BUILD, Inc. and City and County of San Francisco

Project Representatives. Courtney Pash, BUILD; Inc. (Property Owner and Developer); Nicole Avril, San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department (Property Owner); Marcel Wilson, Bionic (Landscape Architect); Leo Chow, SOM (Architect); John Bela, Gehl Studio (Landscape Architect); John Leys, Sherwood (Civil Engineer); Dilip Trivedi, Moffatt and Nichol (Coastal Engineer); Geoff Smick, WRA (Regulatory Guidance).

Project Site. The approximately 23-acre project site is located adjacent to India Basin on the southeastern shoreline of the City and County of San Francisco (Exhibit 2). The site is bound by: 900 Innes Avenue and India Basin Shoreline Park to the north; Innes Avenue and uphill residential developments (Hunters View, Hunters Point East/West, and Westbrook) to the south and west; and the site of a proposed park (“Northside Park”) to the east, which would be developed in association with the future Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 project (Exhibit 3).

Existing Conditions. The site is largely undeveloped, with the exception of Arelious Walker Drive and the Bay Trail (Exhibit 3). In 2002, a 2.5-acre wetland creation project was implemented at the shoreline to mitigate for a project at the San Francisco International Airport (Exhibit 35). The entirety of the project site is located within a San Francisco Bay Plan-designated Waterfront Park, Beach Priority Use Area, as noted on Bay Plan Map No. Five (Exhibit A). The project site also carries a Park Priority Use designation in the Commission’s San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan (SAP).



Project Description. The project presented in this report does *not* illustrate a specific design, but rather a conceptual design and controls that would be used as a framework and the parameters for the ultimate design of the project site. The proposed project includes a mixed-use development (“700 Innes Project”) and an improved open space area along the shoreline, partly on property owned by the City and County of San Francisco (referred to as “India Basin Open Space” in Exhibits 6 and 13). The project area is located entirely within the above-referenced Waterfront Park, Beach Priority Use Area, and partly within the Commission’s Bay and 100-foot shoreline band jurisdictions. Major project elements include:

1. **Mixed-Use Development.** The proposed project includes a mixed-use development of approximately 1,240 residential units (approximately 3,401 residents) and 275,300 square feet of commercial and retail space (approximately 929 employees). Buildings would range in height from one to 14 stories (Exhibit 12). The proposed project also includes an 1,800-space underground parking garage for residents and visitors, possibly a school, approximately 3.22 acres of private open space for use by residents only (e.g., fenced-off front yards, shared courtyards and roof decks, private decks and patios), and approximately 12 acres of new or improved public parks and open space (principally the Big Green and Shoreline areas discussed below).
2. **Streets, Public Right-of-Ways, and Trail Network.** Within the mixed-use development, a new street grid and circulation network is proposed:
 - a. **Vehicular Circulation.** The street network consists of two-lane streets at entrances to the project site from Innes Avenue (at Griffith Street, Arelious Walker Drive, and Earl Street) and along its main commercial street, New Hudson Street, which runs the length of the project site (Exhibits 18-20). Bayward of New Hudson Street is a one-way loop formed by Beach, Fairfax, and Spring Lanes, which are designed as “shared public ways” (Exhibit 22). The shared public ways allow for more limited vehicular access at slow speeds, making them more accommodating for use by pedestrians.
 - b. **Pedestrian Circulation to the Bay (Exhibit 17).** The primary pedestrian route from Innes Avenue to the Bay is envisioned along Arelious Walker Boulevard, the project site’s main entrance, which passes by the proposed public market and connects to a trail leading to the overlook and concession stand directly west of the perched beach (Exhibit 17). Secondary routes from Innes Avenue are envisioned at Earl Street and Beach Lane (connecting to the Bay Trail just east of the perched Beach), a pedestrian-only throughway and public stairs connecting to Spring Lane (connecting to the overlook and concession stand) (Exhibits 21 and 23), and a pedestrian-only throughway (connecting to the Bay Trail and Cove Terrace).
 - c. **Trail Network (Exhibit 25).** Pedestrian circulation within the Big Green occurs on a network of 3- to 6-foot-wide hiking trails and via the 12- to 16-foot-wide Bay Trail (see Big Green below). Along the shoreline, the trails connect to a 4-foot-wide elevated shoreline boardwalk (see Shoreline Area below).

