

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

April 29, 2026

TO: Design Review Board Members

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

SUBJECT: Draft Summary of March 9, 2026, 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, Guneet Anand, Cody Anderson, Leo Chow, Patricia Fonseca, Kristen Hall, and Tom Leader attended in person.

b. **BCDC Staff.** Ashley Tomerlin, Yuri Jewett, Julie Garren, Schuyler Olsson, Katharine Pan, and Lindsay Martien attended in person.

c. **The project teams.**

(1) Bothin Marsh: Chris Chamberlin, Tara McIntire, and Mischon Martin, Marin County Parks; Rob LaPorte and Claire Mooney, Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy; John Gibbs and Cristina Bejarano, WRT

(2) Martinez Marina: Jill Bergman, Lauren Sugayan, Brianne Zorn, and Michael Cass, City of Martinez; Greg Mueller, Tucker Sadler Architects

2. **Staff Update.** The Board Secretary noted the following items:

a. Form 700 filing deadline is Wednesday, April 1.

b. Shoreline Plants Update. The contract with San Francisco Estuary Institute was approved by the Commission on February 19 and submitted to the Department of General Services for final approval. We were advised this could take about 8 weeks, so project kick-off is anticipated for late spring.

c. BCDC permitting and planning staff attended a site visit to the OneShoreline Burlingame-Millbrae project area. We observed many challenging locations requiring adaptation along the reach. Staff look forward to bringing this planning effort and projects to you in the future.

d. Staff anticipate bringing a couple projects the Board has reviewed to the Commission later this year. Belmont's 1301 Shoreway, which the Board reviewed in August 2023 and January 2024; and Burlingame's Peninsula Crossing that came before the Board in June and November 2022.

DRB MEETING SUMMARY
March 9, 2026

- e. The Berkeley Pier and Ferry Project went to the Engineering Criteria Review Board on February 25. The ECRB requested a second review later this year. The project will return to the DRB on May 11 for a second review.
 - f. April 6 will be an update on the Port's Special Area Plan and Fisherman's Wharf plans and a second review of the East Harbor/Marina Green project.
 - g. The Update on 2025 Public Access accomplishments will be included in the staff update at the April meeting.
3. **Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda.** There was no public comment.
4. **Bothin Marsh Evolving Shorelines Project First Review.** The Bothin Marsh Evolving Shorelines project is a proposed marsh restoration and trail realignment in the City of Mill Valley, Marin County. The project proposes marsh restoration and trail improvements that adapt public access for sea level rise; maintaining regional connectivity along the Bay Trail; and reconnects sedimentation processes to support marsh habitats over time. The project proposes to enhance connections to the surrounding neighborhoods with improvements including a new trailhead, restroom facilities, improved site access and transportation infrastructure, a new parking area, marsh viewing areas, and new landscaping.
- a. **Staff Presentation.** Schuyler Olsson provided a staff introduction to the project site and context.
 - b. **Board Clarifying Questions following Presentations.**
 - (1) Gary Strang requested clarification on the where the proposed Bay Trail diverges from the current alignment.
 - c. **Project Presentation.** Tara McIntire, Marin County Parks, Rob LaPorte, Golden Gate National Park Conservancy, and John Gibbs, WRT provided an overview of the Bothin Marsh Evolving Shoreline project with a slide presentation. The presentation focused on the trail realignment, the trailhead and connections to existing adjacent facilities, and restoration efforts.
 - d. **Board Clarifying Questions following Presentations.**
 - (1) Jacinta McCann requested clarification on the project sequencing related to closing the trail with the marsh restoration process. The project team stated the existing trail will be decommissioned once the new trail is complete. On the north end, there will be a section of trail spur that remains in place that will continue to provide access into the marsh.
 - (2) Tom Leader asked about the current development process and how it relates to budget for construction. The project team observed that there is not a definitive timeline. They're nearing 65% for Phase 1. This is a priority adaptation project for Marin County and County Parks is working with other departments to understand costs and with regulatory agencies to identify permitting requirements. There are also many jurisdictional partners and neighboring agencies to coordinate with. The current estimate for total project cost is \$30 million. The funding strategy is important but there is not a clear path right now.

