

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

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

TO: All Commissioners and Alternates

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

SUBJECT: Approved Minutes of November 6, 2017, 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 5:00 p.m., and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Other Board members in attendance included Board Vice Chair Gary Strang and Board Members Cheryl Barton, Tom Leader, and Jacinta McCann. BCDC staff in attendance included Andrea Gaffney, Tinya Hoang, Ethan Lavine, Brad McCrea, and Jaime Michaels. The presenters were Stefan Galvez (Caltrans), Sara Moos-Thompson (Bionic), Blake Sanborn (AECOM), Fran Weld (San Francisco Giants), Marcel Wilson (Bionic), Michael Yarne (BUILD, Inc.). Also in attendance were Ben Botkin (San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail), Maureen Gaffney (San Francisco Bay Trail), and Michael Hamman (resident).

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

2. **Report of Chief of Permits.** Jaime Michaels, the BCDC Chief of Permits, presented her report:

a. Permits have been issued to the Port of San Francisco for the construction of Crane Cove Park and to the East Bay Regional Park District for the construction and reconstruction of Albany Beach.

Ms. Michaels introduced Rebecca Coates-Maloon, a new Permit Analyst at BCDC.

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



DRB MINUTES
November 6, 2017

3. **Approval of Draft Minutes for September 11, 2017, Meeting.** Ms. Alschuler asked to change “is a connection of private land” to “depends on a connection across private land” under Board Discussion on page 6.

Ms. Alschuler asked to add “as an integrated system” to “and the elevated walkway” under Item 3 on page 7.

Ms. Alschuler added language to Item 8 on page 9 that makes clear that the concern was that the proposal of putting the houses right on the water often suggests that they own that water or it is not really a public way.

MOTION: Mr. Strang moved approval of the Minutes for the September 11, 2017, 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 5-0-0 with Board Chair Alschuler, Board Vice Chair Strang, and Board Members Barton, Leader, and McCann voting approval with no abstentions.

4. **San Francisco Bay Bridge Pier Retention for Public Access Briefing**

a. **Staff Presentation.** The Board received a briefing from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) on a possible proposal to retain five marine foundations of the former East Span of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (Piers E2 and E19 through E22) that are currently required to be removed as mitigation for the placement of fill for the new East Span of the Bay Bridge. Three of the piers would serve as public access and the other two piers would be preserved for historical and ecological habitat value. Ms. McCann recused herself from this project review.

Tinya Hoang, BCDC Coastal Program Analyst, provided an overview of the background and location of the proposed project, and similar projects passed by the Commission. She invited the Board to ask questions about the design of the project and what Caltrans should consider when the project comes before the Board for full review. Board questions should address issues related to the San Francisco Bay Plan policies on public access, appearance, design, scenic views, including issues on access connections, recreational opportunities and other public amenities, sea level rise, and wildlife compatibility.

b. **Project Presentation.** Stefan Galvez, Environmental Manager, San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB), Caltrans, introduced the members of his team. He provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the background, alternatives under consideration for the remaining marine foundations, and next steps of the SFOBB East Span Seismic Safety Project. He stated the goals today are to invite Board guidance and feedback on the designs and to assess the general acceptance of the pier retention concepts presented.

Blake Sanborn, AECOM, continued the slide presentation and discussed design ideas and the opportunities provided if the piers would be maintained in place.

DJ Allison, Senior Biologist/Natural Resources Project Manager, AECOM, continued the slide presentation and discussed the ways to enhance Piers 19 and 20 to improve the bicycle path experience and wildlife habitat creation and preservation.

c. Board Questions. Ms. Barton asked about future maintenance of the project. Mr. Galvez stated that question is currently under discussion.

