

# 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](mailto:info@bcdc.ca.gov) | [www.bcdc.ca.gov](http://www.bcdc.ca.gov)

February 28, 2025

**TO:** Design Review Board Members

**FROM:** Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415-352-3653; [larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov))  
Ashley Tomerlin, Senior Bay Dev. Analyst (415-352-3657; [ashley.tomerlin@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:ashley.tomerlin@bcdc.ca.gov))

**SUBJECT: Draft Summary of the February 10, 2025, BCDC Design Review Board Meeting**

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

a. **DRB Board Members.** Chair Jacinta McCann, Vice Chair Gary Strang, Leo Chow, Bob Battalio, Tom Leader and Stefan Pellegrini were present in person.

b. **BCDC Staff.** Ashley Tomerlin, Yuriko Jewett, and Lisa Herron were present in person, Katharine Pan attended online.

c. **Project Proponents.** Eric Tecza (Blue Rise Ventures); Ryan Braniff (Blue Rise Ventures); Matt Malone (Perkins & Will); Angelo Obertello (CBG Civil Engineers).

2. **Staff Update.** Ashley Tomerlin provided updates on the upcoming 2025 DRB meeting dates with the next DRB Meeting scheduled for Monday, March 10 for a second review of Channel Park, Phase IV of the Brooklyn Basin Redevelopment Project in the City of Oakland.

3. **Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda.** There was no public comment.

4. **200 Wind River Development Project (Second Review).** A second review for the proposed life sciences campus at 200 Wind River Way. The project would construct a three-story, approximately 120,000-square-foot office and research and development (R&D) building, completing a complex originally envisioned in the 1997 Wind River Master Plan. This project also proposes public access improvements, including removal of a degrading timber wharf to create open water and enhance views to the Bay, renovation of the remaining concrete portion of that wharf with pedestrian paths offering connectivity along the shoreline and public access amenities.

5. **Staff Presentation.** Lisa Herron provided a staff introduction to the project site and context.

a. **Project Presentation.** Eric Tecza (Blue Rise Ventures) and Matt Malone (Perkins & Will) provided an overview of the project with a slide presentation. The presentation focused on updated design features and how it addressed the recommendations and comments from the initial application review in December 2023.



**DRB MEETING SUMMARY**  
**February 10, 2025**

**b. Board Clarifying Questions following Presentations.**

- (1) Vice Chair Strang inquired about the tree selection, noting the challenging growing environment for this stretch of waterfront. The project proponent stated the team is recommending watergum and big leaf maple along the waterfront and London plane trees for the parking lot areas.
- (2) Vice Chair Strang asked staff to clarify how value engineering works as the project moves forward – is it possible for the rolling lounge chairs to go away, and another amenity be specified in its place for example. Staff responded that the design proposal will be analyzed for usability, safety and appropriateness and equivalent seating would be explored if the current design concept for rolling lounge chairs do not meet those parameters.
- (3) Board Member Leader asked if there are existing maritime relics that are onsite now that would be of interest to the public. The project proponent responded that the large anchor cleats along the edge of the wharf used to tie up the boats has potential to be salvaged. The original steel rails are also still in place on the wharf and may have potential to be salvaged as well. He noted that the Del Monte site across the street houses many relics of the era related to site already.
- (4) Board Member Leader requested clarification of the 2100 sea level rise scenario for the project. The project proponent responded that the life of the project is somewhere between 2050 to 2070 and is designed for that scenario. However, if the project exceeds that and goes to 2100, the base flood elevation of the buildings would be resilient, but the wharf, including the Bay Trail and other shoreline improvements will need to be raised as part of a future adaptation strategy.
- (5) Board Member Leader requested clarification for the vehicular circulation, and how passenger drop off, food delivery etc. would work in this scenario. The project proponent responded that main entrance to the Wind River campus hosts the front door loading zone areas, there is no on street drop off area.
- (6) Board Member Leader requested clarification regarding the fire access for Sherman Way. The project proponent responded that Sherman Way along the north side of the building is a pedestrian walk that has collapsable bollards and serves as the fire access route.
- (7) Board Member Chow asked for clarification between plan and renderings, noting that some of the landscaping does not appear to be consistent between the two. The project proponent responded that some renderings removed the landscaping to better show the building façade treatment, and the design intent is best shown in plan.
- (8) Board Member Chow asked for confirmation that the plant species proposed are native and drought tolerant. The project proponent responded that not all of the trees are native given the tree canopy desired for the project, but when possible native species are being used and many of the drought tolerant plantings are already present on the site.
- (9) Board Member Battalio, asked about the nexus between the wharf removal and the rock revetement. The project proponent noted that the condition of the revetement is unknown until the wharf is removed, but confirmed that the

