

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 510, San Francisco, California 94105 tel 415 352 3600

State of California | Gavin Newsom – Governor | info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov

June 29, 2023

TO: Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Ashley Tomerlin, Senior Bay Development Design Analyst (415/352-3643; ashley.tomerlin@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of the December 12, 2022 BCDC Design Review Board Teleconference Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Meeting Procedure Review.** Design Review Board (Board) Chair Jacinta McCann called the teleconference meeting to order on Zoom at approximately 5:00 p.m.

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

Board Members in attendance included: Board Chair Jacinta McCann, Board Vice Chair Gary Strang and Board Members, Robert “Bob” Battalio, Kristen Hall, Tom Leader and Stefan Pellegrini.

BCDC staff in attendance included: Andrea Gaffney, Ethan Lavine, Katharine Pan and Ashley Tomerlin.

The presenters were: Jon Hughes, Griffin Structures, Chuck Gardella, Gates and Associates.

Also in attendance were: Daniel Shafir-Schorr, Gates and Associates, Kevin Nguyen and Patrick Chan, BKF Engineers, Katie Bowman, Avalon Schultz and Nick Thom, City of San Leandro and Shaye Diveley, Meyers Nave.

Chair McCann reviewed the meeting protocols.

Ms. Gaffney reported that BCDC Staff and Bob Battalio met with the Port of Oakland and the Army Corps of Engineers to discuss beach design at Middle Harbor Shoreline Park.

Board Member Battalio reported out on the meeting as a form of ex parte communications. He stated: Our discussion lasted about one hour. Beach enhancement possibilities were discussed. A new concept was that of grading the existing beach a little differently than they had shown for their consideration.

The Port of Oakland will review the grading design proposal along with the Master Plan with BCDC staff. The Master Plan will be ready for staff review in February.

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
FOR DECEMBER 12, 2022**

2. **Staff Updates.** Ms. Gaffney announced that she has served as the Board Secretary since 2016, for a total of 48 DRB meetings, 111 project reviews and 13 briefings. She noted that the DRB's work has influenced many projects both directly and indirectly, and that the Board's impact is significant and helpful.

Ms. Gaffney stated: It has been a pleasure working with you and I will be leaving you in capable hands. The next DRB meeting is tentatively scheduled for February 6, 2023. At this time, we have not developed an agenda for that meeting.

Chair McCann mentioned that this was a very sad evening for everyone on the DRB. She stated: The graphic that you have shared with us serves as a compliment to us and we want to emphasize what an incredible impact you have had on our work. On behalf of the Board, we appreciate your hard work, dedication, creativity and the sensitivity that you bring to issues. We will miss you and we want to wish you well and we know you will be successful. We wish you all the best.

Various Board Members thanked Ms. Gaffney and highlighted a number of accomplishments.

Ms. Gaffney thanked everyone for the kind words and moved on to the Board Succession Briefing.

3. **Board Succession Briefing.** Ms. Gaffney presented the following. There are seven Members on the Board with at least one architect, one landscape architect and one engineer serving on the Board. There are seven Alternates with three terms of five-year service. Staff is looking for one architect to serve on the Board and to fill three Alternate positions.

Chair McCann asked for public comment on the briefing. (No public comment was voiced)

MOTION: Chair McCann moved to form a Board Selection Committee, seconded by Board Member Leader.

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 6 Yes, 0 No, and 0 abstentions.

With Board Members: Battalio, Hall, Leader, Pellegrini, Vice Chair Strang and Chair McCann voting Yes.

4. **San Leandro Shoreline Development Project, City of San Leandro, Alameda County; (Third Pre-Application Review).** The Design Review Board held their third pre-application review of a proposal by Cal Coast Companies, LLC and the City of San Leandro to redevelop the San Leandro Marina and surrounding land. The proposed project would include a waterfront park, hotel, restaurant, residential and condominium buildings, and a commercial building. The project has undergone significant design and land use changes since the second review in 2016.

a. **Staff Introduction.** BCDC Principal Shoreline Development Analyst, Katharine Pan introduced the project and summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the revised design; the seven objectives for public access are:

(1) Make public access **PUBLIC**.