Ms. Barton asked if there will be a testing procedure to ensure the enhancements are working for habitat in particular. Mr. Galvez answered in the affirmative. He stated the key questions are if the structures are sound, and how much maintenance and improvements are required. Mr. Allison stated options are currently being studied.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the status of nesting under the bridge. Mr. Galvez stated there are over 800 cormorants nesting on the existing platforms.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the path cyclists would take from the bridge to Yerba Buena Island. Mr. Allison pointed out the path on the presentation slides, but part of the path was outside the slide radius. He stated he will provide better illustrations to staff.

Ms. Alschuler stated the importance of showing the path that would be taken and the possible destination points in the area.

Mr. Leader stated these are difficult places to get to, especially on the Oakland side. He suggested that an identity-generating program that goes beyond the presentation today would help attract attention, such as destinations, fitness, art, or fishing beyond just a plaza, and make the public want to visit.

Ms. Alschuler suggested collaborating with partners who are in the business of doing attractions that might make this location become part of the larger visiting of the Bay.

Mr. Strang stated the rustic, durable materials seem to borrow the shapes in the softer forms of the bridge, which seems more inviting than the simple rail at the Yerba Buena pier. Corten is a beautiful material but it does not tend to stabilize in marine environments and durability is a crucial issue.

Ms. Alschuler suggested educational programs or recreational opportunities related to the water and what is happening on the Bay to bring the Yerba Buena project into the life of the Bay. She also suggested a natural landscape rather than potted plants, which require ongoing maintenance.

Ms. Barton suggested being aware that fishing is often incompatible with other activities. She stated the National Park Service often deals with this.

Mr. Strang stated natural landscaping would work better for the Oakland location also. He suggested breaking up the Oakland space to make it more intimate.

Ms. Alschuler asked if a kayak landing is possible at the Oakland location.

Mr. Strang suggested coordinating with the park to make the Oakland location a destination.

Ms. Alschuler stated the work being done at the Oakland location could support a large event to advertise the location as a destination. She stated there are educational and interpretive opportunities for individuals to have a front-door view of sea level rise and changes in the Bay in a way that will be dramatic in the land form that constitutes the park, which is permanent.

Mr. Strang asked how much the two habitat piers will be raised, given the 50- and 100-year scenarios. Mr. Allison stated the specific height is still under consideration. He stated the need to be more adaptive over time.

Ms. Alschuler stated the piers along the rest of the area are being saved. She questioned whether the last two piers need to be saved. Mr. Allison stated high tide refuge for shore birds is in short supply, particularly on the east shore. He stated this part of the concept came at the suggestion of the Audubon Society.

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

5. India Basin Open Space and 700 Innes Mixed-Use Development; BUILD, Inc. (Second Pre-Application Review). The Board held their second pre-application review of a proposal by BUILD, Inc., for a 23-acre proposed mixed-use development and shoreline park. The proposed project would include residential and commercial developments, a school, a public market, an improved open space area along the shoreline, and grassland and meadow features. Public access improvements include a beach, pathways, boardwalk, new and enhanced wetland habitat, and other recreational amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Ethan Lavine, Principal Permit Analyst, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the location, context, and existing conditions of the proposed project. He summarized the changes made to the design since incorporating the Board's comments from the November 7, 2016, meeting, which are included in the staff report. He summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including public access, circulation, visual access, maintenance, wildlife, and sea level rise.

Ms. Gaffney asked Board Members if the proposed designs for the open space in the Big Green are appropriate and enjoyable for a wide variety of users. She continued the slide presentation and discussed the existing site, scale and character comparisons of the open space and Big Green areas, the particular topography, and unique features of this proposal.

b. **Project Presentation.** Michael Yarne, BUILD, Inc., introduced the project team. He provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the project area, guiding principles, design guidelines, and key features of the proposed project. He stated the responses to public comments are now being prepared. He stated the approval process is expected to be completed by April of 2018.

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

Ms. Alschuler referred to page 6 and asked for clarification on the acreages. Mr. Yarne agreed it is a complex property. He stated the numbers are sometimes a little off because the design authority is shifted around the dashed line on the presentation slides. The project site, which is everything to the south of the dashed line, is 29.26 acres. He stated the ownership of the whole site is currently being reorganized. The net transfer of private land to public is 4.2 acres.

