

# San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 510, San Francisco, California 94105 tel 415 352 3600 fax 888 348 5190  
State of California | Gavin Newsom – Governor | info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov

July 2, 2020

**TO:** Design Review Board Members

**FROM:** Andrea Gaffney, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov)

**SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of the June 8, 2020 BCDC Design Review Board Teleconference Meeting**

1. **Call to Order and Meeting Procedure Review.** Design Review Board (Board) Chair Karen Alschuler called the teleconference meeting to order at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Andrea Gaffney, BCDC Senior Bay Development Design Analyst, called the roll and confirmed the presence of a quorum.

Other Board Members in attendance included Board Vice Chair Gary Strang and Board Members Cheryl Barton, Bob Battalio, Tom Leader, Jacinta McCann, and Stefan Pellegrini.

BCDC staff in attendance included Morgan Chow, Andrea Gaffney, Ethan Lavine, Brad McCrea, and Ashley Tomerlin.

The presenters were Rebecca Benassini (Port of San Francisco), Joe Callahan (Callahan Property Company), Rusty Case (Gates & Associates), Will DiBernardo (Scape Landscape Architecture), Afshan Hamid (City of Vallejo), Dan Hodapp (Port of San Francisco), Steve Lichliter (Ruggeri-Jensen-Azar Engineers), Julian Pancoast (Mission Rock Partners), Dan Schaaf (Schaaf and Wheeler), Dilip Trivedi (Moffatt & Nichol), and Fran Weld (Mission Rock Partners).

Also in attendance were Ben Botkin (San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail), Maureen Gaffney (San Francisco Bay Trail), Philip Sales (Napa Valley Vine Trail Coalition), and William Alschuler. Public comment via email was submitted by Paula Bauer, Sidney Coburn, Jimmy Glenn, Judy Irvin, Karimah Karah, and Belinda Seidemann.

2. **Staff Update.** Ms. Gaffney stated, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Board meetings will be held virtually through the end of the year. Future virtual meetings will begin at 5:00 p.m.

a. **The next Board meeting will be held on July 13th.** The tentative agenda includes project reviews for the Klamath which is an historic ferry proposed to be relocated at **Pier 9 in San Francisco, and a mixed-use development project at Point Molate in Richmond.**

Brad McCrea, BCDC Regulatory Program Director, stated this is Morgan Chow's last Board meeting as she has accepted a position with the Delta Stewardship Council. He stated she will be missed.



3. **Approval of Draft Minutes for March 9, 2020 Meeting.** Mr. Battalio referred to his first comment on page 5 and asked to delete the words “or fluvial geomorphology” so it would read “one of the topics that keeps coming up is envisioning how the shore changes over time - geomorphology.” He also asked to remove the word “fluvial” from the following comment by Ms. Barton so it would read “geomorphology has been an important part of that.”

Ms. Barton agreed.

Mr. Battalio referred to his second comment on page 6 and asked to change the phrase “into the water” to “with sea level rise” so it would read “that is important because of the shoreline band, which essentially moves with sea level rise.”

**MOTION:** Mr. Battalio moved approval of the Minutes for the March 9, 2020, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as amended, seconded by Ms. Barton.

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 7 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain with Board Members Barton, Battalio, Leader, McCann, and Pellegrini, Board Vice Chair Strang, and Board Chair Alschuler voting approval with no abstentions.

4. **Mission Rock China Basin Park (Second Post-Permit Issuance Review).** Chair Alschuler and Vice Chair Strang recused themselves from the discussion and decision-making with regard to this agenda item. Chair Alschuler turned the meeting over to Board Member Jacinta McCann to facilitate this agenda item. Chair Alschuler and Vice Chair Strang left the teleconference call pursuant to Board policy.

The Board held their second post-permit issuance review of the revised design of China Basin Park by Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC, and the Port of San Francisco. The project is located approximately at Third Street, between Terry Francois Boulevard and Mission Rock Street, in the City and County of San Francisco. The review will evaluate the project in relation to the issued permit requirements and the Design Controls for China Basin Park.

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 shoreline promenade, passive lawn, active recreation facilities, picnic facilities, seating, and a Bay overlook at the Knuckle Wharf. Additional authorized program elements include public plazas, a public dock, planted areas, a public restroom, permanent or temporary public art installations, and public programming and special events.

The revised design presented at this meeting addressed Board questions and comments made at the November 18, 2019, Board meeting during the first post-permit issuance review, including park amenities, entrance points, circulation, resilience, and adaptation of tidal shelves, programming, and more.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Morgan Chow, BCDC Coastal Program Analyst, reviewed the project and summarized the changes made to the design since incorporating the Board’s comments from the November 18, 2019, meeting, which were included in the staff report. Key areas of the revised design include the park entrances, the beach and play area, the park’s

accessibility program, the design of the Knuckle Wharf and surrounding areas, the designation of materials and plant palettes throughout the site, and a more articulated sea level rise resilience strategy for the tidal shelves on the northern end as well as for the overall park.

Ms. Chow stated the project proponents have provided additional details, as requested by the Board, for the paseos, Block K, park circulation and events, public art locations, and view corridors.

Ms. Chow stated additional materials with studies that have been conducted to address Board questions around the tidal shelf habitat and sea level rise conditions have been included in the meeting packet.

Ms. Chow summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the revised design:

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

(a) Encourages diverse activities and creates a “sense of place,” which is unique and enjoyable, and inviting to the public.

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

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

(a) Includes appropriate enhancements to the park that create an inviting space for the public to enjoy.

(b) Includes a play area that maximizes public use and enjoyment of the waterfront.

(3) Arranges the various facilities and amenities proposed within the park in the best possible configuration in terms of circulation, views, enjoyment, and safety.

(a) Designs and aligns the Bay Trail, Park Promenade, park entry points, and secondary pathways through the park with adequate circulation through the park for a variety of users.

(b) Avoids or minimizes conflicts or congestion at points within the park.

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

(d) Provides a sense of arrival at the entry to the park at Terry Francois Boulevard and guides visitors to the Bay or other points of interest.

(e) Includes considerations for special event programming especially in the added areas between the Bay Trail and the waterfront.

(4) Includes tidal shelves that are adequately designed to colonize and sustain the targeted intertidal species mentioned in the memo provided by the project proponents.

(a) Includes considerations for key characteristics for species growth, texture, invasive species management, public interaction, monitoring, and management.

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

b. **Project Presentation.** Ms. Chow welcomed Dan Hodapp and asked him to say a few words before the project proponents provide their presentation.

Dan Hodapp, Senior Waterfront Planner, Port of San Francisco, reminded Board Members that the Port of San Francisco's Mission Rock Pier 70 Design Advisory Committee met jointly with the Board to review this project at the November 18, 2019, Board meeting.

Mr. Hodapp stated there were ten areas, at the joint meeting in November, where further design information was requested: the play area, the park entrance areas, the food and beverage pavilion, the kiosks, the bicycle circulation through the park, the paseos, how emergency and service vehicle access would function, how water recreation access would occur, more information on site materiality, and more information on public art locations.

Mr. Hodapp stated the Design Advisory Committee met on June 1st to review the revised project. He provided a brief summary of the comments that came out of that meeting, as follows:

- (1) There is a need for appropriate night lighting in relation to bird safety.
- (2) Approximately half of the trees are non-native.
- (3) There were philosophical questions about the new urban park and the need to recreate comfort for new users and what that balance should be.
- (4) Consider more native plants throughout the design to promote biodiversity.
- (5) Create an appearance of consistency and natural versus structured landforms.
- (6) The appearance of the food and beverage building is important given its central location at a raised area of the site.
- (7) Concern about how the food and beverage building will meet the grade.
- (8) The primary restroom within the park is at the food and beverage building. There was concern about the adequacy of the restroom after events such as ball games.
- (9) The approach to the play equipment is imaginative and playful.
- (10) The revised design has accentuated and distinguished the spaces more than the previous proposal.
- (11) Feedback, particularly on the restaurant building, would be helpful.
- (12) The Design Advisory Committee Members noted that the revised design adequately addressed all ten points and they did not require further review of this project.

Rebecca Benassini, Assistant Deputy Director, Waterfront Development Projects, Port of San Francisco, provided a brief update on the progress of the project since the November meeting. She stated project proponents have been working to keep the project on schedule for its construction starts and recently subdivided the property. Later this month, four

parcel leases will be signed, which is a significant milestone as it allows the two office buildings and two apartment buildings to be built.

Ms. Benassini stated the streets and utilities will be put into place and the buildings will be constructed alongside the park with the goal of delivering the buildings at the same time that the park is ready for opening. Ms. Benassini assured the Board that, as the designs are being worked on, the required legal and financial mechanisms are being worked on at the same time.

Ms. Benassini stated special tax districts have been created; all parcels at the site will be subject to an additional tax to pay for the public infrastructure and open spaces planned for this site.

Ms. Benassini stated this project remains on schedule with site preparation in June and more intense construction will begin in July.

Fran Weld, Senior Vice President, Strategy and Development, Mission Rock Partners, provided a brief update on the progress of the project since the November meeting. She highlighted three elements that form the foundation of the design:

(13) Holding a special respect for the Bay and for the environment and thinking long-term about that.

(14) Creating connections for people.

(15) Creating a collaborative culture of design.