- (3) Leo Chow requested a description of the Phase 2 scope and timing and if there is a sense on the timing related to the Phase 1 work. The project team stated the intent is to ensure a project that could be phased, if necessary, but that doesn't need to be phased if full funding is available. The preference would be to complete the project at one time.
- (4) Leo Chow asked if there is a plan to adapt the trail north of the project area. Is that a future phase of this work? The project team stated they are working with the City of Mill Valley and the Sanitary District partners on future adaptation of the parcels north of the County trail.
- (5) Kristen Hall asked what drove +13.5 feet NAVD 88 as the design elevation. The project team stated that the design life is intended to be 2080, assuming 3.5 feet sea level rise plus a 100-year flood. The goal is to ensure the large structures are resilient for the long term while minimizing impacts to the existing context and views. Building to higher elevations would necessitate different structures and additional geotechnical engineering. The team observed there is a lot of deep bay mud and the site was historically open bay. Building the higher and wider structures is heavy so the goal is to find the sweet spot that is resilient but still gives 50 years of design life.
- (6) Kristen Hall observed that the Phase 1 trail ends at the Shoreline Hwy./ Almonte Blvd. intersection, which would be an uncomfortable arrival point for users. The project team stated that users doing the full circuit would stay on the existing trail. The Phase 1 trail would be more of a neighborhood connection until the Phase 2 trail is completed.
- (7) Kristen Hall asked whether they are abandoning or demolishing trail. The project team stated the current alignment will be decommissioned after the full trail is built. Removing the existing trail will help with the restoration efforts of the marsh. The old railroad berm has implications on the tidal prism and wouldn't support marsh resilience, so they are removing much of the berm to restore hydraulic connections to the marsh.
- (8) Patricia Fonseca asked if the ring the marsh concept was also the preferred alignment for construction and site engineering. The project team stated it was the preferred alignment for all purposes. To rebuild the trail in place, there would be profound disruptions to the usability of the trail and would create more marsh impacts. The bicycle community expressed a preference for minimizing disruptions and trail closures, finding the additional length and time of the extended periphery alignment acceptable. The proposed alignment also provides better neighborhood connections to Rosemont Ave. and Tam Junction.
- (9) Cody Anderson asked the project team to expand on the coordination of this project with other resilience projects in the area. He observed that these adaptation projects are hard and will only become more difficult and the need to study the designs and long-term vision so not to limit other future solutions in the area. The project team stated that planning for this project began in 2016 before the neighboring agencies had started their studies. The neighboring agencies have been involved with the project discussions to coordinate the different efforts.

- (10) Guneet Anand requested more description of the considerations that led to the trail cross section, particularly with trail usership. The project team stated they reviewed the MTC Bay Trail Design Guidelines, worked with MTC staff and a transportation engineer to address design criteria for speed, calming elements, and trail surfaces. They were mindful of the spatial limitations recognizing that a wider trail would create more impacts on the marsh. The project team observed the primary design move was to separate bicycles from pedestrians.
- (11) Tom Leader asked if there is opportunity to reduce number of piers currently shown by bringing the trail closer to Almonte Blvd. and cantilevering the trail from the Almonte Blvd. embankment. The project team stated they explored that but that there are existing utilities and a sewer easement. It is also likely they would encroach beyond the marsh parcel.
- (12) Tom Leader asked if the sewer line is vulnerable to sea level rise impacts. The project team stated they understand that the sewer line is in the road embankment.
- (13) Gary Strang requested further description of the plant restoration strategy. The project teams stated the Parks Conservancy will be supporting the planting. They manage three plant nurseries, raising plants specific to watershed. The goal of this restoration is the return of high-quality site-specific plants.
- (14) Gary Strang asked if the proposed railing was inevitable and if the team received any user comments on the rail height exceeding what is required by code. The project team stated they consulted many sources including the Bay Trail Design Guidelines. With the anticipated number of users and speed of cyclists, the project team felt most comfortable employing the higher end of the prescribed design range. The design objective is to provide the necessary safety while keeping it elegant and simple. The project team observed that the trail is also used by equestrians and there's no anticipated change to that use.

e. Public Comment:

- (1) Erin Pang, Save the Bay. She expressed support for the project and emphasized the importance of phasing and maintaining the usability of the trail through construction to avoid any service disruptions. She asked whether the current trail will be protected in any way until the full trail is built out given the 30 flood days a year it already experiences. She emphasized the adaptability to future sea level rise beyond 2080; the need to implement "slow zones" to minimize conflict at busy areas; and ensuring trail widths reflect the anticipated uses and are not too narrow at key locations. She expressed appreciation for the prioritization of marsh restoration and highlighted that it contributes to a strong nature-based sea level rise resilience project.
- (2) Will Hutchinson, local business owner. He stated he is very much in support of this project, noting that without it, the Tam Junction business community likely wouldn't exist in the future. He highlighted that parking is critical to the area, expressing that he appreciates the effort to maintain existing parking and improve the turnaround but asked if any design options that were explored increased parking capacity whether on site or along Almonte. He expressed

concern with the addition of such a great facility without also providing additional parking.

The following written public comment is included at the end of this summary:

- Lee Huo, MTC/ABAG Bay Trail

f. **Board Discussion.** The Board discussed the project focusing on the following objectives and questions:

1) The seven objectives for public access are:

- Make public access PUBLIC.
- Make public access USABLE.
- Provide, maintain, and enhance VISUAL ACCESS to the Bay and shoreline.
- Maintain and enhance the VISUAL QUALITY of the Bay, shoreline, and adjacent developments.
- Provide CONNECTIONS to and CONTINUITY along the shoreline.
- Take advantage of the BAY SETTING.
- Ensure that public access is COMPATIBLE WITH WILDLIFE through siting, design, and management strategies

2) Staff questions:

- Are programs and spaces sited to minimize potential conflicts between the design objectives and planned uses?
- Does the Board have any recommendations on the programming elements, trail materials, or site features?
- Is the proposed plant palette appropriate to site conditions?
- Is the project designed in a way to minimize future required maintenance needs?
- Does the project successfully integrate into the existing community in a cohesive and inviting manner?
- Are there any guiding design objectives that should inform the design development and detailing as it progresses?