(2) Make public access **USABLE**.

- (3) Provide, maintain, and enhance **VISUAL ACCESS** to the Bay and shoreline.
- (4) Maintain and enhance the **VISUAL QUALITY** of the Bay, shoreline, and adjacent developments.
- (5) Provide **CONNECTIONS** to and **CONTINUITY** along the shoreline.
- (6) Take advantage of the **BAY SETTING**.
- (7) Ensure that public access is **COMPATIBLE WITH WILDLIFE** through siting, design, and management strategies.

Staff also has the following specific questions for the Board's consideration:

- (1) Are the different areas of the peninsula designed to ensure that the public spaces "feel public," and allow for the shoreline to be enjoyed by the greatest number of people?
- (2) What advice can you provide for the phase 1 park to ensure its success?
- (3) How can the basin become an integral aspect of the redesigned waterfront park?
- (4) How does the project protect and enhance existing visual access to the Bay, and are there additional ways for the project to improve visual access?
- (5) How can the project improve connections to the Bay from surrounding development and infrastructure?
- (6) What advice or considerations can you provide for resilience and adaptation of the public access areas?
- (7) What advice can you provide on the relocation of the boat ramp and water taxi float in consideration of the adjacent existing fishing activities?

b. **Project Proponent Presentation.** Mr. Jon Hughes with Griffin Structures and Chuck Gardella with Gates and Associates presented to the Board via a slide presentation project details and parameters.

c. **Board Questions.** Board Member Battalio asked about the boat launch. It seems a bit constrained. I am wondering if the people that will use this have had an opportunity to weigh in and whether or not there has been a discussion with the State Parks Department of Boating and Waterways or a review of other guidelines?

One of the presenters replied that we are still in the conceptual level. The county fire department also utilizing this boat launch and we have coordinated with them the turn-around radius that they need to launch their boats.

Board Member Leader asked what attention has there been to the basin itself and what attention can there be given the waterline and the water?

The proponents noted that they have spent a lot of time looking at the basin and trying to figure out the highest and best use of it.

The challenge with this basin is that it is prone to siltation and that will continue. Talking with the engineering staff and the City we have come to the conclusion that the best course of action is to let Nature have its way and allow human-powered craft to interact within the basin but not to incentivize motorized craft in there nor are we looking to incentivize swimming because of the mudflats.

The mudflats do present themselves twice a day at low tide. It is not an ideal place for swimming. We want to maximize views. We want to maximize the beautification of it and we want to allow for people on human-powered craft to be able to go in at high tide at their leisure.

Chair McCann asked if the proponents had studied the removal of riprap on the interior basin?

The response was that we have looked at it but we do not plan to do it now because we are trying to preserve any potential erosion and there are some cost considerations to that.

As we raise the grade especially on the inside basin we are going to be using certain groundcover that are better designed to grow into the riprap. It will smooth out the transition from rock to landscape and soften that edge.

Vice Chair Strang asked the presenters to point out the location of the original shoreline.

It was answered that Monarch Bay Drive was the original shoreline.

Mr. Nick Thom, San Leandro City Engineer added that we commonly refer to the original shoreline as very close to the Union Pacific Railroad. Anything west of that was too marshy to build on. It is quite a distance from where we are today. This area has received a lot of fill since then.

Vice Chair Strang noticed that in the 2100 sea level rise scenario the entire golf course site is completely underwater. Does it have any role in the mitigation of flooding for these neighborhoods later? Has that been taken into account?

Mr. Thom stated that the City has thought of that as well. The grade will be raised so that water will not cross this project and enter the neighborhood. We believe that this neighborhood will not be flooding under some sea level rise.

Vice Chair Strang summarized; so the single-family neighborhood will be raised to form a kind of levee there?

Mr. Thom stated that the new single-family residential neighborhood on the screen here will be raised. Will be built outside of the flood plain.

The existing neighborhood to the east will be protected from flooding because the water will not be able to cross the new higher neighborhood.

Chair McCann for the elevation of Monarch Drive. Does it provide protection through 2050?