Ms. Weld stated three details that the Board pointed out over the years that were inspiring and compelling to the design team and had significant impacts on the project were as follows:

(16) Delivered an interim Bay Trail, which is out there today. That delivery of waterfront access along the perimeter of the site came out of Board comments and is particularly important in this shelter-in-place time.

(17) Encouraged the design team to put more detailed focus on adaptation methods.

(18) Encouraged the design team to think creatively about programming and how the site will be used on a daily basis.

Will DiBernardo, Senior Associate, Scape Landscape Architecture, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the site context, previous and revised designs, phasing, programming, circulation, grading, canopy planting, resilience, and a detailed description of the proposed project. He stated working with the BCDC staff and the Board comments have allowed a significant amount of richness and complexity to be added to the design.

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

Mr. Battalio asked about the treatment on either side of the overlook and if it is accessible.

Mr. DiBernardo referred to Presentation Slide 66 and stated the lined area in the upper right corner of the site is not accessible. That area is designed to be plantings and riprap. He stated there will be a railing at the overlook, which will likely be a pile-supported structure.

Mr. Battalio asked if the walkway between the Great Lawn and the Knuckle Wharf will be accessible to vehicle traffic such as emergency vehicles.

Mr. DiBernardo referred to Presentation Slide 62, Vehicular Circulation, and stated maintenance vehicles will have access to that area by way of the elevated boardwalk on the right side of the slide noted by a blue arrow. He stated there will be fewer conflicts the more the entry is limited. All vehicles - maintenance, events, and ambulances - enter the park through Terry Francois Boulevard, around the Bay Trail, through the promenade, and out.

Mr. Battalio thanked the project proponents for including both the North American Vertical Datum (NAVD) and the Mission Rock city data. He stated the lower part of the play area is at elevation 9.30, which is not much higher. He asked for confirmation that the elevation is 9.30 and how the drainage works from that location.

Mr. DiBernardo referred to Presentation Slide 40, Coastal Play Area Plan Enlargement, and stated that low point is the base exit of the 12-foot slide. It is misleading in that it is a very localized low point. The white boxes on the presentation slide represent the line contour. The accessible walkway to the right of this area on the slide is at elevation 10.30.

Mr. Battalio asked how the tidal shelves and the Cove Access Walkway that are on the channel are founded. He stated it seems like they are extending out over the existing rock revetment. He asked if they will be on piles, as well.

Dilip Trivedi, Vice President and Coastal Engineer, Moffatt & Nichol, referred to Presentation Slide 44, Beach and Tidal Shelves Plan Enlargement, and stated they will not. He stated they are founded on the riprap. Much of the footprint of the walkway is on the existing buttress/riprap that will be regraded and refinished, complete with an aggregate base and a concrete tub that will be filled with a mixture of sand and gravel for a safe walking condition.

Mr. DiBernardo clarified that this is not the primary water access for the park. It is part of the public dock, which is part of Phase 2.

Mr. Leader asked about the material that individuals walk on when they descend from the platforms.

Mr. DiBernardo referred to the middle of Presentation Slide 44, Beach and Tidal Shelves Plan Enlargement, and stated the substrate ground plane in that area is called a "fish-mix," which is a larger mix of gravel. He stated the intent is for only the top tidal shelf to be accessible to the public. The others will be protected by a six-inch raised curb along with Cove Access Walkway.

Mr. DiBernardo referred to Presentation Slide 46, Tidal Shelves Detail, and stated the magnification bubble at the top of the slide shows an example of a walkable fish-mix pebble surface.

Mr. Leader asked about the identity of the Knuckle Wharf and what drives that part of the design.

Mr. DiBernardo referred to the righthand side of Presentation Slide 59, Southeast Park Plan Enlargement, and stated it presents a unique opportunity to be overwater with 180-degree views. In addition, the existing structure is quite old and improvement options are limited.

Mr. DiBernardo stated the project proponents envision an open plane that allows individuals to look out with unobstructed views with informal programming that is geared towards families, picnics, and food service. The adjacent lawn area makes this location a good axillary spot closer to the Bay.

Mr. Leader asked where individuals walk and if there is water under the public dock.

Mr. DiBernardo stated there is water underneath and a riprap revetment that goes all the way underneath the Perimeter Seatwall, which is the line of the existing sea wall. The Knuckle Wharf is over water.

Mr. Leader asked about the ground treatment.

Mr. DiBernardo stated the Knuckle Wharf has a topping slab. There is existing concrete, which will be kept largely intact and will be refinished until larger improvements to the structure can be made.

Mr. Leader asked why the Knuckle Wharf is part of Phase 2.

Mr. DiBernardo asked Mr. Pancoast to provide some background on how this was introduced into the permit in the previous proposal.

Julian Pancoast, Development Director, San Francisco Giants, Mission Rock Partners, clarified that the Public Dock has not yet been constructed. Project proponents are proposing, because the dock is part of Phase 2 and the use of Pier 48 is not yet determined, that some of those improvements be postponed on the existing wharf structure until the adjacent program can be better understood and to design the dock and the adjacent open space to be more compatible. That is the driver of the design.

Mr. Leader ask if structural improvements or changes will be done to keep the wharf functional.

Mr. Trivedi stated not in the immediate future. He stated it was designed for heavy loads. From a loading perspective, there is still a lot of life in it. From a seismic perspective, it depends on the magnitude of the event.

Mr. Pellegrini asked for greater materiality detail of the Bay Trail at the location that shows cobbles in the Central Rumble Strip and the perpendicular cross pieces, particularly the size of the cobbles and spacing of the perpendicular strips along the Bay Trail.

Mr. DiBernardo referred to Presentation Slide 76, Bay Trail Section and Materiality, and stated what is being proposed at the Central Rumble Strip is a thermal finish, which is still accessible since individuals will be crossing north-south or perpendicular to the Bay Trail.

Mr. DiBernardo stated the perpendicular slow-down strips will be standard four-by-four tumbled granite cobbles. On either side of the Bay Trail, where seating abuts it, however, there is a four-foot-wide textured shoulder with companion seating. There is a mandated shoulder at crossings.

Mr. DiBernardo referred to Presentation Slide 66 and pointed out the perpendicular slow-down strips along the Bay Trail. He stated they are six to seven feet apart with the Central Rumble Strip running all along the trail.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the Bay Trail section that continues offsite parallel to Terry Francois Boulevard and the transition between this treatment and what will happen along the frontage.

Mr. DiBernardo stated the project proponents are proposing a mix of striping and light signage to prevent users from careening onto the promenade. He pointed to a location on the lower right side of Presentation Slide 66 and stated the interim condition at the right turn is difficult to maneuver. He noted that there is an approximate five-foot grade change to help mitigate this. Also, the temporary improvements that are planned in this location are a combination of asphalt, signage, and striping, making the materiality of the cyclist portion of the Bay Trail continue onward.

Acting Chair McCann asked about accessible seating, particularly benches that might have hand rests or seating for older individuals, and if those accessible seats are aligned with places in the shade.

Mr. DiBernardo referred to the Presentation Slide 82, Proposed Furnishing Zones, and stated seating is an important part of the park. Many main points in the park such as the entry points to the east and to the west rely on more sturdy seating. The cast-in-place seat walls, which are multi-level, will also have wood inlays in portions of them. These inlays would make a significantly more comfortable seating experience through all seasons. He stated the fixed seating locations will also have seating with and without wood, backs, and armrests. This type of seating is also located adjacent to the Central Plaza.

Mr. DiBernardo stated moveable seating is shown on Presentation Slide 82 by the green hash marks. There are benches along the waterfront, which have backs and armrests. He referred to Block K on Slide 82 and stated this area includes built-in benches adjacent to the wall. He noted that there will also be ample seating in the Knuckle Wharf area.

Mr. DiBernardo referred to Presentation Slide 83, Proposed Furnishings, which had examples of all types of seating options.

Acting Chair McCann agreed that the seating is beautiful but encouraged the project proponents to consider the height of armrests and handrails for individuals who cannot get up and down easily.

Acting Chair McCann asked about how material changes in the food development areas in adjacent Blocks A, G, and K provide a clear delineation between the walkway and the zones that are adjacent to the buildings.

Mr. DiBernardo referred to Presentation Slide 82, Proposed Furnishing Zones, and stated the project proponents shied away from creating a skirt around the buildings or delineating Blocks A, G, and K. However, the moveable tables and chairs and potential barriers that might be in place, such as an alcohol control zone, should drastically help delineate those areas.

Mr. DiBernardo referred to Presentation Slide 66 and stated the size of the pavers at the building interface will be increased from one-foot by one-foot to two-feet by two-feet. He stated, although the grid of pavers is the same tone and the same material, there will be fewer cuts, which helps delineate the area around the building.

Ms. Barton stated the Design Advisory Committee's suggestion to consider using more native plants throughout the design to promote biodiversity is important. Plants shift with climate change. She stated the project proponents are creating a prototype for the region - a giant environmental laboratory that will be naturally enlightening and educational for the public.

Ms. Barton stated the proposed model will be an incredible model for many other places throughout the region and will provide a learning experience for visitors. She asked about the plan for maintaining and curating the proposed site as it evolves and ages over time.

Mr. Pancoast stated the park will be owned by the Port of San Francisco. The Giants and Mission Rock Partners have long contemplated that there would be some private form of maintenance for the park. Mission Rock Partners is working closely with the Port of San Francisco on a private management model agreement, which is still to be determined. The Mission Rock Partners plan to be active in the programming at this site and including educational programs and other events such as farmers' markets.