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

Trail Experience

- (1) Guneet Anand commended the team on a smart and thoughtful strategy of balancing existing needs and experiences with adaption for the future, observing that while the connections and access are changing, there remains an opportunity to experience the site in a different way. She emphasized the significance of this trail as part of the Safe Routes to Schools Program and underscored the importance of pullouts and the opportunities to pull off the trail to appreciate the marsh. She recommends embracing opportunities for education and including interpretive and educational signage in addition to wayfinding.
- (2) Leo Chow observed that the design of the trail, other than at the trailheads, feels like a throughway, stating there's no place to pause and watch the marsh from

the elevated trail. He encouraged creating spaces for people to linger and enjoy the marsh as much as serving the travel purpose.

- (3) Leo Chow also emphasized maintaining the immersive experience of the marsh. The current alignment is out in the middle of the marsh, which is a novel experience when compared to most of the other nearby alignments that are adjacent to roadways. He emphasized care and consideration of the relationship between path and roadway be taken with Phase 2 and the alignment north of this Phase 1 section.
- (4) Jacinta McCann observed that the spur of the old trail does place you out in the marsh and encouraged a similar opportunity for the Phase 2 trail design.

Trail Cross Section

- (1) Kristen Hall observed that it is nice when the preferred strategy is also the best for addressing all design objectives and site factors. For meeting the trail user needs, she observed the street and trail section is similar to the sidewalk near Crissy Field at Sports Basement where despite roadway improvements, there is still bike/ped conflict. She expressed concern that the current design does not provide enough clear space for pedestrians and recommended exploring a curb condition or other means of delineating bike zone from pedestrian zone. She supported the recommendations to include more frequent opportunities for pulling off the trail to make it more than a passthrough facility. She emphasized the design needs to be safe for all users recognizing the range of users age, speed, interests, and abilities, and suggested exploring a wider trail with clear separation for travel speeds.
- (2) Leo Chow seconded the comment on the effectiveness of a white line to divide bikes from pedestrians and questioned if the current condition of mixing may be better because people know they're mixed and are more alert to potential conflict.

Trail Structure

- (1) Tom Leader expressed concern with budgeting and ensuring all phases are completed. He observed the experience of ending at Tam Junction is wholly different than completing the Phase 2 trail connections to the south. He also expressed concern over the sewer line and questioned if it could be attached to the underside of the trail structure. He recommended exploring options on the trail structure that would reduce cost so that the entire project can be achieved.
- (2) Gary Strang suggested that having one larger pile would be more efficient and less impactful than three smaller piles. He commended the proposed character and emphasized maintaining the rural feel and avoiding making it too suburban or urban. He expressed concern with the railing design, the potential for overabundance of signage, and the paving of gravel areas. He praised the planting strategy and observed the Conservancy is doing great work in the Bay Area on similar projects.
- (3) Patricia Fonseca recognized that this is a big investment and encouraged the project team to build in optionality, designing for future adaptive capacity for both

trail and habitat, noting that there is opportunity to have a project that is informed by anticipated projections.

- (4) Leo Chow, on the topic of project budget limitations, questioned if a floating pathway had been studied as a way of reducing structure and project costs.

Railing

- (1) Gary Strang observed that the 48" rail height is right at eye level for most cyclists. He strongly encouraged exploring different design alternatives that could minimize the visual intrusion like a Ha-ha or the Golden Gate Bridge suicide barrier that extends horizontally rather than vertically. Jacinta McCann observed these alternatives could be used in combination with a curb edge and Leo Chow suggested that the railing could be lower if it's only serving pedestrians.

Chair Summary:

- (1) Chair McCann commended the team for meeting the seven objectives of public access and the project team's commitment to the process, stating the Board wants to see this project move ahead.
- (2) She identified that there are outstanding questions on the design of the structure, including the need for so many piers with the current cross section. She observed a lighter structure that requires less support would also reduce the budget and funding needs.
- (3) The Board is supportive of the understated structure, observing it is consistent with the site's character and doesn't overpower the landscape. She encouraged the team to explore the design details for railing and signage, emphasizing the need to balance all the design objectives while avoiding overcrowding or overdoing any of these elements.
- (4) Chair McCann emphasized the importance of pedestrian safety, observing the trail width, while a significant enhancement, might also encourage faster biking.
- (5) She encouraged consideration for more instances to stop and appreciate the marsh including spaces outside the travel lanes of the trail, observing that being immersed in the landscape is an important experience and the design team should provide those opportunities.
- (6) She encouraged further exploration for expanding parking opportunities.
- (7) She emphasized planning for future adaptability and suggested looking out even further than 2080. She stated the design does not need to build the ultimate solution, but it is important to have an idea of how this could be made more resilient in the future.
- (8) The Board stated the project does not need to return to the DRB and directed the project team to continue working with staff.

h. Response by the project team:

Chris Chamberlain, Director Marin County Parks, thanked the Board for the feedback, noting there is a lot to get done to see this project built. He also thanked staff for their efforts.