Mr. Thom replied that the elevation is approximately 10 which is right at the base foot elevation currently from FEMA without any sea level rise considerations. We do propose to raise Monarch Bay Drive in front of this project but outside of the project it is going to remain as is.

Board Member Hall asked what elevation Monarchy Drive would be raised to.

The reply was that where the hotel is - that is going to be raised. The single-family is going to be raised. So Monarch Bay Drive is going to conform to meet those grades. It will be raised in those areas. Where Marina Inn is as well as Horatio's is, those stay existing. It is going to have some unusual undulations to meet existing grades. Wherever we are raising grades in Monarch Bay Drive is conforming to, we are going to be raising it as well.

Board Member Hall mentioned that the design elevation is for year 2070 medium to high risk scenarios and received confirmation of this.

I had another question about the relocation of the boat launch and if you have looked into wave actions and tidal influence in this area. Is it a good location for a boat launch? I am noting that the existing location is quite protected and I did not know if this launch shares the same kind of characteristics.

The response was that it does and all the calculations with regard to sea level rise all take into account wave action and wind/wave and the main reason we have it oriented the way do is we want to take advantage of that protection that it currently has by angling it to the south.

Board Member Hall also asked if there are any ideas about storage facilities for those outrigger canoes here?

It was answered that we are seeking ways to do that. It is a big challenge. They are very big boats but they are a very strong proponent of the project. The City is very much onboard with accommodating them.

Board Member Hall talked about the parking lots around the existing hotel and Horatio's. Is that in the Master Plan area?

The answer given was that that area will remain unchanged. There is a nice pathway behind Horatio's and the Marina that will remain open to the public. We are hoping to tie our sidewalks to those so there is continuous pedestrian access.

Board Member Hall asked if the observation deck behind the restaurant was planned to stay.

The proponent responded that the observation deck would be removed. All fill that is currently in the basin will come out.

Board Member Pellegrini talked about the public access on the west side of the existing hotel and Horatio's and that it will remain at the current elevation. He received confirmation that the new public access that parallels Mulford Point Drive will come in at the new 2070 height condition.

He also was assured that Monarch Bay Drive will be raised for the frontage of the project and that the hotel and Horatio's will stay at their existing elevations.

Board Member Pellegrini noted that this project does not resolve the resiliency issue for Horatio's.

The proponents stated that presently we do not intend to design something as part of this project but the City is establishing a community facilities district to provide funding. If the City needs to take further action to provide resiliency for the future they are working to establish funding to do that.

Board Member Pellegrini asked that when the elevation is raised on the basin frontage - the shoreline profile, does it continue to be a riprap edge on the interior?

The answer was that no, this slide that shows the inside of the basin where we raise the grade we are going to be putting some additional riprap but we are also going to be landscaping it so that we soften that edge. We do not want to bring a bunch of rock right up to the pedestrian access but we do envision some riprap for stability.

Board Member Leader commented on the parking, the 150 spaces. How is that number determined? Was it based on the usage or something else?

The water-quality basins that I am seeing within the park, is that basically C3 for all the new impervious surfaces within the park itself or anything else?

He was informed that the water-quality basins is to achieve W2MP requirements capture and recharge the water table. We have more than we need.

As it relates to parking that was part of the negotiations with CalTrust in terms of what they need and what we can fit. We are trying to strike the right balance between providing the sufficient parking that we need for the community while providing as much natural greening of the area as possible.

Board Member Leader asked how much of that parking by the restaurant is going to be used by the restaurant?

The answer is that the parking of the restaurant is going to be part of your parking lot, it is overflow. The shared parking lot is really overflow parking for special events.

The developer is charged with providing sufficient parking for their amenities in their zone or inside the parcel.

Chair McCann noted that on page 1 showed a very large area of hydro-seeding. What is the irrigation plan for that?

The reply was that we have not worked that out yet but we do intend to irrigate that. Typically spray type irrigation is used on an area such as this that will be a low grass.

Chair McCann also asked about the cultural interpretation area. It was not clear whether the Ohlone recognition plus the memorial to the two vessels lost at sea - do they all go into that area?