Mr. Battalio stated his appreciation for the way the Bay and the shore are part of the park. This is something that has not typically been done.

Mr. Battalio stated, when looking at flood levels, using terms such as Base Flood Elevation (BFE) and storm and inundation can be confusing. He asked Mr. Trivedi how he feels about this. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps have two flood levels - one on the channel side and one on the Bay side.

Mr. Battalio stated, on the channel side, it is approximately 9.7, which is a still-water level that is higher than normally used by a few tenths of a foot. On the Bay side, the water level includes wave runup, which is called a total water level and is a higher base-flood elevation at 11.

Mr. Battalio stated the design goes from 9.7, no waves, to 11, with waves; yet, looking at other work such as the URS/AGS engineering work for the port that was done years ago, there was an approximate three-foot wave runup in this area.

Mr. Battalio stated, in the project proponents' report, it included wind/wave hindcast and runoff calculations, while the inundation maps in the appendix of the report do not include the wave action.

Mr. Battalio stated it is hard to follow exactly how much some of the trails might get inundated. He stated his concern about safety in terms of access. He asked how all this is reconciled.

Mr. Trivedi stated some of the terms in the report need to satisfy several different agencies and audiences. He stated the FEMA map is a good exhibit to review. He referred to Section 2.6, Flood Hazards, on page 17 of the China Basin Park Shoreline Engineering Assessment and stated the total water level within Mission Creek is approximately the same as the still water level at 9.7. He noted that this does not mean there are no wave effects, but that the 1 percent chance of occurrence is approximately the same whether it is with a tide or with waves.

Mr. Trivedi stated Pier 48, the more exposed site, is pile-supported. Pier 50 is in a location that reduces significant waves from the southeast. Diffraction plays a heavy role in mitigating attenuating wave action in that location, which is why the FEMA maps show that the total water level inundates and does not extend far onto the shoreline. There is a quick drop-off of wave action due to the riprap in that location.

Mr. Trivedi stated, while there is also an estimation of an approximate 2.8-foot wave, the total water level along the portion between the overlook and the Knuckle Wharf was only approximately one foot higher. Instead of 9.7 elevation, an 11 elevation was used for the total water level, but then it was clarified that that 11 elevation is a transient water level.

Mr. Trivedi stated, in inundation mapping, inundation should be separated from transient overtopping that may occur every few seconds in a set of waves during a storm. It is not inundation that continues going into the park and flooding all of that because of the time duration of the waves.

Mr. Trivedi agreed that safety is a concern. He stated, during extreme storm events, there would be some amount of Bay water similar to walking along the Embarcadero. The Bay Trail is set back and is higher than the 11 elevation. He stated it does not fit well to try to raise the riprap shoreline above existing grades in that location, as long as the Bay Trail is set back and it is higher.

Mr. Battalio asked about access into the tidal shelves and along the northern walkway and the type of safety measures, such as railings, anti-slip surfaces, or drainage. He stated his concern that, even though the waves are small and only during strong winds, there is also boat wake from ferries and boats. He questioned the tolerance of individuals experiencing a wave sloshing on them unexpectedly.

Mr. DiBernardo referred to Presentation Slide 44, Beach and Tidal Shelves Plan Enlargement, and stated each of the walls acts as breakwater when the waves come in. He

referred to Presentation Slide 93, Tidal Shelves and Beach Section, and stated the top tidal shelf sits well above the data listed on the slide.

Mr. Trivedi added that interpretive signage will be important in these areas.

Mr. Battalio suggested including visual warnings such as not to walk into the next shelf or edge if a certain line was not visible or some other visual measure.

Mr. Battalio asked about the thickness of the gravel surfacing layer in the locations with benches, how it drains, and if it will be resilient to mud coming in or water going in and out.

Mr. Trivedi referred to Presentation Slide 45, Tidal Shelves Flushing, which shows the drainage, and stated the tidal shelves are meant to flush. The intent is not to have standing water but there might be water that is retained.

Mr. Trivedi referred to Presentation Slide 46, Tidal Shelves Detail, and stated the thickness of the sand/gravel mix material in each shelf is twelve to eighteen inches, with a coarser cobble below and a more habitat- and people-friendly pea-gravel-size material mixed with sand, above.

Mr. Trivedi stated a park maintenance program will be necessary to remove floating plants, leaves, and debris that will come in. The beach, shelf, and access-cove areas will be groomed.

Mr. Battalio stated his concerns with tidal pools in the Bay are the higher water temperatures and salt concentrations that can occur under certain conditions, especially in concrete conditions that are not often flushed.

Mr. DiBernardo agreed and stated the temperature issue can be addressed by the depth of these tide pools. He stated each one of the proposed tidal shelves has a small weep hole that allows them to flush to ensure better water quality.

Mr. Battalio asked about the methodology used to compute the boat-generated waves, the wave runup, and the dissipation of the waves through the tidal shelves.

Mr. Trivedi stated he will provide that information to staff offline. He stated these are desktop analysis procedures as far as the ship weight waves go, using the traditional numbers and distance from sailing line.

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

(1) Ben Botkin, Water Trail Planner, San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail, stated his excitement about this project - both the ramp and the future dock. He stated McCovey Cove is a major highway on the Water Trail and is an important access and destination point. He questioned where individuals would park their kayaks while visiting this location.

Mr. Botkin stated the need to ensure that the surfaces on the access ramp are made of an anti-slip material. He stated he shared Mr. Battalio's concerns about the safety of using that ramp, since salt spray and algae build-up can make it slick.

(2) Maureen Gaffney, Senior Bay Trail Planner, San Francisco Bay Trail, stated her appreciation for the fantastic work that has been done, particularly the graphics and diagramming. She stated the way in which they have been presented has made them clear and easy to understand.

Maureen Gaffney stated her continued concerns about the vehicle access end. She stated her understanding that it will only be for maintenance and bringing in supplies to the food and drink pavilion. She stated the proposed site will be well-loved and very busy. She stated she had faith that those issues are being taken seriously, but she remained concerned about vehicles driving on the Bay Trail.

(3) William Alschuler asked if the tidal shelves will stock themselves with living things or if they will be planted or seeded. He asked, if the tidal shelves are expected to stock themselves, if the natural wave action and tidal action is sufficient that they will be stocked from bottom to top as things are designed now.

Mr. Alschuler asked about the parts of the park that are accessible to individuals in wheelchairs and if there is a location for individuals to park their wheelchairs under a shade tree.

Ms. Alschuler asked the project proponents to respond to Mr. Alschuler's public comment.

Mr. DiBernardo stated the idea is for the tidal shelves to be mostly self-supported; however, there may be some small species that initially will be seeded. He stated there will be a monitoring plan in place, due to the delicacy of this ecosystem. He stated observation will be done to learn what can survive at the project site.

Mr. DiBernardo stated the tide pool modules are kept under five feet square with the smallest being one-foot square. He stated they are also slightly adjustable.

Mr. DiBernardo stated there are ample areas that are wheelchair accessible. On the north side, the entire Lifted Grove and Handshake Plaza areas are accessible. The Great Lawn area includes bleacher seating with companion seating and ample room to turn around and park under the shade trees. On the south side, there are fewer trees due to the utilities, but the Knuckle Wharf and Central Plaza areas are wheelchair accessible.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Leader spoke in support of the proposed project. It is done extremely well, especially in response to where it was two years ago. It was beautifully presented and thoroughly documented. He stated the use of natural elements has shaped it to make it more diverse and interesting, and the use of topography has helped to create character in the different zones.

Mr. Leader echoed comments made by Board Members about the tidal shelves, which is a fantastic feature that will make the proposed project unique in the area. He stated the way it is done will be a prototype to lead the way for other innovative projects in different parts of the Bay.

Mr. Leader stated, at the same time, the tidal shelves will be a large maintenance issue and may become a hazardous location if defunded. He stated foreign matter will collect in the shelves, which will require a serious maintenance commitment.

Mr. Leader stated the purpose for the Knuckle Wharf area is still unclear. He suggested peeling off the concrete topping, even though it is probably historic, and replacing it with a crude timber decking so the water could be sensed underneath.

Mr. Leader stated the proposed project site was historically a timber loading spot. He suggested, rather than manufactured picnic tables, the use of big stacks of timbers will perform the same function. Having big stacks of timbers for picnic tables would be more in character of the waterfront loading and unloading of timbers and could add to the character while forming necessary functions in spaces where kayakers store their boats.

Mr. Battalio stated he liked this design and the idea of bringing the water and the shore together as part of the park rather than having the park end on a rock revetment with a perimeter trail along some shoreline that was built years ago for some other purpose.

Mr. Battalio suggested including a docent or someone in the tidal shelves area to encourage individuals to use the different features in the appropriate way. He stated this person could monitor activities for the first year while learning how to adaptively manage and manipulate this space and developing rules so that the tidal shelves are a positive feature for everyone.

Acting Chair McCann agreed and suggested that it could be maintenance or security personnel, or even a security camera to oversee the area from a safety standpoint.

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

(a) Are the Beach, Cove Access Walkway, and Tidal Shelves an appropriate enhancement to the Park? Are there any additional considerations to making this an inviting space for the public to enjoy?

(b) Does the design and location of the play area maximize public use and enjoyment of the waterfront?

Mr. Battalio emphasized previous suggestions to adaptively manage this and having some sort of programmed docent or oversight focused on proper or appropriate uses as they evolve to ensure that individuals are safe.