5. **Martinez Marina Redevelopment Project First Review.** The Martinez Marina and Waterfront Redevelopment Project is a proposed redevelopment of the Martinez Marina and waterfront spaces, in the City of Martinez, Contra Costa County. The project proposes both landside development and waterside marina improvements, encompassing a total area of approximately 67.3 acres. The landside component proposes a mixed-use commercial and hospitality development, including three hotels, commercial and retail buildings, an outdoor amphitheater, surface and underground parking, as well as approximately 44.8 acres of active and passive open spaces, including a boardwalk and waterfront promenade, enhanced access to existing parks, and new Bay Trail connections. The waterside development is in the conceptual planning stages and may include improved access to the existing fishing pier, new and upgraded boat slips, a redesigned seawall and breakwater, and public boat launch facilities. The proposal also includes a designated area for a potential future ferry service.
- a. **Staff Presentation.** Lindsay Martien provided a staff introduction to the project site and context.
 - b. **Board Clarifying Questions following Presentations.**
 - (1) Jacinta McCann inquired if the project could change with determination of BCDC jurisdiction. Staff stated it would affect public access requirements.
 - c. **Project Presentation.** Jill Bergman, City of Martinez, and Greg Mueller, Tucker Sadler, provided an overview of the Martinez Marina project with a slide presentation.
 - d. **Board Clarifying Questions following Presentations.**
 - (1) Jacinta McCann noted the Board would typically see different scenarios for a project at this stage to better advise with the project's design development. She asked the team to confirm they are still in the visioning stage and that further refinement is expected. The project team responded that they continue to study from an economic standpoint noting CBRE, a real estate consultant, studied the site for hotel development. Several different options and plans for how to develop the site have been studied and the current proposal reflects that information.
 - (2) Jacinta McCann asked about the feasibility for the redevelopment of the marina, inquiring about the demand for berths in the area. The project team responded that Safe Harbor, a marina consultant, has completed a study for the waterside development of the project. The study notes that the seawall is the key structure that needs to be addressed and replaced first. They noted that the consultant looked at the market conditions and growth opportunity.
 - (3) Gary Strang requested to see the diagram showing the sea level rise for the area. Staff shared the existing conditions analysis from the staff presentation and noted the project team will be analyzing the project for sea level rise.
 - (4) Leo Chow asked for clarification regarding the public/private partnership for the project. The project team responded that they are both the developer and the architect of record for the project in partnership with the City of Martinez.
 - (5) Tom Leader requested clarification for the marina area, asking where the underpinnings for the development come from. A City representative responded that the city is responsible for repairing the seawall and marina dredging. The city

was advised that the marina redevelopment would require a landside partnership. The site currently hosts 200+ events a year including festivals, and the sports fields are often fully rented on weekends for tournaments. The study highlighted that statewide sporting events could be hosted but is limited by availability of hotel rooms, noting there are only 220 rooms in Martinez proper, but 1200 rooms in adjacent cities. CBRE conducted market studies and developed a retail scenario for the site. The city representative noted that Martinez is the County seat and that the County hospital system is also planning an expansion, which anticipates bringing more healthcare workers and the need for hotels to the area. The city representative additionally noted that the introduction of the ferry would provide another opportunity to activate the marina.

- (6) Cody Anderson asked for clarification regarding the physical feasibility of the site, noting that it is a low lying area. He asked if there is a strategy to hit minimum floor elevations, while limiting the import of fill material. The project team noted that this issue will be addressed at a future meeting in more detail.
- (7) Patricia Fonseca asked for clarification on the location of facilities within BCDC jurisdiction. The project team responded that further analysis is needed and may include relocating buildings outside the 100-foot Shoreline Band jurisdiction.
- (8) Kristen Hall and Guneet Anand relayed questions associated with the ownership of the site and possible uses. The project team confirmed that the site is City-owned and bound by the Public Trust with long term leases in place. State Land Commission has reviewed the project and is comfortable with the uses. They also noted that the current agreement does not allow residential use and that both passive and active trust uses are continuing to be explored for the site. The City representative noted that this site is not zoned for residential.

e. Public Comment:

- (1) Erin Pang, Save the Bay. Noted that the existing Bay Trail alignment runs along inland roads and does not provide a shoreline experience. She stated that this development would be an opportunity to realign the Bay Trail closer to shoreline and provide recreational and active transportation as well as provide equitable community access to the shoreline. She stated that Save the Bay hopes the project will explore connecting the Bay Trail to the adjacent Radke-Martinez Regional Shoreline Park trail network and that the community be involved in designing a realignment of the Bay Trail to serve all users. She stated she hopes to see extensive community and stakeholder engagement.
- (2) Oliva Dwyer, Martinez resident. Stated that the hotel complex is extremely large and she has concerns that it overpowers the site. She has concerns that the design looks like a strip mall and is a heavy development in regard to the rest of the space around it.