revetement is located along the shore perimeter of the site, underneath the concrete wharf, the timber portion of the wharf is outboard of that and completely in the water. He confirmed the plan is to remove the wharf and repair the existing riprap as needed with minimal new fill.

- (10) Board Member Battalio asked about the public boat dock and how users will carry small watercraft such as a kayak through the site. The project proponent responded that they provide kayaks and kayak dollies for tenant use to transport equipment at other locations within the complex and can expand the program here.
- (11) Board Member Pellegrini asked about the original rail spur and where that would be articulated on the plans. Is it on the Bay Trail edge as drawn? The project proponent responded that Jean Sweeny Open Space Park was the original site to host the rail switching yard for the area and the spur runs north along the central portion of the Wind River campus. There are also rails along the timber wharf that are to be demolished. The rails along the Bay Trail are replicas; they do not represent the historic alignment.
- (12) Chair McCann inquired about how maintenance will be included in the project. The project proponent responded that there is a maintenance plan in place for the existing development that would be extended to this site but acknowledged that the program needs to be improved, and shoreline cleanups will occur on a more regular basis to address blight and other landscape issues.

c. **Public Comment.** There were no in-person public comments. The following written public comments were received prior to the meeting, and are included at the end of this summary. In order of reception:

- (1) Katie Hofstetter, Strata Development
- (2) Michael Gorman, Encinal Yacht Club

d. **Board Discussion.** The Board discussed how the project responds to the seven objectives for public access found in the Public Access Design Guidelines, provided feedback on the proposed public access improvements with respond to the Commission's policies on sea level rise and environmental justice and social equity, and addressed the staff questions listed below.

- (1) **The seven objectives for public access are:**
  - i. Make public access PUBLIC.
  - ii. Make public access USABLE.
  - iii. Provide, maintain, and enhance VISUAL ACCESS to the Bay and shoreline.
  - iv. Maintain and enhance the VISUAL QUALITY of the Bay, shoreline, and adjacent developments.
  - v. Provide CONNECTIONS to and CONTINUITY along the shoreline.
  - vi. Take advantage of the BAY SETTING.
  - vii. Ensure that public access is COMPATIBLE WITH WILDLIFE through siting, design, and management strategies.

**(2) Staff also has the following specific questions for the Board's consideration**

- i. Does the design provide legible and inviting connections from the adjacent roadways and bike/pedestrian networks to draw users into and through the site to the Bay Trail and Shoreline?
- ii. Is the interpretive program designed and sited to maximize the public's use and enjoyment of the shoreline? Does the Board have any design recommendations to enhance the interpretive program for the project?
- iii. Are the public access areas appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise, ensuring high-quality public access opportunities over time?
- iv. Does the Board have any recommendations regarding proposed landside amenities that support the water access proposed as part of the project? Is the launch area in the basin appropriately sited to encourage the public to use this feature?

**e. Summary of Key Issues and Board Comments**

**(1) Overall Site Connectivity**

- i. Board Member Chow observed the tree cover at the south end of Clement Street near the loading dock appears to conceal the entrance and the Public Shore parking area. He recommended adjusting the entrance to the south so that the right turn into the parking area is more welcoming and has a better sightline to the Public Shore parking spaces and site amenities.
- ii. Vice Chair Strang observed the trellis covered seating helps provide a visual cue along Bay Trail to the site and stressed these should be key structures that remain as part of the wayfinding and design. If they were to be value engineered out of the project, then the site entrance would not be very successful.
- iii. Vice Chair Strang acknowledged the challenge of having Sherman Walk also serve as emergency vehicular access and recommended a low planting strip down the middle of the Walk to maintain design interest by using other ground materials such as decomposed granite for fire access or concrete.