Ms. Gaffney stated the Big Green is 5.5 acres and the shoreline open space area is 6.2 acres for a total of 11.7 acres.

Mr. Leader asked how much of the Big Green is biofiltration wetlands, natural grasses, and ecological planting. Mr. Yarne stated 82 percent or 4.34 acres of the Big Green is publicly-accessible; stormwater wetlands account for 38 percent or .86 acres, and blackwater wetland is 2,900 square feet or approximately one percent.

Mr. Leader asked about the stormwater treatment drain moving through the site. Mr. Yarne asked Sarah Moos-Thompson, Project Manager, Bionic Landscape Architecture, to provide greater detail. Ms. Moos-Thompson clarified that the site will have a range of native and adaptive species. She stated water flows into the stormwater treatment pond and then out the outfall, which flows into the basin to avoid affecting the tidal marsh.

Ms. Barton asked about stormwater reclamation. Ms. Moos-Thompson stated a portion of the water will be treated within the flats in a blackwater treatment wetland and recirculated throughout the center area.

Ms. McCann asked how public access will be perceived. Mr. Yarne stated the streets will be publicly owned and privately maintained, with an almost continuous plaza feeling, preserved views, and clear access points.

Mr. Leader asked about the character of Northside Park. Mr. Yarne stated it is the recreation and athletic facility park. He asked Marcel Wilson, Design Director, Bionic Landscape Architecture, for added detail. Mr. Wilson stated, in the basin-wide planning, each park had responsibilities. This park is more wild and oriented to the Bay. Northside Park has an interface with the water, a performance area, a marketplace, flexible sports fields, and more organized sport courts.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the responsibilities for the India Basin Shoreline Park. Mr. Wilson stated 900 Innes will be responsible for the heritage aspect of the site and may have building and community programming, and India Basin Shoreline Park will have a more mixed, less formal program.

Ms. McCann asked about the estimated population of the site at build-out. Mr. Yarne stated family-sized units are planned, with a concentration of two- and three-bedroom apartments. Three or four thousand residents are anticipated. The proponents are focused on bringing in a small neighborhood commercial district for a daytime population.

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

(1) Michael Hamman, India Basin resident, stated a kayak launching facility at the 900 Innes parcel is not a good location. Reports indicate there is two to three feet of water at low tide but residents find that there is none. He suggested that the small facility planned at the 700 Innes parcel become the primary facility, as it boasts deeper water and ideal access to the India Basin.

(2) Maureen Gaffney, San Francisco Bay Trail Project, questioned if the Bay Trail is still too far from the Bay. She asked to make the Bay Trail as wide as possible. She requested retaining the existing Bay Trail or creating a short-term trail during the interim. She asked that bicycle parking be considered on the boardwalks that are pedestrian-only.

(3) Ben Botkin, Planner, San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail, agreed with looking at tides in the India Basin proposed kayak launches, but stated the shoreline park is an appropriate place to concentrate facilities and programs. He recommended ensuring the 700 Innes site has sufficient space to accommodate its anticipated uses and making sure ramp maintenance is appropriate.

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

(1) Does the proposed design provide adequate, usable and attractive public access for a wide range of users?

Ms. Alschuler asked if kayaks will be brought in via the one-way loop. Mr. Yarne replied in the affirmative. He stated thought and care has been put into this. He pointed out the streets, parking spaces, and drop-off locations on the presentation slides.

Ms. Alschuler stated the need to look at the three park areas together to ensure that they have clear connections, feel public and inviting, and meet the BCDC policies.

Ms. McCann stated the design is strong but she questioned if the one-way access loop is public and inviting enough and if there is enough gathering space in the Big Green area.

Ms. Alschuler suggested adjusting the balance in the hardscape area around the market to include a softer, greener area for flexibility of uses. She stated there are opportunities for interpretive, historical areas.