The following written public comment is included at the end of this summary:

- Lee Huo, MTC/ABAG Bay Trail
- David Lewis, Save the Bay.
- Christine Wilson, Martinez resident.

- Stefan Pellegrini, DRB, submitted written comments that are incorporated below.

f. **Board Discussion.** The Board discussed the project focusing on the following objectives and questions:

- 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 questions:
 - i. Does the scale of the project as designed feel appropriate for the project site?
 - ii. How could the project design better enhance the user's access to and experience of the shoreline? What other opportunities are there to build connections or further improve existing public access as part of this project?
 - iii. Does the proposed project provide adequate connections to public transit and promote walking, biking, and other non-motorized travel? What design elements could be added to improve non-vehicular access?
 - iv. Does the project design capture & reflect the cultural and historical character of the City of Martinez? What design recommendations can you provide to enhance the user's sense of connection with the history of the area?
 - v. Does the project, as designed, provide sufficient capacity for future adaptation strategies? What can be incorporated into the current design to facilitate shoreline change in the future?

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

Site Design and Connectivity

- (1) Gary Strang questioned if there is enough density to warrant the amount of paving shown in the design, noting that the site would benefit from a restored softer landscape edge. He encouraged balancing small, intimate spaces with larger green open areas and that the designers explore improved views from the promenade. He would like to better understand the public uses for the project and noted that the initial entrance to the site should feel public and inviting.
- (2) Guneet Anand stressed going from macro to micro as the design is further developed. She stated that the existing uses appear to have "great bones" and that there are a lot of ingredients to work with including the ferry use, bringing in artists early in the process, and understanding the recreation demands. She expressed concerns related to adaptation, stating that development can dry up near the water and that the scale of deployment as shown feels excessive. She stated that a forward-thinking plan is needed. She recommended exploring

elements of “soft and hard” design and establishing character zones along the linear shoreline, noting that an all-retail waterfront is not a good idea.

- (3) Kristen Hall noted that the site is an active waterfront now with recreational uses and expressed concern over how this space could be built out without the loss of economic resilience, similar to the outcome at Jack London Square in Oakland, where there is a significant disconnect from the waterfront development to the fabric of the downtown core. She asked if there is a way to turn the design on its side and connect to the city in a more walkable way by providing something to do every minute. From a pedestrian standpoint, she sees the amphitheater as a rock in the stream. In general, she would like to see the overall site have a more pedestrian-friendly design.
- (4) Leo Chow commented that the site is a unique and special place, particularly with the marshes located on either side of the development and its water access to the strait. He felt this area is an important public resource for the community and wants to better understand the need for mixed uses and how the design can make economic development at this scale feel like home. He noted that the price point for the amenities will change the economic experience for others and stated that the natural resources and beauty must be maintained and taken advantage of in the design. He stated that the design as presented feels like a harsh red lined boundary and the cluster of hotels feels like a wall. He continued that the design shown not only feels private but exclusive. He would like to see more refinement with the design with layers of space to create places for people and would like to see different schemes when the design comes back. He agreed with others’ sentiments that this place needs to feel like “home” and supported the Chair’s request for process and seeing more scenarios and options.
- (5) Stefan Pellegrini noted that two-sided retail is tricky and recommended looking at other projects such as the Mission Rock development along the San Francisco waterfront as an example. He stated that the design needs to create an arrival experience at the waterfront and not a parking lot.
- (6) Jacinta McCann noted that future design presentations should show the trail network mapped with the project. She stressed that the existing trail networks need to be mapped completely and accurately, and that connection points need to be clear, especially at the southern point of the site.
- (7) Patricia Fonseca stated the importance of providing public access and views at this project scale. The scale alone creates a perception that this is a private area. She commented that the scale needs to be broken down or a more gradient design needs to be explored. She stressed that the waterfront should be the most public space and the architecture could be more inland. She expressed concern that the promenade is designed to end abruptly at the ecological zones where they serve as bookends to the project instead of a more graceful transition, emphasizing that this line should not be so obvious.

Sea Level Rise and Climate Change

- (1) Cody Anderson stated that this is an enormously complicated site with a dynamic shoreline edge condition. He commented that there will be a shocking change in elevations to get the proposed design scenarios to work. He felt that the proposed

- project is overbuilt for the long term and stressed that before the design team selects architectural materials, the first priority should be adequate infrastructure.
- (2) Patricia Fonseca agreed that the project needs a sea level rise strategy and all the design goals and concepts mentioned by the Board should be included in that strategy. She additionally recommended that the project tie into the goals and assumptions of the RSAP being developed for Contra Costa County.
 - (3) Tom Leader stated that a shoreline engineer or landscape architect is needed to move the project forward.