- d. **Bicycle Network (Exhibit 16).** The primary bicycle route, a Class I cycle track, would run through the mixed-use development along the proposed New Hudson Street, while the Bay Trail (12- to 16-foot wide) would run Bayward of the mixed-use development along an alignment that has been modified somewhat since the Board's previous review (Exhibit 24). The bike network also includes multi-use shared paths and Class III "sharrows" on Earl Street and internal streets.
 - e. **Transit Access (Exhibit 16).** Local and Express Muni bus service runs along Innes Avenue, where a Transit Plaza is proposed at Arelious Walker Drive.
3. **Big Green.** An approximately 5.5-acre public park called the Big Green (Exhibits 30 and 31) would be constructed northwest of the mixed-use development and adjacent to the Public Market (see below). The park would include earthwork mounds (varying from approximately 5- to 15-feet in height) and naturalistic landscapes, such as grasslands, stormwater bioretention ponds, swales, planters, a wet meadow, and groves of trees. Active recreational elements would include play areas for children and a fitness loop. A network of hiking trails (3- to 6-foot wide with turnouts in narrower areas, for pedestrians and dogs only) would connect the mixed-use development and the shoreline, with seating and furnishings at various locations. At least three small picnic areas and one barbeque area would be connected by the hiking trails. Sculptures and public art would be sited at various points within the Big Green. A lawn, recreational area, and flower cutting garden would be located at the Big Green adjacent to the Public Market Plaza. A light-weight pavilion would be constructed as a field house to support environmental education and stewardship activities. A fenced, off-leash dog area would also be constructed within the Big Green.
4. **Shoreline Open Space Area.** The approximately 6.2-acre Shoreline area would include:
- a. *Perched Beach, Boat Launch, and Overlook* (Exhibits 39 and 40). A new perched recreational beach (sand only, no water access) would be constructed at the eastern edge of the project site. Adjacent to the perched beach would be an overlook with a concession stand and restroom, a boat launch for human powered-boat boats, and a boat locker for at least 50 boats.
 - b. *East and West Shoreline Areas* (Exhibits 46-47 and 52). A pedestrian-only elevated boardwalk with occasional overlook areas (4-foot wide, with 6-inch wood curb at edges) would run the length of the shoreline between the Cove Terrace and the proposed perched beach. Existing tidal salt marsh wetlands along the shoreline would be retained and existing shoreline protection (rubble, riprap) would be replaced with new protection, which, in addition to engineered rip rap, could include artificial reefs and tide pools that act as breakwaters and engineered sand dunes. Off-shore, installation of eel grass beds and floating wetlands is proposed. Approximately 0.49 acres of new tidal salt marsh and 0.31 acres of new seasonal wetlands would be constructed in the shoreline area. The centralized stormwater feature on the Big Green connects to the West Shoreline, where the slope landward of the existing wetland mitigation areas would be re-graded with a shallower slope.

5. **Cove Terrace.** The Cove Terrace area (Exhibit 51) would include a waterfront plaza, along which active ground-floor retail uses would be sited, such as cafes and restaurants. A terrace in the slope would step down to a newly constructed tidal marsh. The Bay Trail would run through the plaza adjacent to the terrace, connecting to the Big Green and the adjacent 900 Innes park site. A public restroom would also be provided at the Cove Terrace.
6. **Public Market.** An approximately 0.5-acre plaza with pavilion structures would be constructed bayward of New Hudson Street and adjacent to the Big Green and Cove Terrace to create the Public Market (Exhibit 29). The plaza would include seating, community spaces, stalls for vendors, drinking fountains, and public restrooms.