Mr. Leader suggested more public use and programs inside the Big Green. He stated the need for a greater description of how the Big Green will be used, places to go, activities to take part in, historical stories, and how those stories link as individuals move through the site.

Mr. Strang asked how the Big Green is different from the adjacent spaces, how it focuses individuals on the Bay and views and reaches out to the larger environment, and how it is program-driven.

Mr. Leader asked how it feels to visit the Big Green. Mr. Strang stated it feels like an ocean beach that opens up after passing through the berms. However, too much activity can hinder that experience.

Ms. McCann stated there is a significant amount of open space in this area. She asked if that is differentiated enough and appropriately scaled in the Big Green.

Ms. Barton agreed that the space could be over-programmed. She stated she appreciated the “conceal and reveal” and adventuresome feel that the twelve-foot-high berms provide.

Mr. Leader agreed and stated he liked the geometry and intrigue the berms provide. He pointed out the need to be conscious of defining how the Big Green area will be used. Closer to the water may be rougher, but there may be an area further away that people gravitate to for family activities.

(2) Is the circulation network designed to encourage movement to and along the shoreline?

Ms. Alschuler stated it is important that people know they can park in the garage.

Ms. McCann appreciated the subtle flow of the design. She pointed out the importance of delineating the public space.

Ms. Alschuler stated the projected sea level rise raises questions about the public/private transition in the cove area in the future. She asked when the parks will be built in the phases of development. It is important that the parks be built early on to denote public space. Mr. Wilson stated his understanding that the parks will be built in phases along with the mixed-use development.

Ms. Alschuler stated it is a challenge to understand how to find the water. Appropriate signage will be necessary.

(3) Does the proposed design provide, maintain, and enhance visual access to the Bay and shoreline from Innes Avenue and important viewpoints within the proposed project?

Mr. Strang stated the main entry to the site from Innes is terminated by the public market. He suggested, if there is more of the park, including more greenery that comes further toward Innes so that is what is seen instead of the market and buildings. He suggested giving more of a sense that it is open to the public without having to pass through many other uses to get to the green space.

(4) Are the public access facilities designed to reduce ongoing 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?

Ms. Alschuler stated the need to see that development and park phasing are combined for maintenance and operations long-term and that it is committed in the early phases.

Ms. McCann stated that the delivery of the park needs to occur in the initial phases of development 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?

Ms. McCann stated the transition down towards the water's edge where there are lower-intensity uses is a perfect match with encouraging wildlife. She loved that the Bay Trail is pulled back from the edge to encourage a stronger range of wildlife habitat.

(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?

Mr. Strang asked if there would still be accessible public space by the year 2100 or if it is all habitat and meadow. Ms. Alschuler asked if there will be any boardwalk left by then. Mr. Yarne pointed out the Bay Trail, outlooks, and other accessible areas on the presentation slide. Ms. Moos-Thompson stated the slide shows a storm surge, king tide condition, which is temporary inundation. She stated the boardwalk will still be at an accessible elevation in 2100.

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Yarne responded positively to the Board's suggestions and stated the design 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) Does the proposed design provide adequate, usable and attractive public access for a wide range of users?

- (a) Ensure there is a variety of usable public spaces.
- (b) Ensure there is a sense of different uses.
- (c) Include family-focused areas that 4,000 individuals can use easily and safely on a daily basis.
- (d) Ensure main park has a clearly defined program that accommodates family groups.

(2) Is the circulation network designed to encourage movement to and along the shoreline?

- (a) Consider public comments about facilities for cyclists and kayakers.
- (b) Encourage use of the boardwalk while keeping bicycles on the Bay Trail.
- (c) Make the Bay Trail as wide as possible.
- (d) Consider interim use while the Bay Trail is developed.

(3) Does the proposed design provide, maintain, and enhance visual access to the Bay and shoreline from Innes Avenue and important viewpoints within the proposed project?

(a) Ensure the main entrance is understandable and the area feels public all the way through.

(b) Invite individuals through views or materials used.