Chair Summary:

- (1) Chair McCann observed that the marina redevelopment is visionary and exciting. She appreciated the collaboration with city leadership and private partnership to explore possible solutions. She stressed the importance of community outreach to further shape the design of the waterfront development and the Board would like to see progress on these efforts when the project returns.
- (2) She emphasized that the existing regional park is an attractor and that the project has the gift of having a starting point to maintain a connection to nature; it can serve as an underlying theme to help develop the design of the public realm with walking and biking trails and connections to downtown.
- (3) She recognizes the economic vibrancy of hotel use, but various scales and structure should be explored and several scenarios should be presented. She emphasized the importance for the development to have a “front door” and that connectivity to the city core needs to work. She stated the design team needs to explore historical connections and tie into how stories about the waterfront can be told as part of the project.
- (4) Chair McCann emphasized the need for the project to incorporate resiliency to sea level rise, including a study of bay mud and infrastructure. The Board would like to see a scenario that incorporates a more natural shoreline edge and how adaptation works for the project designed at 2050 and 2080.
- (5) She stated the development needs to make everybody feel welcome to the waterfront while providing a sense of security and shelter. She observed that privatized structures are not typically located in the BCDC shoreline band and that the project needs to balance softer areas with paved areas, as well as address other site factors such as temperature and wind.
- (6) The Board would like the project to come back for additional design review.

h. Response by the project team:

The project proponent thanked the Board for their comments and asked staff if there are best practice examples they could provide for the team. Staff agreed to follow up with examples, specifically of the China Basin/Mission Rock development project.

6. **Adjournment.** Gary Strang motioned to adjourn. Tom Leader seconded the motion. Meeting concluded at 8:54 p.m.



March 6, 2026

BCDC Design Review Board
375 Beale Street, Suite 510
San Francisco, CA 94105

Subject: Comments on the Bothin Marsh Evolving Shorelines Project

Dear BCDC Design Review Board,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Bothin Marsh Evolving Shorelines Project. I'm writing on behalf of Save The Bay to support the Bay Trail realignment and marsh restoration described in the project design. Save The Bay's mission is to protect the San Francisco Bay for people and wildlife, and our vision for the Bay includes a complete, accessible, and climate-resilient Bay Trail around the entire Bay and for communities to be protected from sea level rise by nature-based resilience features.

We are very glad to see that this project will adapt the Bay Trail to rising sea levels by removing the Bay Trail from the historic rail berm and re-routing it along the shoreline to the west, using the "Ring the Marsh" concept. This realignment will ensure that trail users will have access to active transportation and recreation opportunities along the shoreline in decades to come as sea levels rise. We're also glad that it will restore natural tidal flows and sediment deposition between the Bay and Bothin Marsh, improving habitat connectivity and enhancing the marsh's ability to adapt to sea level rise. We also congratulate the project team on the extensive community engagement that went into various stages of project design.

To ensure the proposed Bay Trail realignment is as accessible as possible to all users, we offer the following feedback and questions on the design exhibits:

- Exhibit 26 (Project Phasing): We are glad to see that the existing Bay Trail through Bothin Marsh will remain in commission until the realigned Bay Trail around the marsh is complete. It is critical that this active transportation and recreation amenity remains usable while the project is being constructed. Given that the current trail floods more than 30 days a year, what are the plans to maximize accessibility of this trail while the realignment is being built?
- Exhibit 29 (Typical Trail Section Along the Causeway Structure): We're glad to see that the Bay Trail realignment is designed to be resilient to 3.5 feet of sea level rise plus a 100-year storm, likely protecting it from flooding up until 2080. We recommend that the project team consider adaptive pathways for the Bay Trail to prepare for higher sea level rise scenarios past 2080 or the case that sea level rise accelerates.
- Exhibit 31 (Existing Trail Signage): We're glad to see the proposed signage includes the Bay Trail Logo. If possible, we recommend a map showing the entire Bay Trail route along with an inset that zooms in on the Bay Trail segment along Bothin Marsh.
- Exhibits 38-46 (Rosemont Trailhead & Tam Junction Trailhead): These trailheads will be busy areas with lots of traffic. They should be designed with slow zones to help minimize conflict between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles.



- Exhibit 44 (Tam Junction Trailhead): The paths connecting the Trailhead Entrance to the main Bay Trail appear too narrow to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists. Please ensure that these paths conform with Policy 5 as described in Page 12 of the staff report: "Paths designed for joint pedestrian and bicycle use should be 13 feet in width wherever possible."

Finally, we are pleased that this project prioritizes restoration of the marsh's habitats and natural adaptive capacity, making it a strong nature-based sea level rise resilience project.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and we look forward to continuing to engage on this important public access and climate resilience project.