**(2) Interpretive Program Recommendations**

- iv. Board Member Pellegrini expressed concern with the interpretive program, observing it is the least developed portion of the proposal. He emphasized that using existing and authentic elements that reflect the wharf history is best and to stay away from elements that are fake or false that promote an idea that wasn't there.
- v. Board Member Leader agreed, noting that while he was not a part of the initial review, his only comment for the project is related to understanding the site narrative. He observed the only remaining historic elements on site are the wharf cleats and recommended using the trellis structures over the seating areas as a place to anchor a narrative regarding the processes that

occurred on the site. He recommended taking the time to research and review the photo archive to tell the right story for the area. He noted that the Rosie the Riveter exhibit in Richmond is a good example to follow. He liked the inclusion of the rails near the Bay Trail, but he recommended the design team pursue seating authentic to the site and not mimic the High Line seating.

- vi. Vice Chair Strang concurred and noted that the image of the tall ships from the historic photos as part of the presentation is really powerful and would like to see if they could be incorporated into the site narrative somehow.

### **(3) Public Dock and Adjacent Landside Amenities**

- i. Boad Member Battalio appreciated the addition of the public but stressed that a design to avoid conflicts between recreational dock users and the Bay Trail needs to be further developed. He also noted that widening the gangway would be required if it is to be shared with water taxi users, which would then likely require a larger float. He noted that area appears to be sheltered so the dock is oriented correctly, but he recommended working with a marine engineer for the final dock configuration.

### **(4) Planting Recommendations**

- i. Vice Chair Strang stressed that soil preparation and maintenance will be critical for the site given that planting is a key part of the design. He often sees large budgets dedicated to identifying plant material, but soil preparation and maintenance should be prioritized. He noted that the maple is more of a riparian tree and not the best choice for this location. He recommended the Catalina ironwood or Catalina cherry as good choices. He also noted that sycamore, buckeye, and oaks can grow as well in this area with the right soil preparation.

### **(5) Sea Level Rise and Shoreline Improvements**

- ii. Boad Member Battalio noted that the current design and adaptation plan appear to be reasonable given the finished floor elevation is at 15.6 feet NAVD88. However, he recommended that for future programming, the team should also evaluate storm water drainage from the development areas to the water. He also stated that it appears that the majority of the utilities are at the grade of the wharf and placing them on a pedestal now may be helpful to address future sea level rise.

### **(6) Final Comments from the Chair.**

- i. Chair McCann reinforced many of the Board comments related to the interpretive program, and specifically called out the importance of maintaining “authenticity” as a basis of design as the team moves forward with the project.
- ii. Chair McCann encouraged the selection of final finishes and furnishings to be as robust as possible and that a corresponding maintenance program to keep them in place is what will make the project a success.

iii. Chair McCann stated that the public dock and other site improvements are appreciated by the Board, and in general the Board feels that the current proposal addressed many of the concerns from the previous review.

iv. Chair McCann stated that no additional review will be required.

f. **Project Proponent Response.** The project team thanked the Board and agreed with many of the recommendations. They specifically noted that they have been in communication with the Star Alta housing development and can use them as a resource as they continue to develop the interpretive program for the site.

6. **Meeting Adjournment.** Board Member Leader moved to adjourn the meeting. Vice Chair Strang seconded the motion. The meeting concluded at 6:35 p.m.