The answer was no. And in our conversations with the Ohlone they have specifically asked if they could have a special area for ceremonies and other culturally sensitive things. That is why we picked that site specifically for that. It will not be quarantined off so the public will still have access to it. It will be a private place of contemplation for the entire community and it will be designed around and in the interest of the request from the Ohlone.

The other memorials will be placed throughout the park. We have met with the other agencies involved and have taken our direction from their wants and desires.

d. **Public Comment.** Chair McCann opened the meeting up to public comment. The Bay Trail Project submitted a comment via email which was shared with Board Members and project proponents. A brief summary of that email was read to the Board. No public comment was given in person or via phone.

e. **Board Discussion and Summary.** Chair McCann stated that a substantial change and a great deal of work done based on previous meetings and suggestions. I want to commend project proponents for that.

After six years of preparing for this project a lot of things have changed particularly in the resiliency area and adaptation area. Six years ago that was not the first thing we talked about. It is good to see that thought has been given to those aspects of the project.

Board Member Leader opined that the park was over-parked. It is bringing vehicles too far out into the park. There is too much uniform use of lawn. There is consistency in this park of lawns framed by other features and the parking has to provide access for all these areas uniformly.

I disagree with the uniformity of it. The parking ought to be confined much more over by the restaurant and it seems like too much parking by the hub. There could be some zoning becoming more and more ecological, more and more a natural-system based and less kind of like lawns with barbecues.

There is a topographic potential here that is not getting exploited. We have tremendous wind off the Bay. Would there not be some benefit in having a real system of berms on the west edge which would shelter people? And then on the inboard side facing onto the basin there could be more sheltered areas for use.

As you get down the peninsula there is more possibilities for habitat, more dominated by natural systems.

The last thing is that if you had a cross-section where there was an elevated series of berms along the west edge that the topography could step towards the basin. Do we need to keep this riprap on the inboard side? How much wave action is really going on there? Could there be an approach to the basin that really banks on that.

We have to know what the future life of the basin is going to be. Are there ways that we could move things along and I do not think just letting nature take its course is going to be a very pleasant outcome. It is going to just silt up like a big pancake of mud.

Could we work with the way the water that the water is being organized through terracing and establish more wetlands, more areas that might actually get rid of the riprap on the inboard side and work that edge into something much softer and more natural-system based.

Board Member Battalio spoke about what information the Board had in regards to what is going to happen in the future. We have seen places where the sedimentation has been so extensive that you actually get vegetated marsh plain.

It would be good to know if it is likely to remain as a mudflat and to what elevation or if it is going to reach high enough that cord grass and then pebble weed could establish and be really beautiful.

One of the things that is missing ecologically is a transition to higher elevations for high-tide refuge and more of an ecotone and a broader ecological opportunity.

I would suggest it might even be worth filling that area a little bit here and there and maybe even creating some islands for birds.

It would be good to get an ecologist on board to see if that could be really enhanced.

Board Member Leader emphasized that this could create a lot of value and it is just a missed opportunity that should not keep getting missed.

Board Member Hall appreciated all the background on community engagement process and how it shaped the plan.

It helpful to see that the proponents are thinking about the amazing views from this site. It is also great that you are including restrooms. These things are so helpful for people.

We should call this, "a little lagoon" or something instead of the basin. These places where you can see the Bay looking across a body of water are really unique and special.

You might think about keeping a few of the docks and be able to do that in this basin. Maybe making it inviting to some of the sea lions or maybe some shorebirds types of mudflats. These are opportunities to think of that water sheet as a space of activation and would add a lot of value to the surrounding development.

This is in an area of high social vulnerability including households without vehicles. You have to go quite a distance from the surrounding neighborhoods to get to the waterfront, the park.

Could you create connections at 133rd and West Avenue because those would be connections from the neighborhood that could get you to the waterfront more directly.

There should be a lot better and more frequent opportunities to cross Monarch Bay Drive for the residents that are going to be living here in this new community.

At least every 500 feet there should be some kind of pedestrian crossing.

Getting through the parking lot for the existing Horatio's and the hotel, there is no pedestrian sidewalks anywhere. It is just a lot of parking lots with islands but no real safe pedestrian routes.