Ms. Barton also underscored previous comments and suggestions about maintenance. She stated the person or persons should not just be docents but should be able to read people to work with what they need to know and are curious about to explain important concepts such as natural systems and sea level rise, and tell stories to help visitors better understand the features in this environment.

Acting Chair McCann agreed. She stated parks in the area are being used intensively, especially lawn areas. She stated she appreciated the scale and simplicity of the Great Lawn, which is a critical part of the design. This speaks to the quality of the amenities in the park.

(3) Does the arrangement of the various facilities proposed within the Park, including trails, stormwater plantings, proposed public art and other amenities result in the best possible configuration in terms of circulation, views, enjoyment, and safety?

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

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

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

(d) Does the entry to the Park at Terry Francois Boulevard provide a sense of arrival and guide visitors to the Bay or other points of interest?

(e) What considerations should be made for special event programming considering the addition of program areas between the Bay Trail and the waterfront?

Mr. Battalio asked how bicyclists will navigate the area. He asked for additional details on how deliveries and trash pickup will work for the concession.

Acting Chair McCann stated there also was a concern voiced during public comment about having maintenance vehicles on the Bay Trail.

Mr. Pellegrini stated his appreciation for the way this project has paid considerable attention to what is happening at the ground plane in terms of how individuals might move through and use the space, and providing indications to users in a subtle way to direct them towards the public spaces.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the less-is-more approach in the level of permanent programming and the shifting more to a dependence on moveable kiosks or popup structures is commendable. It puts pressure on the civic nature of the singular kiosk in the middle. He stated

his hope that additional attention will be given to the choice of materials of that building and durability and permanence as part of the park landscape, which will be subject to high-intensity public use.

Mr. Pellegrini addressed Staff Question 3(d) about the entry to the park at Terry Francois Boulevard, which alludes to a question he brought up earlier about the transition of the Bay Trail. He stated he was unsure if there should be an additional opening up at the intersection where different paths come together. He suggested thinking about that during the development of the Knuckle Wharf Area, which still feels left out.

Mr. Pellegrini stated this could be resolved at the southwest corner of that intersection where the building on that block has yet to be determined. He suggested that there could be an opening up at that corner to help make that more of an entry point or give it a sense of arrival.

Acting Chair McCann agreed that the Block K corner is a critical part of the experience of the space in that location. She stated she liked how the Phase 1 park frames the tighter corner there, but it is a combination of several things going on at once.

Ms. Barton referred to Presentation Slide 79, Views from China Basin Park, and stated the diversity of vantage points and views from this one space is extraordinary. She stated she is particularly fond of View 3 with the tidal shelves dropping down and opening to the water so quickly in the foreground and bringing it in, rather than lawn to riprap, which is what characterizes many of the Bay edge projects the Board reviews.

Mr. Leader stated the proposed project site will experience hard winds from the west and across the cover. He stated the hope that the trees that will be chosen will be resistant to heavy winds coming from one side. Trees typically seen in those conditions are Monterey Cypress or Shore Pine or different types of Melaleuca that can withstand the blast.

Mr. Leader stated more spaces could be framed with trees, but he stated he worries when there are one or two trees out by themselves because they are often blown over, particularly out at the end of the open space. As long as there are views out to the Bay, it can be additionally framed with very wind-resistant trees. He noted that groupings of trees tend to help hold each other up.

Acting Chair McCann echoed the comment made for the port review for the capacity of the restroom at the kiosk - it seemed small. She stated it would be worth examining other public restrooms at Mission Bay. She stated the need for additional restrooms.

(4) Are the tidal shelves adequately designed to colonize and sustain the targeted intertidal species mentioned in the memo provided by the project proponents?

(a) Does the Board have any advice on additional considerations that should be given to key characteristics for species growth, texture, invasive species management, public interaction, monitoring, and management?

Mr. Battalio stated he previously mentioned temperature and salt concentration in the tidal shelves. He stated this staff question cannot be answered completely because this is a new area for this region in terms of grading and rocky, tide-pool-type habitat. It is difficult for everyone to know exactly how things will work and how to adapt, but it is worth doing and learning from. He stated he was glad that the project proponents are working with individuals at the Smithsonian who are actively engaged in this type of feature to get their input and perspective.

Acting Chair McCann stated the consultation that has occurred illustrates that the project proponents have put a lot of thought into this feature.

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

Mr. Battalio stated he likes the idea of bringing the Bay in and having a transition that acknowledges the natural environment in a way that works. With that comes the need to relax in terms of full protection all the time and to allow for future adaption. That is a smart way to go.

Acting Chair McCann commended the project proponents for taking this project on. Adaptation around the Bay is experimental. She stated, although success is not guaranteed, the evaluation science and engineering behind the design is a great launching point. She stated the project proponents cannot do better than that.

Mr. Leader commended the project proponents for making the subject of keeping things out of sea level rise interesting because of the use of topography and making things get up quite a bit higher than they might be otherwise. It is more of the natural method of keeping things out of the Bay, which is great.

Applicant Response. Ms. Weld responded positively to the Board's discussion and suggestions. She offered clarifying points to questions raised by the Board during the Board discussion. She stated the project team will take the Board's comments into consideration and will come up with an improved design.

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

(1) The approach to the design is extremely strong. Board Member are appreciative of the quality of the design and appreciative of the creation and use of topography. The materiality of the project is supported by the Board.

(2) There was an emphasis on the tidal shelves. The tidal shelves are a prototype. Keep that in mind and be prepared for what may happen.

(3) There was an emphasis on the importance of maintenance. The maintenance ties back not only to the entire park but in particular to the tidal shelves because of the uncertainty of how that may evolve.

(4) There was a comment on the Phase 2 Knuckle Plaza. Refine the design further in the future. Perhaps take on some of the original character of the sea edge, the wood, and possibly peeling off the topping. Perhaps it does not have to be thought so much of as an extension to the park but as its own place.

(5) There was a good conversation about the possibility that a docent in the future may be able to communicate the extent of science and the strong underpinning of the design.

(6) There was public comment on the bicycle path and if individuals want to commute. There was public comment on maintenance and making sure that trash pickup does not impede the use of the Bay Trail.

(7) The arrangement of the facilities and the rich diversity of spaces and facilities inside the park are elegant and well-designed. The Board appreciates the level of further refinement and detail for each of the key spaces.

(8) There was a comment in terms of permanent programming - less is more. The Board encouraged the programming not to clutter the park. The design is doing a good job of that.

(9) The concept of pop-up kiosks is commendable. Address the civic nature of the kiosk in the middle. It will be a key facility in the park and will add a lot of use and demand. The capacity of the building to maintain that intensive use needs to be confirmed.

(10) The latest entry approach at the Building K corner of Terry Francois Boulevard addresses the entrance question. Ensure that there is an adequate opening there to welcome visitors into the park.

(11) There was a comment on tree plantings. There is very strong wind into the park from the west. Ensure that wind-resistant trees are favored, take a closer look at groves of 3 to 5 trees, and perhaps avoid single trees to help the resilience of the trees to withstand the winds at this site.

(12) Board Members applaud and are excited about the tidal shelves concept. The Board brought up all the variables: temperature, salt concentration, circulation, water quality - all the things that must be considered. This is somewhat experimental in the region. The Board appreciated the technical memo. Even with all the science, it may not be guaranteed to look exactly and to develop and evolve exactly as anticipated in the design. Encourage project proponents to keep an eye on this and to be able to respond over time in ways that may be needed to keep the concept alive.

(13) The Board commended the project proponents on this point. It has been appropriately designed. Given that it is somewhat experimental, the design does acknowledge the natural environment and brings that into the park. It is a special design.

(14) There was a further point saying how great the design is from the standpoint of the way in which the terrain, knolls, grading of the park, and creation of these vertical elements of the park are responding to sea level rise.

(15) The Board does not often see where potential constraints lead to a really good design. This is an excellent example of how to respond to sea level rise within the broader forming of the park.

Mr. Battalio made a clarifying remark. He stated safety is important. In response to Staff Questions 3 and 4, the Board noted that the docent or other kind of oversight programming and adaptive management of the site access and some of the intertidal areas are important components. He stated the need to ensure that there are no negative experiences with all the uses that are hoped for. He recommended some sort of safety-level programming with a docent or other type of oversight.

Acting Chair McCann stated the Board does not need to review this project again.

Chair Alschuler and Vice Chair Strang rejoined the teleconference call.

**5. Mariners Cove Development, Vallejo (First Pre-Application Review).** The Board held their first pre-application review of the Mariner's Cove Development project, sponsored by the City of Vallejo and Callahan Property Company, to develop a 27-acre mixed-use residential project, located along the Northern Waterfront of the City of Vallejo. The site is bound by River Park and open space to the north, residential neighborhoods to the south and east, and Mare Island Strait to the west.

The project's waterfront is in a Waterfront Park, Beach Priority Use Area.

The proposed project would include 175 single family residences, two public parks, a waterfront trail/promenade, three parking lots, and commercial lots. Public access improvements include public restrooms, seating, picnic tables, play areas, gathering spaces, and other public amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Morgan Chow, BCDC Coastal Program Analyst, introduced the project.

Ms. Gaffney showed a hyper-lapse video from a recent site visit that showed the existing conditions and experience on the shoreline moving from north to south along the shoreline edge of the project site.