Sincerely,

David Lewis
Executive Director
Save The Bay

From: Lee Huo <lhuo@bayareametro.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 8:57 AM

To: Martien, Lindsay@BCDC <Lindsay.Martien@bcdc.ca.gov>; Jewett, Yuriko@BCDC <yuriko.jewett@bcdc.ca.gov>; Tomerlin, Ashley@BCDC <ashley.tomerlin@bcdc.ca.gov>; Olsson, Schuyler@BCDC <schuyler.olsson@bcdc.ca.gov>

Cc: Diane Dohm <ddohm@bayareametro.gov>

Subject: Bay Trail Comments for BCDC's March 9, 2026, Design Review Board Meeting

Lindsay, Ashley, Yuri, and Schuyler:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments for BCDC's DRB meeting.

On behalf of the Bay Trail and Active Transportation Team at MTC/ABAG, the project team for the Evolving Shorelines Project at Bothin Marsh Open Space Preserve (Bothin Marsh Project) has coordinated with us. We support this project and appreciate the project team's efforts to coordinate directly with us. We have no further comments at this time for the Bothin Marsh project.

We are providing the following comments on behalf of the Bay Trail and Active Transportation Team at MTC/ABAG for the DRB review of the proposed Martinez Marina Redevelopment Project (Martinez Marina Project) in the City of Martinez. Please provide copies to the project sponsors and the DRB.

Since the project is at a planning and conceptual design stage, our comments are focused on high-level planning opportunities to create a Bay Trail alignment that more closely meets the Bay Trail vision for a shoreline trail.

- 1. Bay Trail Realignment:** Despite the vision of the Bay Trail to provide a shoreline and "Bay/blue-water" experience, none of the adopted Bay Trail alignment in the City of Martinez provides a shoreline or water experience and primarily runs through downtown Martinez along Marina Vista and Escobar. The Martinez Marina project provides an opportunity to create an updated Bay Trail alignment that moves the Bay Trail off Martinez streets and onto separated off-street trails that lead to Martinez's waterfront and run along the shoreline. The City of Martinez has been unable to complete the current adopted Bay Trail through downtown Martinez (segments 5076 and 5077, [Bay Trail Gap Closure Implementation Plan](#)) because of limited right-of-way and concerns over loss of parking along Marina Vista and Escobar. Ideally, a realigned Bay Trail would be moved off Marina Vista as soon as possible when approaching from the East and have the Bay Trail alignment run towards the shoreline along the Project's eastern edge. Towards the western edge of the Project site, there is an opportunity for the City of Martinez and other project sponsors to coordinate with East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD) to determine how a realigned Bay Trail could continue and extend along the shoreline of Radke Martinez Regional Shoreline Park and determine the most appropriate alignment of

any potential Bay Trail realignment back towards the current adopted Bay Trail alignment along Carquinez Scenic Drive west of Martinez.

2. **Stakeholder Coordination and Bay Trail Connectivity:** As mentioned above, City of Martinez/project sponsor coordination with key stakeholders such as EBRPD and the Bay Trail and Active Transportation Team at MTC/ABAG to discuss the opportunities for a Bay Trail realignment through the City of Martinez is needed. Coordination meetings would ensure that any realigned Bay Trail in Martinez is comprehensive and maximizes the shoreline experience and alignment of any proposed Bay Trail realignment. It would also ensure that any proposed Bay Trail realignment maintains connectivity with the overall Bay Trail system including the George Miller Trail towards the West and the Martinez-Benicia Bridge Trail towards the East.
3. **Grade Separated UPRR Crossings:** A realignment of the Bay Trail towards the Martinez Waterfront would require crossing the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) corridor. In order to provide the safest and most usable Bay Trail for all ages and abilities, a realignment would ideally involve grade-separated bicycle/pedestrian crossings of the UPRR tracks.
4. **Connections to Transit:** In order to support access and the use of public transit and active transportation to the proposed Martinez Marina Project, the Project should ensure that there are bicycle/pedestrian trail connections from the Martinez Marina Project to the Martinez Intermodal Station. Since the existing Bay Trail alignment runs adjacent to the Martinez Intermodal Station, this creates another opportunity for an improved Bay Trail alignment as an active transportation corridor between the Martinez Intermodal Station and the Martinez Marina Project. Bay Trail connections to transit ensure safe biking and walking conditions to access transit, which is critical for an Equity Priority Community such as Martinez.
5. **Events and the Bay Trail:** As the Martinez Marina Project is currently proposed, it will have significant events on site that will attract large numbers of people. The event spaces and circulation throughout the project site during events should be designed and operated in a manner where it complements rather than impacts any proposed Bay Trail alignments. While a Bay Trail realignment along the parameters of the Martinez Marina Project provides an opportunity to facilitate bicycle and walking to events, it is also critical to design any Bay Trail in the area with sufficient capacity to ensure that the Bay Trail will be able to accommodate both event attendees and general public access and Bay Trail users that are not attending the events. Please use the Bay Trail Design Guidelines & Toolkit 2.0 to determine design needs for this project.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on this project and look forward to our continued partnership with BCDC and the City of Martinez in completing a Bay Trail

system that meets the Bay Trail vision of a shoreline trail as an active transportation and recreational opportunity for bicyclists and pedestrians. Please let us know if you have any questions regarding our comments.