Phasing. Construction would occur in phases over an anticipated period of five to 15 years, and development of public access areas, including the Big Green and City-owned India Basin Open Space property would occur in phases tied to the construction of the mixed-use development (Exhibit 14). During initial phases of project construction, the project proponent proposes interim uses on the site, some of which could serve as interim public access improvements, such as construction of a dirt bike course, an on-site nursery to develop testing planting and landscaping strategies in test plots, and on-site storage of sculpture pieces in advance of permanent installation (Exhibit 15).

Resilience and Adaptation to Rising Sea Level. Much of the project site, including the mixed-use development, would not be vulnerable to anticipated sea level rise, even during extreme storm events at the end of the century (an anticipated 66 inches sea level rise). At the shoreline, the project proponent proposes a variety of structural and non-structural adaptation strategies (Exhibit 38) primarily aimed at managed retreat and provision of transitional space to allow tidal and brackish wetlands to migrate inland as sea levels rise. The project proponents would establish a trust (the India Basin Trust), which would be responsible for ongoing monitoring and preparation of an adaptation plan to be updated every five years. The adaptation plan would identify when planting of vegetation is required to facilitate wetland transition, the timing for relocation of project elements to higher elevations, and maintenance as needed for the shoreline to adapt as proposed.

A variety of approaches would be implemented to adapt the various public access facilities at the shoreline:

- a. **Boardwalk (Exhibits 48-50).** The boardwalk that runs the shoreline would be removed or relocated at a higher elevation when subject to regular inundation by rising sea levels.
- b. **Perched Beach (Exhibits 41-43).** The perched beach is located just inland of a tidal marsh area created in 2002 as mitigation for a project for the San Francisco International Airport. The perched beach is designed to function through the end of the century (an anticipated 66 inches of sea level rise). As sea levels rise and flood the tidal marsh area, the beach will become tidally influenced. During large storm events with 66

inches of sea level rise, the beach will be inundated. When the entire beach is subject to regular inundation, the deck backing the beach would be removed and the seawall at the edge of the beach area would function as a shoreline protection device for the Bay Trail.

- c. **Cove Terrace (Exhibit 53).** The lower steps of the Cove Terrace would be constructed out of cast-in-place concrete so that they will function as a seawall in the future. The upper steps would remain available as a seating area for the public for the life of the project, including during extreme storm events with 66 inches of sea level rise.

Prior DRB Review. The Board previously reviewed the proposed project at its November 7, 2016 meeting. At the same meeting, the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (RPD) presented an initial design of its project to redevelop and expand the existing City-owned park directly to the west of the project site (at 900 Innes Avenue and India Basin Shoreline Park). RPD and the project sponsors are developing their projects in close coordination, and the two projects are being evaluated as part of the same Environmental Impact Report. However, the two parties will apply separately for their BCDC permits, and the Board and Commission will review each project independent of the other. The two projects are operating on separate timelines, which is why the Board is not hearing a full update on the RPD project at this meeting.

Board Comments Regarding Two Related Projects. At its November 7, 2016 meeting, the Board made some comments on the connections between the two projects, including that: (1) unifying the sites with a similar palette and aesthetic and making the sites an integrated whole would be desirable; (2) focus is required on creation of a seamless transition between the two project sites; (3) the projects may not be able to support everything stakeholders suggest, and an editing process may be required to consider what each project can support in partnership with Northside Park; and (4) the two sites share a common ecology but can have different character at different locations.

Board Comments Regarding the 700 Innes/India Basin Open Space Project. Regarding the 700 Innes/India Basin Open Space proposal, the Board commented that: (1) the wildness of the shoreline is one of the resources to consider during the design phase; (2) more needs to be known about the design of Northside Park to inform the design of the proposed project's eastern edge; (3) a rationale for why Bay fill is necessary at the site should be provided; (4) the beach and kayak launch access would need to be clearly signed; (5) more needs to be known about programming of the Big Green and how it fits within the programming of the overall site; (6) the nature of the interface between buildings and public spaces is not yet clear, and will be particularly important where private residences are adjacent to areas that need to be very public; (7) the view corridors to the water from Innes Avenue were not entirely convincing, and the Board would need to see how visitors on Innes Avenue will understand what is at the end of the view corridors; and (8) the Public Market should not block the view of the water from Innes Avenue.