Ms. Chow summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the project:

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

(a) Includes a design for the Promenade Park, Wetland Park, and the promenade pathway that encourages diverse activities and creates a "sense of place," which is unique, enjoyable, and inviting to the public.

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

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

(a) Includes components for the Promenade Park (meadow, plazas, gardens, play area, dog park, path, and picnic areas) that are an appropriate enhancement to the waterfront.

(b) Includes a design for the Wetland Park that feels inviting to the public to enjoy.

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

(d) Includes amenities that expand the enjoyment of the shoreline experience, considering the planned development intensity and the beach/park priority use designation.

(e) Includes parking areas that are suitable for the park and the waterfront.

(f) Includes a design for the Bay Trail that meets user needs in this area.

(g) Includes appropriate event programming at the proposed parks.

(3) Includes an arrangement of the various facilities within the Promenade Park, Waterfront Promenade, and Wetland Park that result in the best possible configuration in terms of circulation, views, enjoyment, and safety.

(a) Provides adequate circulation throughout the waterfront for a variety of users.

(b) Includes measures to be taken to avoid or minimize conflicts or congestion points.

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

(4) Designs the public access areas and amenities to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise.

b. **Project Presentation.** Afshan Hamid, Planning Manager, City of Vallejo, introduced the project team. She reviewed the background and community process of the Mariner's Cove Proposed Development.

Rusty Case, Associate Principal, Gates & Associates, the landscape architect, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the context, phasing, existing site conditions, and a detailed description of the proposed project.

Steve Lichliter, Senior Project Manager, Ruggeri-Jensen-Azar (RJA)Engineers, continued the slide presentation and discussed various site sections and sea level rise.

Ms. Hamid continued the project presentation and discussed the entitlement process. She stated it is anticipated that the entitlement hearings will take place in late summer to early fall of 2020.

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

Mr. Battalio stated his understanding that the proposed site is behind the marina, which has breakwaters so waves will not be a problem in terms of the flood levels.

Mr. Lichliter stated that is correct that the marina includes breakwaters.

Mr. Battalio asked about the Bay tides or the river flood levels in this location.

Mr. Lichliter stated his understanding that the Bay tides govern the hundred-year flood elevation. The FEMA maps show the base flood elevation in this area at elevation 10, which is the same as the elevation at the Bay.

Dan Schaaf, Consulting Civil Engineer, Schaaf and Wheeler, agreed and stated FEMA uses mean high high water as the starting water surface against the hundred-year flood. The tidal data puts the hundred-year flood at approximately 9.5 elevation and FEMA rounds that up to 10 elevation.

Mr. Battalio stated there is a conservative sea level rise scenario looking at the medium-high risks with high emissions, which is good. He asked about the amount of sea level rise the park can accommodate before the threshold is reached, at which point the sea level rise will interrupt the use of park functions.

Mr. Schaaf stated, under the likely sea level rise scenario, it is still approximately 50 years out under what is likely to happen at approximately 24 inches. He noted that 1.9 is considered likely.

Mr. Leader asked if the surrounding housing area is outside the consideration of this review since they are outside of current or potential BCDC line.

Ethan Lavine, BCDC Coastal Program Manager, stated it is true that the surrounding housing area is outside of BCDC's permitting jurisdiction; however, when the Board looks at a project like this, it tends to look at the totality of the space to consider how the full development works together and how the public access areas interact with each development.

Mr. Leader asked how a tidal wetland design was chosen.

A project proponent stated the implementation of the tidal pond was an outgrowth of community input. He stated there was a Settlement Agreement among a community group, the Vallejo Waterfront Coalition, in 2006 or 2007 that the tidal pond would be included in this project.

Mr. Leader asked, given that the tidal wetland will have a tidal-influence, how the performance and success of the tidal pipes are predicted.

A project proponent stated there are two tidal pipes as a backup. One is larger than the other and they are nearly flat. An analysis of success has not been done but the vision is that they will flow both ways. They will serve to relieve the stormwater that enters the pond from local storms by discharging towards the river through those pipes. Water will flow through the pipes on a daily basis and will rise and fall with the tides in the wetland pond.

Mr. Schaaf added that the existing pipes were looked at, along with the flushing of the tidal exchange under several scenarios. He stated, even though the tidal pipes mute the tide, there still was a significant exchange of water within the pond.

Mr. Strang asked about the main principles of the Master Plan and how those principles have or have not been carried forward.

Ms. Hamid referred to Staff Presentation Slide 6, Waterfront/Downtown Master Plan, and stated community input since the 2002 Master Plan indicated that the public wanted more connection to the waterfront and public parks. Some of the key features that have evolved since that 2002 Master Plan were the Wetland Park, which is tidally influenced, the Promenade Park, the connection to the waterfront with the Promenade, and the development itself, which is located on either side of the Wetland Park.

Ms. Hamid stated the Settlement Agreement, which occurred after 2002 and resulted in a new Master Plan, discussed the total height, density, and type of units. Those are some of the key features that resulted after the 2002 Master Plan with the public input, the Settlement Agreement, the adoption of the Design Guidelines, and the new Waterfront Master Plan.

Mr. Strang commended staff for the vulnerability diagram. He asked about the community input. He stated it looked as though, from the original Master Plan, the streets from the neighborhoods, which were identified as having the greatest social vulnerability, had a strong connection to the waterfront. This seems to be different in this plan. He asked about the difference between public access availability to the greatest number of units in the new Master Plan versus the old one.

Ms. Alschuler stated she had a similar question. She asked the project proponents to compare Presentation Slide 3, Construction Phasing Plan, and Presentation Slide 2, Overview and Future Development, which shows the proposed site in relation to the city as a whole. She asked how the project proponents see the proposed project connecting back into the city and how surrounding communities can access the site.

Mr. Case stated individuals from the surrounding neighborhoods can access the proposed site by the main streets, such as Tennessee Street. He noted there will be a pedestrian crossing at the intersection to the north at Mare Island Way and Tennessee Street. Once individuals get to that crossing, they can choose to take the Wetland Park route to the Promenade Park or they can take Mare Island Way down to the Promenade Park, which links to the Bay Trail and access to the ferry and River Park.

Mr. Case stated there may be another intersection planned at the main entrance to the proposed project at the corner of Mare Island Way and the Promenade Park.

Ms. Alschuler asked if there is public transportation to this area.

Ms. Hamid stated there is an existing Vallejo ferry terminal, which is within one half-mile of the development. That is one of the most widely-used ferry terminals. She stated the intent is to provide a connection throughout the entire waterfront, which consists of not only this project but several sites along the waterfront and the downtown area. There will be a vehicular connection, a pedestrian connection, and a multi-mobile connection so that this parcel will connect throughout along Mare Island Way as well as the Mare Island Causeway.

Ms. Hamid stated there will be improvements at that pedestrian intersection where the pedestrian way goes underneath the existing Mare Island Causeway, as well.

Ms. Alschuler asked if those are city improvements.

Ms. Hamid stated those improvements have been proposed by the developer as part of the proposed project.

Ms. McCann asked how much the community outreach influenced the design approach to Promenade Park.

Ms. Hamid stated the Settlement Agreement required two community outreach efforts, which occurred in December of 2018 and January of 2019. The city posted those meetings and facilitated, but the developer did the presentations and took the public comments.

Ms. Hamid stated, as a result of those two meetings, as well as the study session that was held for the Design Review Board for the City of Vallejo, comments and feedback were taken in. The developer has also met with the Vallejo Waterfront Coalition and taken comments from that neighborhood group.

Ms. Hamid stated the development, parks, and programming were modified, based on the public comments that were gathered. She asked Mr. Case to discuss the modifications in more detail.

Mr. Case stated, based on feedback gathered from the public outreach and the Vallejo Waterfront Coalition, some of the Site Plan of the greater residential housing above started to morph to accentuate the view corridors.

Mr. Case stated one major design tweak was that the alignment of Harbor Way coming in shifted. This squashed and stretched the park, which was originally more of a square shape. He stated the design pivoted from the previous park design to respond to that to allow that elliptical pathway to reach both ends of the park, now that it is much thinner.

Mr. Case stated other feedback that was received was a demand for a dog area, which was initially placed along Harbor Way. Further public comment suggested that that was not the best place for a dog area. It was then moved to the south of the project by the offices.

Mr. Leader stated, going back to the beginning in 2002, the Wallace, Roberts, and Todd, Inc. (WRT) plan intended to extend the grid of the city down to the water to make a strong connection that brings the benefits of that kind of grid planning all the way to the water. He asked what actions or decisions resulted in going away from the original plan and creating a pattern that deflects individuals around the development.

Ms. Hamid stated her understanding that the previous project did not result in enough public areas. Many of the features in the current design are a direct result of what the public did not like about the 2002 proposal. She asked the developer, who has been involved consistently throughout the evolution of the project, to answer Mr. Leader's question.

Joe Callahan, Callahan Property Company, the developer of the project, stated the current street pattern follows the original plan worked out by Mr. Callahan and WRT fairly closely as part of the 2002 program. The grid elements of the WRT plan are in the Central Waterfront and the current plan is in the Southern Waterfront, which is no longer a portion of the project.

Mr. Callahan stated this plan is close to the original plan. The park plans have changed, based on the interaction with the community, Vallejo Waterfront Coalition, and others. Beyond that, the basic layout of the Mariner's Cove portion of the plan is the same and the grid elements of the plan remain in the Central Waterfront portion of it.