I was also looking at the San Leandro Bike Master Plan and it looks like they have identified Monarch Bay Drive as a Class 1 bike facility which is a shared-use path. It looks like you have that on the east side of Monarch Bay Drive. Just make sure that there are safe crossings to get across the drive there without having to go too far from that path to the waterfront.

Board Member Pellegrini spoke about short-term access and comments from the Bay Trail. We do not know when Phase 2 is going to happen so that is an argument for including some of the primary public access ensuring that it is in Phase 1 is a useful thing to think about.

These new public access ways are being built at a higher elevation with the expectation that when the site redevelops they also will come and redecorate but it is only done on one side. I wonder if you can actually build the public access on the west side of Monarch Bay Drive instead of giving shoreline Bay Trail users an unnecessary need to cross the street from the west to the east and back to the west as they are travelling in that direction. The right of way may not be sufficient there but there is a lot of parking there on the west side and it may be too busy in the future.

I am concerned about a long stretch of riprap being the best way to access the public shoreline in all locations. The basin would give us an opportunity to change to a different profile which would allow folks to get closer to the Bay and I would support that.

Vice Chair Strang spoke about the City's constraints relating to the project. Having a free marsh on the site might offer some good public-access benefits.

I really appreciate what the developer has done in response to our suggestions. I do not have issues with the park and the open spaces and it provides an important area for the neighborhood.

However, they might be setting up a longer-term problem that there might not be a near-term solution to.

On Phase 1 we are dealing with a very large area of hydro-seeding and while it is fairly inexpensive it is rarely very successful. You really need dependable rainfall to have hydro-seeding be dependable and we do not really have that so much anymore and then if you do get a lot of rain then you have erosion and birds eating all the seeds.

And even if everything goes perfect it is not really a permanent solution. It is a short term planting before weeds and erosion take over. Is it possible instead of the hydro-seeding to do a restoration type of strategy where you get some type of native or very tough southwestern grass and have it contract grown in plugs and you core them into the ground. This is much more likely to have a durable effect.

Chair McCann agreed with Board Member Strang's comments on the cons of hydro-seeding. This is very important especially as it related to Phase 1. What is there is no resemblance to what people are imagining that park might be one day and it might be extremely disappointing to the community.

Does it make sense to if you remove everything from what is there at the moment, all the trees, Objects that people go and look at, tables and chairs and benches and all of the things that make people enjoy the space at the moment; I think it is a very challenging question to look at that area hydro-seeded with no shade and the likelihood that that hydro-seeding will fail even if it is irrigated temporarily - that may just look like it is an area that on hold basically, just really of no appeal.

At least at the moment when I was out there I would say at least 50 cars spaced out in these large parking lots with people just sitting in their cars enjoying the views. If you look at what Phase 1 might actually be like, the people cannot even access the areas the way they can at the moment so it could be a diminishment of people's experiences.

Given that you are going to be raising the grade through there as part of Phase 1, it is clearly problematic and is there some way where you consider a sub-phase where you keep a zone that is a chip of the area or a zone more inland which is treated a little better? Can you give people in some area of that large park a real park for them to use?

It is a big area and can you imagine no trees and nothing else there; it does not seem very attractive.

An important point regarding access is if you look at the way the golf course is changed with the housing alongside it that you have to ask the question - long-term, does the golf course remain so or does it become more housing?

If you are thinking about a larger master plan from an access standpoint, providing some cut-throughs in the housing that you have set up that might anticipate a long-term change of land use from the golf course to other uses; it would be a useful for you to internally just to trace out what potential connections could be made back into these housing areas that might create a more connected way of people accessing these amenities on the shore.

The exposure to the Bay from this site is very dramatic. To basically turn around and then walk 30 or 40 feet and then you have this calm, inland basin is a very unusual thing to be able to experience that duality in a very confined area.

Putting the issues of the basin long-term; do you have to put any riprap, additional riprap on the inland basin, maybe factor that in. Maybe you save money by not putting the riprap in and putting the natural edge down there and even ultimately taking out some of the riprap. There may ways to look creatively at the whole question of riprap.