Commission Findings, Policies & Guidelines

Waterfront Park, Beach Priority Use Area. The proposed project is located within a Bay Plan-designated Waterfront Park, Beach Priority Use Area, within which waterfront parks and beaches are to be prioritized. The San Francisco Bay Plan Recreation policies encourage certain facilities over others within waterfront parks. Facilities are to “capitalize on the attractiveness of their bayfront location,” and are to “emphasize hiking, bicycling, riding trails, picnic facilities, swimming, environmental, historical and cultural education and interpretation, viewpoints, beaches, and fishing facilities,” over facilities that do not need a waterfront location. “Public launching facilities for a variety of boats and other water-oriented recreational craft, such as kayaks, canoes and sailboats, should be provided in waterfront parks where feasible.” “Limited commercial recreation facilities, such as small restaurants” are permitted “provided they are clearly incidental to the park use, are in keeping with the basic character of the park, and do not obstruct public access to and enjoyment of the Bay.” The Bay Trail is to be developed along “an alignment as near to the shore as possible, consistent with Bay resource protection.” Public transportation is to be provided to waterfront parks, as is public parking “in a manner that does not diminish the park-like character of the site.” “Interpretive information describing natural, historical and cultural resources should be provided in waterfront parks where feasible.” Public utilities and services are allowed, “provided they would be unobtrusive, would not permanently disrupt use of the site for recreation, and would not detract from the visual character of the site.”

The Bay Plan Recreation policies emphasize active recreational uses for parks, with a preference for water-oriented recreational uses where possible, and facilities commonly found in parks, such as picnic facilities. Except in cases where such uses would be incompatible with wildlife protection needs, shoreline parks within Waterfront Park, Beach Priority Use Areas approved by the Commission have historically been designed with large areas of unprogrammed open space to support a variety of recreational users, as seen parks such as César E. Chavez Park in Berkeley, Albany Bulb in Albany, San Leandro Marina Park, and Miller/Knox Regional Shoreline in Richmond. (See Exhibit B for scale comparisons.)

San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan Policies. The *San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan* (SAP) states that “[t]he India Basin area should be developed as a major waterfront park in accordance with the Recreation and Open Space Plan of the City of San Francisco.” The plan states that some fill may be needed, and that “[l]imited development, preferably Bay-oriented commercial recreation, should be permitted on the shoreline, provided it is incidental to public access and water-related recreation and does not obstruct public access.”

San Francisco Bay Plan Policies. The *San Francisco Bay Plan* (Bay Plan) **Public Access** policies state that maximum feasible public access to and along the waterfront should “be provided in and through every new development in the Bay or on the shoreline.” The Bay Plan further explains that public access should be designed—using the Commission’s *Public Access Design Guidelines*—“to encourage diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline,” be conveniently located near parking and public transit, “permit barrier free access for persons with disabilities to the maximum feasible extent...and include an ongoing maintenance program.”

These policies state in part that “public access should be sited, designed and managed to prevent significant adverse effects on wildlife,” and that, “whenever public access to the Bay is provided as a condition of development, on fill or in the shoreline, the access should be permanently guaranteed.”

These policies further state that, “[a]ny public access provided as a condition of development should either be required to remain viable in the event of future sea level rise or flooding, or equivalent access consistent with the project should be provided nearby.” The Bay Plan’s **Climate Change** policies state, in part, that “[w]herever feasible and appropriate, effective, innovative sea level rise adaptation approaches should be encouraged.”

The Bay Plan **Recreation** policies state in part, that “recreational facilities, such as waterfront parks, trails, marinas, live-aboard boats, non-motorized small boat access, fishing piers, launching lanes, and beaches, should be encouraged and allowed by the Commission, provided they are located, improved and managed,” following certain standards.