Lee Huo
Senior Planner
Bay Trail and Active Transportation Team
Sustainable Mobility and Operations Section
MTC/ABAG



March 6, 2026

BCDC Design Review Board
375 Beale Street, Suite 510
San Francisco, CA 94105

Subject: Bay Trail Realignment in the Martinez Marina Redevelopment Project

Dear BCDC Design Review Board,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Martinez Marina Redevelopment Project. I'm writing on behalf of Save The Bay with input on incorporating Bay Trail realignment into this project to provide better access to the shoreline. Save The Bay's mission is to protect the San Francisco Bay for people and wildlife, and our vision for the Bay includes a complete, accessible, and climate-resilient Bay Trail around the entire Bay.

Currently, the Bay Trail alignment in Martinez does not provide a shoreline experience and instead largely runs along Marina Vista Ave and Escobar Street. There have been challenges with completing the Bay Trail along these streets due to concerns over loss of parking space. As is the case in many parts of the Bay, the adopted Bay Trail alignment may have originally been placed along inland roads because the shoreline was inaccessible. However, we should take advantage of redevelopment projects that provide opportunities to realign the Bay Trail to better reflect its intention of being a shore-adjacent trail providing shoreline views and recreation opportunities. The Martinez Marina Redevelopment Project represents such an opportunity.

We recommend realigning the Bay Trail to run along the waterfront at the northern edge of the Martinez Marina. When approaching the project site from the east, the Bay Trail alignment should redirect towards the shoreline as early as possible. On the western edge of the project site, the project team should work with the East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD) to have the realigned Bay Trail continue along the shoreline of Radke Martinez Regional Shoreline Park.

The project team should work closely with stakeholders including East Bay Regional Parks, the Bay Trail and Active Transportation Team at MTC/ABAG, and Save The Bay to determine the best Bay Trail realignment configuration. It should also engage with the community and trail users for input.

Additional considerations that we urge to project team to incorporate into the project and Bay Trail realignment include:

1. **Sea Level Rise Resilience:** We're glad that the project team plans to integrate sea level rise resilience into the project design. We support plans to develop adaptation pathways for the shoreline and to reinforce marsh and transitional zones as a sea level rise resilience strategy. We encourage the project team to ensure that a realigned Bay Trail will be designed to be resilient to sea level rise and extreme storms.
2. **Grade-Separated Railroad Crossings:** In order to be realigned along the Martinez Waterfront, the Bay Trail will need to cross the Union Pacific Railroad corridor. The railroad crossing locations should include grade-separated bicycle and pedestrian crossings.



3. **Connections to Transit:** The project should include bicycle and pedestrian trail connections from the Martinez Marina to the Martinez Intermodal Station. This will help improve access to the shoreline and to the Bay Trail from public transit and enhance opportunities for active transportation along the shoreline. Accessibility from public transit centers is especially important in an Equity Priority Community such as Martinez.
4. **Design for High Use:** The project team should design the project so that it has sufficient capacity to accommodate the expected traffic volume for the redeveloped Marina without interfering with Bay Trail use. This includes designing the space so that events held at the Marina don't hinder activity along the Bay Trail and that the Bay Trail in this area can facilitate bicycling and walking to events at the Marina. Spaces should be designed to avoid conflict between bicyclists, pedestrians, and vehicles in busy areas.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. We look forward to staying engaged with this project to support a realigned Bay Trail that provides bicyclists and pedestrians with recreational and active transportation access along the shoreline.

Sincerely,

David Lewis
Executive Director
Save The Bay



Martinez Marina Shoreside

From Christine Watson <thepersianslipper@gmail.com>
Date Thu 2/26/2026 4:10 AM
To BCDC Public Comment <publiccomment@bccdc.ca.gov>

You don't often get email from thepersianslipper@gmail.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.

Dear BCDC,

I am writing in response to the plans for redevelopment of Martinez shoreline. I have seen the plan and object to some things. Three hotels???? They are mistaken. There is barely room for One. Where do you propose to cram them in? The other hotels in town already are hanging on. Don't let them do it. The volume of the work is just Too Much. Amphitheater? For what? They will be crowding too much into too little space. I would suggest you visit the site. There would sure be a lot of parking lots needed. See for yourselves where these structures are going to go. It has been my experience that city councils will approve grandiose plans, only to find they are impractical. They don't visit the site either. It is often shocking that some council members just look at such plans in terms of personal gain.

Look, Martinez is a very small town, in spite of being the county seat. It has a small town atmosphere that is obviously not of value to the city council. They plan to turn it over to Real Estate developers.. it has also been my experience that many of the Council Members are realtors. So, hmmm Does this have anything to do with their own sales commissions?

Please make them scale this down. The marsh land of the Alhambra Creek is at stake too. They would be happy to build a big pipe and bulldoze and fill the marshland.

This all started with trying to make improvements to the marina, and look what it has turned into.

Thank you for your [attention.to](#) this matter.

Christine Watson

35 year Martinez resident