Board Member Battalio stated that he liked the Chair's comments about the riprap especially on the Marina side. It might be instructive for folks to go look at the Marin Bay Peninsula up in Richmond.

The rock riprap has a lot of ground squirrels in it and then the green lawns have these geese. The geese just kind of take over and they fertilize the area which is not great for people to be around.

There are things that could be done on the basin side that might be better for people as well as the environment and it might actually cost less.

Board Member Battalio commented that he like that the proponents were including water access even though it seemed limited to just the hand-launched boats and not so much for people.

It seems constrained to me. There is this kind of water-quality vegetation area between the trailer parking and the ramp and I can just imagine somebody really wanting to just spray down their boat or lay something out. And then getting into those trailer spots and backing in and out of them and with the turn-around; it just looked very constrained to me.

I looked at this thinking it was great but if they could just widen it. I would appreciate it if they would take a harder look at that and see if there is something because it may just get overwhelmed. There could be substantial congestion with people lining up to launch.

It also seems like there could be more dock space on the water side for folks to tie up and go ashore.

Board Member Hall noted that we have seen single-family homes and the 2070 and beyond flood plain. On other projects we have said that this is potentially very problematic to have these homes in this soon of a timeline to be flooded by sea level rise.

The possibility of moving the Bay Trail from the east side to the west and another really good reason to move the Bay Trail from the east side of Monarch Bay Drive to west is that there is so many frequent crossings of that potential Bay Trail by those driveways for the townhomes that it would really be creating a lot of conflicts for cyclists. And if you move it to the other side you can have much more of a safely controlled intersection.

If we see this project again I would like to understand the section of Monarch Bay Drive and how that grade change would work between Mulford Point Drive and Pescadora Point Drive with the really significant grade change there with access between the street and the parking lot.

Board Member Battalio looked at the overlooks and the Trail coming right up next to them; it made me a little uncomfortable because it just seems that if somebody was riding their bicycle they could just swerve right on into the overlook because it seemed like it was all at the same elevation. It might be good to have a grade separation there or some sort of access separation just to keep the bikes off.

You could build adaptive capacity by raising those platforms a little bit so that they are a little higher up and they can accommodate more sea level rise and not have the wave hit the soffit of the deck.

Chair McCann recalled that the proponents mentioned that the City is establishing this sum to be able to build greater resiliency after 2070. That is good to hear and I do not think we have heard that from a city before so that is encouraging to seeing a city looking ahead.

Board Member Battalio commented that the hotel overlook should be raised and there should be a grade separation between the Trail and the overlook. By raising the overlook you can accommodate greater sea level rise and you are less likely to have trouble with wave run-up hitting the underside of the deck.

The cost of a pile being a couple of feet longer is pretty insignificant relative to the overall cost.

The proponents mentioned something about keeping it low so you could maintain views from the hotel.

Board Member Leader concurred with Board Member Battalio and stated that as long as the cost is not too much because providing you can get ADA up this deck; it would keep bikes from veering in there.

Chair McCann noted that right at the corner you have the access from the hotel and it looks like a path coming down right on the turn. It seems like if you are coming from the hotel; that is a natural crossing point into this area. It feels like the resolution could be a bit more study made of exactly how that crossing would work.

Board Member Hall stated that softer geometry would be helpful at this point. Also if that is a public area providing wider access and more points of access into it would be helpful because right now it feels like it has a setback with a limited garden path into it.

Chair McCann stated that this is public space but we have very little detail on this area. It could be perceived as being the hotel's garden. There could be ways to make some accommodations for seating on the inland side of the path. But this is a great place for viewing.

Chair McCann announced that this concludes the Board's discussion and there has been a lot of feedback. We have looked for enhanced access particularly looking for those additional connections through part of the site and adjacent areas that could help with broader access from the community into the site.

There are strong feelings from the Board that the interior basin and the transitions into the basin need more study or we need to know more about the work that is being done for that area. It seems like there is not a lot of information about the basin for us to consider.

There are some concerns about Phase 1. Knowing that Phase 1 may only be for a few years, there are always the unknowns that prevent the ultimate phases occurring in a very rapid timeline and so what is the contingency plan there?