Mr. Pellegrini asked staff for further details with regard to the possible future jurisdiction around the wetland pond, on the possible portion of that, and how the project proponents would like the Board to respond to the notion of providing public access within that sphere.

Brad McCrea, BCDC Regulatory Program Director, stated staff would like the Board's input with regard to public access on the experience in and around that park. He asked Mr. Lavine if there has been a decision about how that will be handled with regard to the Wetland Park.

Mr. Lavine stated his understanding that the question is about the future jurisdiction of the Wetland Park.

Mr. McCrea asked Mr. Pellegrini to restate his question.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the question of jurisdiction is only part of his question. The other part of the question is through what lens staff would like the Board to look at that area, understanding that, if it is in the BCDC shoreline jurisdiction today, the Board would be seeking to maximize public access in that area in a different way than if it is not in the BCDC shoreline band jurisdiction today.

Mr. Lavine stated the Board's advice would be most valuable looking at the development in totality and understanding the best experience as it relates to the waterfront. He stated, as he understands the project today, if the Wetland Park does become tidally

influenced in the future, it would then become BCDC jurisdiction. The wetland itself, where it is tidally influenced, would be considered Bay and the one hundred feet around it would be considered the BCDC Shoreline Band Jurisdiction.

Mr. Lavine stated the question for the Board is how it all works together to provide the best experience on the waterfront.

Ms. Alschuler suggested that the Board look at the Wetland Park as it has been presented today, as part of the whole package for public access.

Mr. Strang asked about the two green triangular spaces in the upper right of Presentation Slide 3, Construction Phasing Plan. He asked if they are publicly accessible.

Mr. Callahan stated they are accessible off the perimeter sidewalk on Mare Island Way, which also ties into walkways within the project. That is also true on Mare Island Causeway.

Ms. Alschuler stated, in the previous plans, there was much discussion about the regional or citywide purpose of the waterfront and bringing the city back to its waterfront, remembering its maritime heritage, and understanding the relationship to the area around it. She asked if there is anything in the plan that relates to the history of the site.

Mr. Callahan referred to Presentation Slide 2, Overview and Future Development, and stated directly opposite of the Vallejo Ferry Terminal is the city library and Vallejo City Hall. The current design ties in the street grid. Georgia Street has already been opened up between Mare Island Way and Santa Clara Street. Approximately 50 percent of the Capital Street extension has been built and will be finished to Santa Clara, tying it into the other city streets.

Mr. Callahan stated the parks in that area have a variety of elements that are aimed at the history of Mare Island and the naval history in the community. He stated there are extensive items that the city had once had in other parts of the community that are in storage. He stated those items will be brought back out and put in portions of the two public park areas in the Central Waterfront.

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

(1) Maureen Gaffney provided her public comment as follows:

(a) Will the project extent include the Bay Trail? Some of the exhibits look like the line stops short of the existing promenade.

(b) Are there improvements to the Bay Trail existing promenade proposed as part of this project, in particular, moving north towards the Mare Island Causeway where the trail goes under the facility?

(c) It looks like the park and public access improvements are in Phase 2. If so, she suggested including interim public access in Phase 1 at the earliest possible time.

(d) Questioned locating the dog park adjacent to the Bay edge from a water-quality perspective.

(e) Is the wetland area historically or naturally a wetland area?

(2) Maureen Gaffney provided public comment on behalf of the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail. Opportunities to include launch and landing facilities for non-motorized watercraft in this area would be key and something that would be a great amenity in this area that will serve the public and the entire city very well.

(3) Philip Sales, Executive Director, Napa Valley Vine Trail Coalition, stated he did a feasibility study a few years ago on the undercrossing of the Mare Island Causeway. He is encouraged that this project includes the Mare Island Causeway because it is a major connector, although its condition is poor. He stated the condition of the asphalt pathway along the embarcadero in that location is in sad shape. He asked if there is a proposal to fix it all as part of this project.

Mr. Sales agreed with Maureen Gaffney that it would be nice to include the park and public access improvements in the interim as part of Phase 1.

Mr. Sales stated the Napa Valley Vine Trail Coalition has one or two iconic bicycle and pedestrian shelters in each section along the Bay Trail. He stated the coalition has been looking for a home for a shelter in the Vallejo area. He stated there may be an opportunity to include a shelter along the Promenade.

(4) Sidney Coburn provided his comment via email as follows:

(a) The project is being built on marshland, which is susceptible to liquefaction.

(b) Geese land on this parcel during migration, which is protected by the Migratory Bird Act of 1918.

(c) The buildings will continue to settle since they are raised out of the flood zone by fill.

(5) Jimmy Glenn provided his comment via email as follows:

(a) This Application has not had an environmental review since 2007, which contained questionable calculations. It would be better to stop and start over accounting for new data on sea level rise.

(b) Three stories of buildings in the triangle formed by Mare Island Way, Harbor Way, and Mare Island Causeway will create a barrier, making anyone living below the streets of Farragut, Trinity, Wilson, B, and C, plus lower Hichborn, Alabama, Louisiana, and Ohio, unable to see the Napa River.

(c) Access to the river is crowded due to too few access points.

(d) This application had a pre-existing promenade that already floods.

(e) There is too much building to the edge of the river, eliminating most existing open space.

(f) Deny this design and ask the applicant to develop downtown.

(6) Karimah Karah provided her comment via email as follows:

(a) Review BCDC policy, since the last environmental review was in 2007, and advancements in science and expected sea level rise demand a thorough and up-to-date review.

(b) We in the Bay Area look to the BCDC to provide sensible, measured, and impartial leadership.

(7) Belinda Seidemann provided her comment via email as follows:

(a) The design of this project will have a negative impact on Vallejo's waterfront access, beauty, open space, and ambiance.

(8) Judy Irvin provided her comment via email as follows: The Project Area seems limited to the southern part of the site, ignoring the area previously developed during the 1960s Marina Redevelopment. This area includes several existing waterfront-oriented commercial buildings, associated parking, and the existing levee topped with an alley of Eucalyptus trees. The area has been subsiding for many years and currently the sea level is within one foot of the top of the levee during King Tides. Even though the Project site plans indicate that the later levee promenade is above the elevation of projected sea level rise, the 1960s levee drops in elevation and will be breached by sea level rise. The necessary improvements to bring the 1960s levee up to protect this residential development are not factored. How will this oversight be addressed?

Staff Response: The existing elevation along the promenade walkway typically ranges between elevations 9+/- to 10.5 +/- North American Vertical Datum 1988 (NAVD88). The current FEMA Base Flood Elevation (BFE) with 100-year floods (a 1 percent chance of flooding in the Bay) is elevation 10 NAVD88; this water elevation would occur in the Napa River when there is a 100-year tidal event in the Bay/Napa River. King Tides currently reach about elevation 7 to 7.5 +/- NAVD88. The city will undertake a Climate Adaptation Plan (CAP) along the Vallejo shoreline with an adaptation plan study and mitigate sea level rise.

The footprints of three commercial buildings within the area of the existing State Lands Trust are being traded for a strip of land adjacent to the road. What happened to the State Lands limitations on housing and non-waterfront-oriented commercial buildings on Trust lands? One proposed building is a waterfront restaurant, which could qualify, but the other building is clearly highway-oriented, not waterfront-oriented.

Staff Response: This is factually incorrect. The strip of land adjacent to the road had the Trust removed through an amendment to an existing State Lands Settlement Agreement with the State Lands Commission. The amendment was approved by the City Council, the State Lands Commission, and the Governor. The developer provided funds to the State Lands Commission Kaplioff Mitigation Bank to remove the Trust interest. The proposed commercial buildings are in fact on three designated Trust use interest areas. These three areas will still need to be negotiated or require further discussion with the State Lands Commission.

Regarding that commercial building, there do not seem to be any conditions on illumination to protect night views of the waterfront. Night lighting on roadway-oriented commercial buildings will be a major visual impairment.

Staff Response: On all projects, staff reviews the lighting as part of the Building Permit process to ensure night sky compliance. In addition, during the Vallejo entitlement process, a standard condition of approval is to direct any illumination away from adjacent properties and roadways.

What is BCDC's jurisdiction in this case? BCDC was established in 1965 when Mariner's Cove was still a tidally affected salt water marsh so the BCDC jurisdiction would have been established as one hundred feet from MHH, which roughly coincides with Mare Island Way now. It was filled illegally in the 1980s. The city was fined by the California Department of Fish and Game (CF&G) and replacement wetlands were constructed elsewhere. How has BCDC's jurisdiction line been moved from the 1965 line to the 1980s illegal fill line? Does CF&G's actions define BCDC's jurisdiction?

Staff Response: BCDC obtained shoreline band jurisdiction after 1969. Thereafter, BCDC issued numerous shoreline band and bay fill (marina) permits based on the location of the shoreline at the quay wall. To the best of the developer's knowledge, there has been no illegal filling in the 1980s, fines from CF&G, or replacement wetlands constructed elsewhere as a result.

The city has done the following: (a) the city entered into an amendment to an existing State Lands Commission Settlement Agreement that lifted the Trust off most of the area in the Mariners Cove development as discussed above; and (b) the Army Corps of Engineers in 1985 issued a permit for the filling of whatever wetlands remained in the Mariner's Cove area with wetland mitigation required elsewhere along the Vallejo waterfront.