(c) Ensure the market, while inviting individuals into the site, does not take over from the public experience.

(d) Emphasize the large vista through the urban zone out into the Bay to encourage individuals to move there.

(e) Ensure views through the park are sufficiently open in respect to the mounds to provide for personal safety for park users.

(4) Are the public access facilities designed to reduce ongoing 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?

(a) Develop the phasing commitment specifically to public access and open space as much as possible at this point in time. This is important as development proceeds and as water rises.

(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?

(a) No changes were offered on this point.

(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?

(a) Ensure it is public enough in the last phases of sea level rise.

(b) Ensure there is a large enough public outdoor space in the Big Green area between 2050 and 2100.

6. Mission Rock Mixed-Use Development, Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC, and the Port of San Francisco (Second Pre-Application Review). The Board held their second pre-application review of the design by Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC, and the Port of San Francisco for development of a redesigned street grid and utility network to support a proposed mixed-use community and approximately 6.8 acres of new or redeveloped public parks. The proposed project would include a mixed-use development, a parking structure, a large lawn and plaza, and a redeveloped and expanded China Basin Park. Public access improvements include a multi-use center, seating, picnic, recreation, and open space areas, a waterfront café, and other public amenities. Ms. Alschuler recused herself from the project and Mr. Strang assumed the role of meeting Chair.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Mr. Lavine provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the location, context, and existing conditions of the proposed project. He summarized the changes made to the design since incorporating the Board's comments from the December 5, 2016, meeting, which are included in the staff report. He noted that Piers 48 and 48-1/2 are no longer part of this project. Mr. Lavine summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including public amenities, configuration, sense of arrival, street furniture, visual access, and sea level rise.

b. **Project Presentation.** Fran Weld, Vice President of Development, San Francisco Giants, introduced the members of her team. She provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the circulation and accessibility, public areas, project phasing, and climate change response of the proposed project sites at Seawall Lot 337, China Basin Park, Mission Rock Square, and Terry Francois Boulevard.

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

Mr. Leader asked about the interim condition of Terry Francois Boulevard. Ms. Weld stated the street and bicycle lanes will remain open during the renovation.

Mr. Leader asked about parking along Terry Francoise Boulevard during the renovation. Ms. Weld stated there currently is parking along the western side and the lot will remain in operation during the renovation.

Mr. Leader asked when Piers 48 and 50 will connect to the project. Ms. Weld stated Pier 50 is not part of the Mission Rock project. Pier 48 is anticipated to be part of Phase 4, where the Terry Francois Boulevard changes will be integrated with the Pier 48 and Channel Wharf portion.

Mr. Strang asked if he heard correctly that there are 150 events planned per year. Ms. Weld stated the events are programming and activities within the park, such as educational and exercise classes, demonstrations, and farmer's markets.

Ms. McCann asked if the Bay Trail adaptation and build-up will be funded by CFD. Ms. Weld stated there are CFDs for maintenance and operations and for the port to help with shoreline uses.

Ms. McCann asked how much retail is being proposed. Ms. Weld stated 250,000 square feet, the ground floor of all the buildings, will be allotted as well as space in the front of Pier 48.

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

(1) Maureen Gaffney read comments from Mr. Botkin as follows:

(a) It is unclear whether a kayak launch and a rental kiosk are being proposed as part of the project.

(b) The project should also provide a destination/emergency ramp on McCovey Cove because there are no good options in the area to safely get out of the water.

(2) Maureen Gaffney stated 20 feet would be more appropriate for the Bay Trail in this location due to the potential popularity of the site. She stated Phase 4 may not begin

construction until 2047. In the meantime, the site will be home to a beautiful shoreline park that will be drawing new users, residents, and employees of the previous phases with two national sports team home fields on each end. She suggested a robust, creative, fun, and inviting 30-year “interim” Bay Trail on Terry Francois Boulevard between China Basin and Mission Rock Street. She stated the need to clearly delineate the space between bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles with signage, striping, pavement coloring, landscaping, bollards, and planters.