As they relate to non-motorized small boats, the Recreation policies state, in part, that “where practicable, access facilities for non-motorized small boats should be incorporated into waterfront parks, marinas, launching ramps and beaches, especially near popular waterfront destinations,” and that “access points should be located, improved and managed to avoid significant adverse effects on wildlife and their habitats, [and] should not interfere with commercial navigation.” Additionally, “site improvements, such as landing and launching facilities, restrooms, rigging areas, equipment storage and concessions, and educational programs that address navigational safety, security, and wildlife compatibility and disturbance should be provided, consistent with use of the site,” and “facilities for boating organizations that provide training and stewardship, operate concessions, provide storage or boathouses should be allowed in recreational facilities where appropriate.” “[L]aunching facilities should be accessible and designed to ensure that boaters can easily launch their watercraft. Facilities should be durable to minimize maintenance and replacement cost.”

As they relate to beaches, the Recreation policies state, in part, that, “sandy beaches should be preserved, enhanced, or restored for recreational use, such as swimming, consistent with wildlife protection. New beaches should be permitted if the site conditions are suitable for sustaining a beach without excessive beach nourishment.”

The Bay Plan **Appearance, Design and Scenic Views** policies state, in part, that “all bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay” and that “maximum efforts should be made to provide, enhance, or preserve views of the Bay and shoreline, especially from public areas...” These policies also state, in part, that “[s]horeline developments should be built in clusters, leaving open area around them to permit more frequent views of the Bay” and “that views of the Bay from vista points and from roads should be maintained by appropriate arrangements and heights of all developments and landscaping between the view areas and the water.” Lastly, the policies state, in part, that “parking areas should be located away from the shoreline.”

The ***Public Access Design Guidelines*** state that public access should feel public, be designed so that the user is not intimidated nor is the user's appreciation diminished by structures or incompatible uses, and that there should be visual cues that public access is available for the public's use by using site furnishings, such as benches, trash containers, lighting and signage. The ***Public Access Design Guidelines*** further state that public access areas should be designed for a wide range of users, should maximize user comfort by designing for weather and day and night use, and that each site's historical, cultural and natural attributes provide opportunities for creating projects with a "sense of place" and a unique identity.

Board Questions

The Board's advice and recommendations are sought on the following issues regarding the design of the proposed public access:

1. Does the proposed design provide adequate, usable and attractive public access for a wide range of users?
 - Does the proposed design capitalize on the attractiveness of its Bayfront location by emphasizing the uses described in the Bay Plan Recreation policies related to waterfront parks, which include: hiking, bicycling, riding trails, picnic facilities, swimming, environmental, historical and cultural education and interpretation, viewpoints, beaches, and fishing facilities, over recreational facilities that do not need a waterfront location.
 - Are the proposed public access facilities and connections designed in a way that indicate their public nature and "feels public"?
 - Does the proposed design provide clear and continuous transitions to adjacent planned developments, particularly Northside Park and 900 Innes?
2. Is the circulation network (consisting of the Bay Trail, bicycle network, pedestrian pathways, trails, shoreline boardwalk, etc.) designed to encourage movement to and along the shoreline?
 - Are the trails and walkways wide enough, made of appropriate materials, and designed to avoid overcrowding and conflicts among users, and universally accessible? These pathways include areas at the Public Market, on the Bay Trail at Terrace Cove, and on the shoreline boardwalk.
3. Does the proposed design provide, maintain and enhance visual access to the Bay and shoreline from Innes Avenue (e.g., at Arelious Walker Drive and other cross streets) and important viewpoints within the proposed project?
4. Are the public access facilities designed to reduce on-going maintenance requirements, where possible, and is the design conducive to the requirement that the areas be properly managed for the public's safety and enjoyment and reasonably maintained for the life of the project?

5. Are the public access facilities sited and designed to prevent significant adverse effects on wildlife, and can they be managed to provide for ongoing public access in harmony with wildlife over time?
6. Do the proposed sea level rise adaptation measures ensure that the public access areas and amenities will remain viable in the event of future sea level rise or flooding?