We had very good feedback on the riprap, some of the transitions, some of the views and potential weather protection from winds, thinking through how much lawn is really needed in the final stage for the park and other issues.

Vice Chair Strang posed a hypothetical. Let's say that none of the great ideas that were mentioned occurred and we are just dealing with a conventional park; the most important thing would be to have a soil profile plan to really understand what is engineered backfill, what is horticultural soil that would be imported because without the proper volume of soil to support those items none of this will go anywhere.

I think of the fill as being engineered backfill. It is a levee and it cannot dissipate very easily. It is really built to last and it is not really a growing medium.

Chair McCann noted that there are many areas shown for recharging of the soil and it may be very difficult for it to make its way down into the existing materials below. A soil profile would very useful here.

f. **Proponent Response.** Ms. Katie Bowman, Economic Development Manager with the city of San Leandro spoke. We want to thank you for some very thoughtful comments.

You talked about what the goals and the constraints are for the project. And these are valid questions.

The staff report talks about what the goals are for the park and for the project overall. The Community Advisory Group did establish some specific goals for this project.

In general they talked about enhancing the experience in this location. It is currently not in a state at the present that we find sustainable. We physically need to make improvements. As a city we need to think about how we can do things in a sustainable manner.

A big goal of this project was to look at how the project can be self-sustaining and not be supported by the General Fund. The whole business arrangement and development was designed to utilize selling a portion of the golf course to build and fund the park and bringing in the public/private partnership with the private development will allow for that and to be able to fund all of these public improvements.

We need to get the development to happen will help support things. Once it is developed the formation of the Community Facilities District will help to fund the ongoing maintenance and to make it a quality property able to adapt to rising sea level.

With our current constraints is where Phase 1 came into play. Other goals of this project have been to help enhance people's connection with the Bay and naturalize the area to bring amenities to the community, to bring additional housing to the community which will be very valuable as well as providing potential customers for the hotel and surrounding businesses.

Different forms of transportation will come with this development to enhance access.

These are our over-arching goals for the project and we do have to look at financial constraints. The big challenge is that the project faces related to sea level rise we have made those a primary priority but that has a cost implication.

With addressing sea level rise you do what you can where you can. It is obviously a big challenge that all cities are looking at. We cannot solve everything with this project but where this project can help within its scope that is what we are looking to do.

I would say overall I did hear that the bike path is a bit constrained along Monarch Bay Drive. I know that is something that we were thoughtful of working with our engineering and transportation division and based on their recommendation that steep turn alignment was made and also to align with the Trail to the south but we can provide more background on kind of what the thought was going into that.

In looking at the different phases I think that is something as well that we can look at and think about. This is a long-term project so we are continually working on grant funding and looking out for a lot of the grant funding meets shovel-ready projects and so the project just is not primed right now for the grant funding.

We are always looking to leverage and we were very grateful the City was able to - a portion of the funds were going to be needed for the new library but the City has successfully gotten grant funding for that. Every little bit helps.

Also we are going to be working with our existing disability manager who has gotten the CalFire grant for about 5,000 trees and so we are going to look potentially use that for things out here as well. But we want to continue on the planning so that we can prime the project.

We will build as much as we can when we can but we wanted to be - not commit to more than we technically commit to and so that was the thought with the phasing.

I know on the interior the thoughts were very interesting and helpful and looking at that some more because I know we have looked at the riprap on the interior.

Mr. Jon Hughes stated that the main reason why we are currently not contemplating taking out the riprap on the interior basin is in spite of the fact that it is not as exposed as the exterior portion, our engineering staff that studies this has said that if you do not have any kind of protection for slope stability, it will erode.

If you pull out the riprap we would have to do some other slope stabilization like a seawall or something like that which is vastly more expensive and cost prohibitive.

We need to have some kind of slope stability on the interior basin. Our idea of trying to strike the right balance is to provide a softening of the edge while we are still maintaining the current slope stability that is in place.