**From:** [Amezcuca, Reyna@BCDC](mailto:Amezcuca_Reyna@BCDC)  
**To:** [Herron, Lisa@BCDC](mailto:Herron_Lisa@BCDC); [Tomerlin, Ashley@BCDC](mailto:Tomerlin_Ashley@BCDC)  
**Cc:** [Jewett, Yuriko@BCDC](mailto:Jewett_Yuriko@BCDC)  
**Subject:** FW: Office building proposed at 200 Windriver Way Alameda, California  
**Date:** Monday, February 10, 2025 11:34:50 AM

---

FYI...Public Comment

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Gorman <mrmike1230@gmail.com>  
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 10:54 AM  
To: BCDC PublicComment <publiccomment@bcdca.gov>  
Cc: Eric Tecza <etecza@blueriseventures.com>; Chris Banner <gm@encinal.org>  
Subject: Office building proposed at 200 Windriver Way Alameda, California

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from mrmike1230@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

WARNING: This message is from an external source. Verify the sender and exercise caution when clicking links or opening attachments.

Dear design review members

I am a member, director, and the co-Director of the Jr Sailing program at the Encinal yacht club in Alameda adjacent to the proposed project.

We have reviewed the plans and are very favorable in recommending their approval.

Windriver and Blue Rise Ventures have been a very supportive and a good neighbor over the years and we look forward to these improvements on the adjacent property. Our junior program serves nearly 300 children between 8 and 18 years of age each year. We train and host 18 East Bay high school sailing teams year round. We strongly support the public access to our program and to the waterfront in general.

The public access proposed will be very helpful in allowing the public to access to the Oakland, Alameda Estuary and all of the recreational benefits that go with it. We strongly recommend approval of the project proposed.

Thank you

Michael Gorman

**From:** [Amezcuca, Reyna@BCDC](mailto:Amezcuca_Reyna@BCDC)  
**To:** [Herron, Lisa@BCDC](mailto:Herron_Lisa@BCDC); [Tomerlin, Ashley@BCDC](mailto:Tomerlin_Ashley@BCDC)  
**Cc:** [Jewett, Yuriko@BCDC](mailto:Jewett_Yuriko@BCDC)  
**Subject:** FW: 200 Wind River Way Public Comment  
**Date:** Monday, February 10, 2025 10:35:49 AM

---

FYI...Public Comments

Thanks,  
Reyna

---

**From:** Katie Hofstetter <[KHofstetter@stradasf.com](mailto:KHofstetter@stradasf.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 7, 2025 2:14 PM  
**To:** BCDC PublicComment <[publiccomment@bcdcc.ca.gov](mailto:publiccomment@bcdcc.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** 200 Wind River Way Public Comment

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [khofstetter@stradasf.com](mailto:khofstetter@stradasf.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

**WARNING:** This message is from an external source. Verify the sender and exercise caution when clicking links or opening attachments.

Hello,

I am writing in support of the proposed project at 200 Wind River in Alameda. My name is Katie Hofstetter and I work with Strada Development Group, a Bay Area focused real estate investment and development firm, and the recent Buyer of the Star Harbor apartment building located across Clement Ave from the 200 Wind River project. Coincidentally, I am also a long-time Alameda resident and live less than a half mile from the project site.

I've reviewed the proposed plans for the 200 Wind River building and associated public improvements, and am a huge supporter of the upgrades to the neighborhood that this project would create. This Project proposes improved public access to a beautiful and underutilized portion of Alameda that has recently seen an increase in residents. The continuation and beautification of the Bay Trail connection to the new bike pathway on Clement Ave would encourage more foot traffic and bike traffic, and the direct connection to Alaska Basin is a huge benefit to a population that has to otherwise travel via car to access the water. Many residents of Star Harbor choose to live in Alameda because of access to the Bay, but this part of Alameda is currently missing a publicly-accessible connection to the water. The 200 Wind River project will provide that connection.

The development team has clearly spent a lot of time and effort responding to public and committee feedback, and the revised site plan represents a project that will bring increased



activation to this area, bettering the neighborhood, public experience, and City overall.

Thank you for your time.

Katie

**Katie Hofstetter**

Senior Vice President

Office/Mobile: 831.234.9996

Email: [khofstetter@stradasf.com](mailto:khofstetter@stradasf.com)