On Parcel A2, there is a 1.5-acre area that is a mitigated Army Corp of Engineers jurisdictional wetland. The city mitigated that wetland by funding creation of more than 10 acres of jurisdictional wetlands in 1987, but ongoing drainage into the area has maintained this wetland. The city has an active permit from the Army Corp of Engineers to fill the 1.5-acre area by November of 2020, completing the project.

(9) Paula Bauer provided her comment via email as follows: The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was done long before sea level rise was the major concern that it has become in the last few years as climate change has accelerated. The project is built on fill in a tidal basin that needs to be properly analyzed in light of current knowledge.

Staff Response: The applicant provided sections and they meet the projected 2050 Sea Level Rise in the 2018 State of California Sea Level Rise Guidance. An environmental review was completed, and the proposed plan is consistent with the certified EIR.

There is concern that the interior streets are so narrow that cars will not be allowed to park there, so people living there will have to park in garages or on driveways, and people visiting them will have to park outside of the complex.

Staff Response: All residential units have two side-by-side parking spaces in their garages. There is guest parking on streets A, B, and C, on the north side of Harbor Way, and in the courts serving the residential garages. The number of spaces include: Street A – 25 spaces, Street B – 18 spaces, Street C – 14 spaces, Harbor Way North – 34 spaces, courts – 47 spaces, for a total of 138 guest spaces, plus 350 garage spaces, for a total of 488 garage and guest spaces for 175 units.

The project renderings do not include the solar panels that are now required on new home construction. What will this really look like with the glare of 175 solar-paneled roofs? Three-story homes packed tightly together limit the view of the strait from anywhere to the east of the project. Providing two straight and one curved "view corridors" seems like scant compensation.

Staff Response: The California Building Code (CBC) requires that all homes constructed as of 2020 include installation of solar panels.

The site plan is part of the approved Development Agreement, 2006 Settlement Agreement, Master Plan, and the adopted Design Guidelines. All three documents went through an extensive public review period. The current proposed site plan and view corridors implement the adopted documents.

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board members discussed the following: Ms. Alschuler stated the material presented for the proposed project suggests that it is an important place in the city of Vallejo both for its future access to the waterfront and in terms of the history of the city's relationship to the water and the larger surrounding area, including Mare Island.

Ms. Alschuler asked Board Members to remember the role the proposed project could play to bring people to the water and to learn about the history of the area. It is important to think about the lively nature of the water in relationship to this site.

Ms. Alschuler stated, in reading through the older plans, it struck her that maritime heritage, multiculturalism, and ecology were key points that should be taken into consideration. It was suggested that the proposed site could be a place for a jazz festival and other local events.

Ms. Alschuler stated the geography of the site and the environment do suggest a careful look at sea level rise in relation to the Wetland Park.

Ms. Alschuler asked Board Members to think about the Bay Plan policies and the concern about views into the site, physical and visual connections, bringing people in who are not yet oriented to the water or to this site, and the access equity issues.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Leader stated it seems like every project along the Napa River waterfront in Vallejo is underlain by the question of social equity. He asked to hear more about the neighborhoods that participated in the community meetings and who provided public comment.

Mr. Leader stated sea level rise is often discussed but seismic liquefaction is rarely brought up, and the proposed site is on a former wetland. Deep fills will be placed on top to create the housing portion of the project. He asked how that will perform during a major event.

Mr. Battalio stated, based on looking at the written public comments submitted to staff, it appears that this area used to be a wetland cove of some type and that it has been filled. There was a comment about land subsidence or local vertical land motion. He stated land subsidence results in a relative rise of sea level. He asked to hear more about the sea level rise, including local vertical land motion or local land subsidence, and what is being done to adapt.

Ms. Alschuler asked about Dolores Huerta Park and if it represents an opportunity in terms of a mix of cultures in Vallejo to continue to use that history. She suggested naming the parks something other than their current descriptive names to connect these parks to the rest of the city using the Dolores Huerta Park as a base. She suggested that the maritime history and the river may be an interesting way for the city to feel that this park belongs to everyone.

Ms. Alschuler stated the importance of including interesting programming at the site with important things that matter to people and will introduce visitors to the park so they will want to come back.

Ms. McCann stated she visited this site yesterday afternoon and there was a large gathering. She stated she saw the area in great use and it was incredibly impressive to see the number of people who had gathered at the site for the event and to see how many individuals were walking along the waterfront or weeding their way back through into the entire Vallejo area. These individuals had come from all neighborhoods to the waterfront. She stated it is a strategically-located park in the city and has the potential to become an important gathering place.

Ms. McCann agreed about naming the parks after significant individuals. She stated creating a place that has real meaning and value to the residents of Vallejo will be critical to make it successful and to make it a draw. She suggested thoughtful consideration about that and to encourage as much ownership of the park as possible.

Mr. Strang stated the question about maximizing public use is closely related to the questions of circulation, views, how welcoming it feels as a space, and how it is geometrically connected to the rest of the city. He stated it is possible to get to the water and people will

figure out a way to get there and how to use this park, but there is a difference between being able to get there and having it be really inviting and easy to get there. He stated this is an important parcel and, by virtue of the geometry, it forces individuals around the site as opposed to inviting them in from multiple points.

Mr. Strang stated, even when in the central space of the wetland, which is the main access to the park besides the Promenade, it can possibly feel private being surrounded by the new homes even though it is technically open to the public. The space has a narrow opening with residential windows looking out onto it. He stated whether or not it feels public needs to be looked at.

Ms. Alschuler followed up on the connection across to the river. She asked how the project proponents would accommodate a water taxi that would go between the different waterfront areas and connect to the ferry terminal.

Ms. McCann stated the current waterfront is chopped up with various parking lots. The proposed design clarifies and helps emphasize the site as an important park. She stated her appreciation of the evolution of the site plan from that standpoint.

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

(a) Are the components of the Promenade Park (meadow, plazas, gardens, play area, dog park, path, picnic areas) an appropriate enhancement to the waterfront? Are they distributed and designed to meet and balance the needs of the public? Are there any additional considerations for the Promenade to make the waterfront an inviting space for the public to enjoy?

(b) Will the Wetland Park feel inviting to the public to enjoy?

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

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

(e) Are the proposed parking areas suitable for the park and the waterfront?

(f) Does the Bay Trail design meet user needs in this area?

(g) What advice do you have for events that may occur at the proposed parks?

Ms. Alschuler asked to show Presentation Slide 5, Promenade Park Schematic Plan, to help Board Members in the discussion of these staff questions.

Mr. Strang asked if the riprap shoreline goes right into the Promenade. He asked if something can be done to soften that edge or to make it more inviting, such as a foreground of vegetation with well-placed openings.

Mr. Strang discussed the edge of Promenade Park on the left side of the oval and how it relates to the access roadway with the diagonal parking. He suggested additional screening and enhanced vegetation to make that area feel like a more private and enjoyable space.

Mr. Strang stated the play area on the east is in fairly close proximity to another parking lot. He suggested looking at the edges more than the specific programs in the middle.

Mr. Strang stated it looks like it will be a beautiful space with lots of open space but how the uses around the edges are dealt with is important.

Mr. Leader stated the Promenade area with the double row of eucalyptus trees to the north is nice. This area of the Promenade does not feel distinctive. It is all backed up into the park itself. He suggested more generosity and dignity in the plantings such as, if there are palm trees, putting them on both sides to make this feel like an important place to be because of the central circulation's spine.

Mr. Leader referred to the cross-section slide and stated his concern that the Stepped Concrete Wall and Upper Promenade (Areas 17 and 19 on Slide 5) would be kept above sea level but the Promenade would flood fairly soon. He suggested preserving that area from being flooded for a longer period of time and making it a more grand, dignified place for individuals to walk.

Ms. Alschuler built on Mr. Leader's comments. She stated, thinking of individuals walking through and over time as it changes, one question is about the Promenade itself. Something happened in the history of the site that caused it to go from 24 feet to 10 feet to 15 feet. She suggested more consistency. She stated the Board looks for a 12-foot minimum and a 15-foot preference. The 10-foot area is difficult. She asked if there is a way to widen the Promenade itself.

Ms. Alschuler stated there is a curve around Area 12 where individuals could choose to walk up to the higher level and go along the waterfront the same as would be imagined they would do some time in the future, but it does not quite follow through as a major path. She suggested considering that in the adaptation plan for access or even now to give a double choice to individuals. That would allow for that flow.

Mr. Pellegrini built on Ms. Alschuler's comments. He stated he is struggling with the fact that this portion of the park does not appear to demonstrate a clear hierarchy about the most significant spaces or what thing might be more important than another. The different geometries come together in a way where they often feel that they are competing with one another.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he is hearing from fellow Board Members that, even if the Promenade exists at two levels - a lower Promenade and an Upper Promenade - it might be important to emphasize that as a primary organizing piece of this parti. This is not seen in the current plan.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the need to better understand the primary connections off of the Promenade back up into the open space system. This emphasis might be important. He agreed with Mr. Leader that the quality of the Eucalyptus trees and the linear plantings on the west side are a strong element but are limited in their extent.

Mr. Pellegrini stated his assumption that the diagonal that goes from Area 17, Stepped Concrete Wall, up toward Area 7, Play Area, is the old holdover. It is the street grid in the old WRT plan, but the way it is seen in the current plan is as a regular sidewalk. He suggested putting some thought toward what the big idea should be that should come down to the waterfront in this location and be seen as being primary that might drive the decision-making or parti in this area.