Mr. Hughes mentioned that some of the comments on the boat launch were interesting. According to Public Works it has a very, very limited use and it primarily serves as an emergency access for County Fire in the event that there is an event related to the Oakland Airport.

The main reason why we relocated it to where we did is because it is actually deeper water out there and it makes it more useful.

To answer the question about parking and the turn-around and the congestion; there is only so much space you can fit there. And so we have tried to strategize how you can get a truck and trailer and in the Plan it is actually oriented in a way so that a person could launch their boat, come out and nose in; and then when they go to retrieve their boat they back out and go down and we built the roundabout for this purpose so you can loop around to go retrieve your boat.

There is just no physical way you can have any other route to get your boat there in that regard.

The arrival is enhanced by the straightening of Mulford Point. So we are trying to actually open the arrival and the access to the park rather than just feeling obscured.

The fencing around the hotel is only around the pool. So that entire patio area you see is open to the public. And the developer is actually hoping that the public engages because they want to sell food and beverage and they want to invite people in because it is a revenue source for them.

The lawn areas are not just envisioned as just big, flat grassy areas. We are trying to use some lumpy grasses in some areas. We are envisioning some mounds in other areas. We are envisioning some other areas with boulders.

The main goal is to just to create an environment that is interesting and interactive but not necessarily open to large-scale sporting activities. That is why there are grasses but they are going to be diverse in nature.

And the CFD does envision paying for the maintenance of Phase 1. It will not be that we just hydro-seed it and walk away. This is area is currently heavily used with being not much more than just a dirt patch.

5. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 PM.

From: [Lily Brown](#)
To: [Pan, Katharine@BCDC](#); [Gaffney, Andrea@BCDC](#)
Cc: [johnrobertwoodbury@gmail.com](#); [Toshi Shepard-Ohta](#); [Nicola Szibbo](#); [Tomerlin, Ashley@BCDC](#)
Subject: Bay Trail comments on San Leandro Shoreline Development Project for BCDC DRB
Date: Thursday, December 8, 2022 5:04:33 PM

Hi Andrea and Katherine,

MTC's Bay Trail Team would like to submit the following comments regarding the San Leandro Shoreline Development Project. Please provide them to the BCDC Design Review Board members at the upcoming DRB meeting on 12/12/22.

1. Much of the proposed Bay Trail is 18' wide. This is the minimum standard that accommodates the typical level of use. In many instances, and most likely in this instance due to the location along an urban waterfront promenade, projected use levels may be high, and therefore the project should consider a wider Bay Trail width. For example, this project would be a great opportunity to widen the existing shoreline trails along the Pescador bridge to accommodate a higher volume of both bicyclists and pedestrians.
2. There are existing shoreline trails in front of Horatio's and The Marina Inn as well as extending from Marina Park to the boat ramp at the southeastern portion of the project site. To maximize shoreline public access and trails, the project should include shoreline trails on the project site along the proposed South Mixed Use and Cafe/Boat Rental site that connects the trails at Marina Park to the trails at The Marina Inn/Horatio's and Pescador Point. This new system of trails could be designated as part of the Bay Trail used by bicyclists and pedestrians.
3. The project proposes additional pedestrian pathways that would connect the Bay Trail to the interior edge of Mulford Point and the new businesses and apartments. The project should provide access for both bicyclists and pedestrians on the pathways, not just pedestrians, to accommodate all Bay Trail user groups and meet Bay Trail design needs.
4. We would like to see details of how the Bay Trail along Monarch Bay Drive will be upgraded, particularly the trail width and treatment at the Pescador Point Drive intersection.
5. To ensure access to the Bay Trail, with phased projects we prefer that the Bay Trail segments be completed during Phase 1 and not during the final phase. We would like to hear more about the project's plan to provide adequate and uninterrupted access to the Bay Trail throughout the project phases.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this project. Please let me know if you need us to clarify anything or have any questions.

Thank you,

Lily Brown

She/Her

Associate Planner/Analyst - Equitable and Active Transportation

lbrown@bayareametro.gov

510-325-4169

BAY AREA METRO | BayAreaMetro.gov

Association of Bay Area Governments
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Bay Area Metro Center | 375 Beale Street | Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105