Maureen Gaffney stated, while technically not a part of the Bay Trail, the secondary path along the stormwater garden should be a minimum of 12 feet.

Maureen Gaffney highlighted the need for greater traffic control measures to avoid conflicts between vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians, the importance of enough space for trucks to pull off the Bay Trail and fully onto the aprons of Piers 48 and 50, and the need for the access to China Basin Park entry plaza from the Lefty O’Doul Bridge to be carefully coordinated for safety.

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

(1) **China Basin Park**

(a) Does the proposed design for China Basin Park provide the appropriate sort of public amenities given its location, the existing and proposed surrounding uses, and the populations it will serve?

(b) Are there opportunities for water-oriented or other recreational facilities that should be explored as part of future iterations of the design?

(c) Are the facilities adequate in terms of scope and size given the anticipated number of users, occupants and employees? Will they be adequate during the 100 to 150 short-term events proposed during the calendar year, or on game days?

Mr. Strang stated it seems appropriately designed but questioned if the circulation is big enough and open enough to accommodate the number of visitors expected.

Ms. McCann stated streets and crosswalks may be a challenge due to the timing of the phases. She suggested leaving room for adaptation. She stated she liked the controls and how the park program has been defined. The spaces are appropriate.

Mr. Strang stated the amount of greenery is appropriate for residents but he questioned the durability considering the numbers of visitors expected. He suggested more hard and urban spaces to accommodate large gatherings.

(d) Does the arrangement of the various facilities proposed within the park, including trails, stormwater plantings, proposed public art and other amenities that might be included within the conceptual “three rooms” (plaza, play area, and great lawn), result in the best possible configuration in terms of circulation, views, enjoyment, and safety?

(c) Does the design and alignment of the Bay Trail, Park Promenade, and the secondary pathways through the park provide for adequate circulation through the park for a variety of users?

(d) Is the width of the Bay Trail (at minimum 16-feet wide with no shoulder) adequate to support the anticipated level of use and a mix of pedestrians and bicyclists?

(e) Is the width of the Park Promenade adequate at a minimum 24-feet wide, with 12 feet dedicated for circulation and the remaining available to various retail uses, such as kiosks and café seating?

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

(g) Does the proposed design preserve important views to the Bay? Does the Board have concerns related to the proposed siting of structures such as the waterfront café and kiosks, trees, or other project elements in terms of their effect on views?

Ms. Gaffney asked for comments on the baseball diamond. Ms. Weld stated it is an existing community asset, which will be moved to be a more centralized location.

Ms. McCann stated it is a wonderful community amenity. She asked about the height of the fence around it. Ms. Weld stated the field is not large enough to meet Little League Regulations. It is a low-scale feature.

Mr. Strang stated the need for safety features to be designed into the baseball open field area.

Ms. McCann asked about parking for the residents of the first buildings constructed. Ms. Weld stated surface parking will serve the first building until the parking garage is built.

Ms. McCann stated the provisions described in the presentation are adequate for access and parking.

Ms. Gaffney asked for feedback about views and trees. Mr. Leader stated views through the park are almost too plentiful. He stated more and larger trees would not present any problems. (BDA Note: this is not necessarily consistent with Bay Plan policies concerning views.)

Ms. McCann agreed. She stated, if anything, the park is too open. She suggested adding trees and objects in the park to help frame views.

(h) Does the entry to the park at the proposed Gateway Plaza provide a sense of arrival and guide visitors to the Bay or other points of interest? Is it adequate in size to avoid congestion at the Third Street sidewalk?

Mr. Leader stated the entry plaza may be a little tight to support crowds surging across the bridge. It needs to accommodate the crowds to keep individuals from stepping into the street.

Board Members agreed and pointed to various tight areas of the entry plaza location on the presentation slides and stated it would be worth looking at. Ms. Weld stated the bottleneck shown on the diagram is wider. Transitions have been designed between the entry plaza and the access down onto the surface of the bridge to take advantage of the wider pedestrian-only area on game days.