Mr. Pellegrini stated this might be helpful to consider as the design evolves to bring more clarity or a stronger idea to this part of the waterfront and to help accommodate the opportunities for large gatherings. He stated, currently, it is difficult for those activities to happen in this part of the riverfront.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the restaurant has the opportunity to be a key animator and key focus of activity, but the edges of that building footprint do not respond and relate to that. He suggested including terraced spaces or outdoor seating spaces that could help connect the Promenade and the public spaces to the activities that are happening inside the buildings.

Mr. Pellegrini stated, currently, the buildings are just being set in lawns, which will not provide an opportunity to animate and bring life to this part of the riverfront. He stated there is an opportunity, particularly at the park edges as they relate to the buildings, to think about them more as public edges and public frontages than how they are in the current design.

Mr. Battalio stated, based on the presentation, it was not clear that the project proponents intended that raised area to be a throughway, necessarily. He stated he was curious why not.

Ms. Alschuler asked the project proponents, at the next Board review, to include the intent with the plan and how it will serve different kinds of events, such as how water and electricity will be available at these public spaces, to show how those will be managed. She asked to hear stories about various days during the year for these spaces.

Ms. McCann built on comments already made about the edges and the Promenade. She stated the next evolution of the design of this park might aim for some simplification. There is potential for three spaces that are a little more simplified that would better clarify the edges. She stated she could imagine two other types of beautiful ellipses on either side of the current single ellipse that would be in those other two areas or they could even intersect with each other. She suggested emphasizing very beautifully-framed edges to all three spaces.

Ms. Alschuler stated, regarding wind protection and shade, it is important in these sites to include protection.

Ms. Alschuler stated it will be important for the Board to hear how the project proponents anticipate parking to be used. There was an unusual trade with the state lands that

ended up with the 17 diagonal parking spaces across the street which seem like they should serve the park. She asked for additional details on how the whole development will work together in terms of parking. Another part of that answer could include other ways that individuals could get to the park for an event.

Mr. Leader referred to Presentation Slide 3, Construction Phasing Plan, and stated this slide shows more of the whole project, including the Wetland Park. He stated he is not a believer in tidal pipes. There are too many examples around the area where they quickly fill with sand or debris.

Mr. Leader stated the proposed tidal pipes will not perform well. They are longer than other pipes he has seen that did not perform well, such as the Aquatic Park in Berkeley or in Miller Park in Richmond, which had the same situation. They get algae blooms, develop unpleasant odors, and do not deliver value for housing.

Mr. Leader suggested another solution for the proposed project such as treating it as a tidal estuary and that water should be brought in between the oval and the mariner's office to create a piece of estuary that reaches all the way in and will deliver good flushing and good hydrology to make that work.

Mr. Leader asked if there is enough water being shown in the Wetland Park because it is drawn so the BCDC jurisdiction line does not go into the housing, but the rendering showed it quite a bit larger. He stated the need for an evaluation of the size, quantity, and depth of the water as it goes up and down with the tides.

(3) Does the arrangement of the various facilities proposed within the Promenade Park, Waterfront Promenade, and Wetland Park result in the best possible configuration in terms of circulation, views, enjoyment, and safety?

(a) Does the design of the project provide for adequate circulation throughout the waterfront for a variety of users?

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

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

Mr. Leader stated the need for individuals to know if these are public spaces or not and how to get into the site from the surrounding neighborhoods, given that the original grid design has changed. He suggested creating a corridor moving through the middle of the project, which tracks the flow of the water to make a more dramatic and more fully fleshed-out pedestrian connection that goes from the Mare Island Causeway at the top and moves all the way through to the Napa River.

Mr. Leader stated this would invite individuals to pass through. It would create a very public sort of connection with an estuary-side path all the way through. He suggested that Harbor Way could have a bridge or a culvert under it so the connections are strong and ecologically feasible.

Mr. Battalio stated he liked Mr. Leader's comment. The only issue is that there is a marina right there, which makes it awkward. He stated one of the things about having a lagoon like this hydrologically for a basin is, if it is muted, that also means that it will drain slowly once it is filled to a high elevation due to rainfall together with high tides.

Mr. Battalio requested that the project proponents help the Board better understand the hydrology and the anticipated water levels of that feature. He stated there are water quality issues that affect access and public use that link to the Board's charge.

Ms. Alschuler stated a question was raised about whether the smaller, triangular parks on the southern part on the right side of the plan in the development area were public. She stated they appear to be public. They almost line up with Alabama Street. She asked if some of the ways of getting into the site could line up so individuals would see from around the sides.

Ms. Alschuler stated her concern that the intersection at Tennessee Street and Mare Island Causeway will be congested. It will be challenging for pedestrians to easily cross there. She asked to see more about how individuals will arrive by foot and different modes of transportation. Maybe there is an opportunity to make a more welcoming way into the site.

Mr. Strang agreed and asked for more information about crosswalks or how to get to the view corridors from the main points of entry.

Ms. Alschuler stated it is essential to have a large open park but it is challenging to go under the Mare Island Causeway. She asked for more information on navigating and getting under the Mare Island Causeway and who will manage that. She stated it will be important because it will be the connection to the waterfront.

Ms. Alschuler asked for more clarity on the sense of approach and how individuals will move along the waterfront.

Mr. Strang noted that the view corridors in blue and pink terminate in parking lots.

Ms. Alschuler added that curved view corridors are difficult. She stated the view will be of houses for visitors who arrive to the site via Tennessee Street.

(4) What advice do you have for designing the public access areas and amenities to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise?

Ms. Alschuler stated Mr. Battalio had commented earlier about understanding the history of the site and whether it was a wetland and if there is a subsidence problem in terms of seismic or liquefaction questions.

Mr. Battalio asked for more information on vertical capacity, the amount of feet of sea level rise the park can withstand and still function, and how it will be adapted afterwards. He stated the need to consider the vertical land motion. He asked for more detail on the amount of settlement or subsidence that is anticipated locally or how it will be worked around.

Mr. Battalio stated Board Members mentioned wanting to better understand the historical geomorphology and hydrology of the site to the extent that there is a representation

of that in a managed wetland feature that used to be apparently tidal wetland. He stated it would be interesting to hear more about the tidal hydrology, water levels, and tide range, and how it relates to the drainage of the stormwater runoff at the site.

Mr. Battalio stated, to Mr. Leader's point, the tidal pipes must be installed to drain stormwater from farther inland or substitute for an open channel. He asked for more information on the drainage of the site.

Ms. Alschuler asked who will provide the management and maintenance of the park and how that fits with making decisions on when to adapt.

Ms. Alschuler asked the project proponents to report back on how the city is doing on their larger Climate Action Plan, how it relates to this site, and what the timing is on that.

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

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

(1) Board members are interested in this parcel, its public spaces and the ability to serve the full range of individuals in the city, issues of equity, vulnerability, and lack of recreational and waterfront access areas. What will the sense of invitation be?

(2) See how the site fits in in its region and tells the story about the life of the space and how it relates to what is happening in the surroundings, and connects to all the exciting things happening downriver and across on Mare Island. This will make a big difference.

(3) There is a lot to work with at the site in terms of informal uses that are currently giving families a little fun and relief and how to build on that to truly be a destination in the city.

(4) In terms of the Promenade itself, it does not seem to have a distinctive role in the area. It is left the way it is, which might have drawbacks. Board Members suggested a kind of generosity of spirit and dignity in its design.

(5) The Promenade is important - it is the place where the three excellent locations on the waterfront will be connected.

(6) Board Members asked to better understand how, over time, the Promenade will evolve and split and how to ensure it is really ready. Maybe offer opportunities for individuals to use the upper level as well as the lower level.

(7) Board Members asked how pedestrians, members of the disability community, bicycles, and others will pass through.

(8) Look at softening the riprap edge. Is there any way to plant on both sides of the Promenade?

(9) The main meadow needs a real sense of what the different uses are. Perhaps simplifying and giving clarity to the edges and the way different uses fit together might be a simpler plan.

(10) While doing that, look at some buffering and care in terms of individuals enjoying those spaces and the relationship that cannot be avoided to parking on roadways. In those locations, ensure that there is a sense of protection in those areas, including the environmental issues of wind and shade.

(11) Look at the ecology of the site and how it will work.

(12) Promenade Park will be affected by Board Comments on the Wetland Park. It is important to be concerned with Mr. Leader's suggestions about learning the lessons from Aquatic Park, Miller, and others to see if this is the right decision.

(13) Elaborate on how the park will have good flushing again, that it can be used, that the size and quantity is appropriate, and that all those things have been thought through.

(14) Consider the possibility of more of a single estuary-type connection.

(15) The Wetland Park is the place to emphasize the pedestrian connection all the way to the river to invite the community and individuals in the surrounding area through and bring everyone in to enjoy this Wetland Park and to understand how the tides and the stormwater could work.

(16) Understand the seismic situation and how that is being handled. Is there subsidence nearby and is that a concern?

(17) Understand the vertical capacity of the site. When will it not be possible to use the Promenade and what parts of the park will be affected? Understand the hydrology, geomorphology, and the water levels and how that all fits together.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board would like to review this project again.

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

**MOTION:** Ms. McCann moved to adjourn the June 8, 2020, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Strang.

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 7 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain with and Board Members Barton, Battalio, Leader, McCann, and Pellegrini, Vice Chair Strang, and Board Chair Alschuler voting approval.

There being no further business, Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:45 p.m.