(i) Does the board have any comments or suggestions on furnishing, lighting and signage?

Board Members stated these items are adequate for this stage of concept design.

(j) Does the Board think that the proposed response to sea level rise at the park—which includes raising the grade of the Bay Trail and Park Promenade, and which would allow for potential inundation of low-lying areas within the park during extreme storm events toward the end of century—will provide for and maintain adequate, usable public access for the life of the project?

Ms. McCann stated she appreciated the diagrams but stated the larger question about Mission Bay and sea level rise is beyond the scope of this project. Ms. Weld stated the BCDC has led the way in creating a forum for that conversation to begin.

Mr. Strang stated the stormwater gardens would be inundated during sea level rise, which is a code issue because the ability to treat the water coming off the buildings and streets will be lost.

Mr. Leader agreed and stated the need for an adaptation for stormwater treatment.

(2) **Terry A. Francois Boulevard**

(a) Does the proposed design of Terry A. Francois Boulevard provide for the best experience for the public, in terms of safety, ease of use, and balancing the public access and marine industrial users?

The Board did not offer suggestions to this question.

(b) Does the proposed design provide adequate access to the Bay, both in terms of visual access and physical proximity to the water, along Terry A. Francois Boulevard?

The Board did not offer suggestions to this question.

(c) As the improvements to Terry A. Francois Boulevard will not be complete until Phase 4 of the project (which could occur between 2025 at earliest and 2047 at latest), will the interim condition of Terry A. Francois be safe and adequate to support users of the Bay Trail?

Mr. Leader asked if the Bay Trail along Terry Francois Boulevard is currently adequate to last 30 years or if it should be reconstructed. Ms. Weld stated there is currently a roadway with striped bike lanes and, east of the roadway where the vehicles circulate is a wide

swath that is a public walkway. It currently is pockmarked asphalt and concrete. The anticipated timeline for Phase 4 is six years. She noted that soil preparation work will be done on the Terry Francois Boulevard renovation, which gives the opportunity to resurface the trail at that time.

Mr. Leader asked if the Bay Trail should be wider than 16 feet at this high-traffic area. Ms. Weld stated the current width is 14 feet in this location on the waterfront side.

Ms. Barton asked if the piers will be shut down on game days. Ms. Weld stated they will remain open on game days as they do today.

Mr. Strang asked if these are public streets. Ms. Weld stated the entire site is in the State Lands Commission jurisdiction, therefore it is port property with port streets that are DPW accepted.

Mr. Strang asked if DPW standards apply. Ms. Weld stated they do but there are a few exceptions to the standards, such as the drainage trench.

(d) Does the Board feel that the proposed response to sea level rise at Terry A. Francois Boulevard—which might involve construction of a wall or other protective device, if a superior adaptation response is not identified—will provide for and maintain adequate, usable public access to the waterfront and along the street for the life of the project?

Mr. Leader stated, as Terry Francois Boulevard is adapted through steps and ramps to protect the buildings, it will obstruct the entrance to Pier 48. It will require ramping five feet down to the Pier 48 entrance or ramping up the Pier 48 entrance to meet the adapted height of Terry Francois Boulevard.

Mr. Leader asked what the adaptation for the height of Pier 48. Ms. Weld stated there is not yet an answer to this question.

(3) **Other Issues.** As construction will occur in phases over at least several years, does the Board have thoughts on the condition of the project site during each phase and ways in which public access to the Bay can be maintained to the greatest extent possible during these interim periods?

The Board did not offer suggestions to this question.

f. **Applicant Response.** Ms. Weld responded positively throughout the Board discussion period.

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board did not summarize their conclusions.

The Board directed staff to continue working with the proponents to move the permit forward.

7. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, Mr. Strang adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREA GAFFNEY
Bay Design Analyst

Approved, as corrected, at the
Design Review Board Meeting of December 11, 2017.