

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

July 1, 2026

TO: Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415-352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Yuriko Jewett, Bay Dev. Design Analyst (415-352-3616; yuriko.jewett@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Draft Summary of May 11, 2026, BCDP Design Review Board Meeting

1. Call to Order

- a. **DRB Board Members.** Jacinta McCann, Chair; Gary Strang, Vice Chair; Cody Anderson, DRB; Kristen Hall, DRB; Stefan Pellegrini, DRB. Cody Anderson, DRB online.
- b. **BCDP Staff.** Ashley Tomerlin, Yuri Jewett, Lindsay Martien, Katharine Pan
- c. **Project Proponent Representative.** Liza McNulty, Capital Improvement Program Manager, City of Berkeley Parks Recreation and Waterfront Department

2. Staff Update.

- a. **DRB Recruitment.** Board Secretary Tomerlin announced recruitment for new Board members and alternates and asked Board members for suggestions on potential candidates to include in the initial contact.
- b. **Future Meeting Schedule.** There will be no meeting scheduled for June, but we will likely have a meeting in July for the first review of the SAFER Bay levee project that spans from Bedwell Bayfront Park in Menlo Park south to San Francisquito Creek in East Palo Alto. Fall is looking light on projects, and staff are scheduling a briefing on the RSAP progress.

3. Non-Agenda Public Comments. No public comments received.

4. **Berkeley Waterfront and Ferry Pier Project, City of Berkeley, Alameda County; Second Review.** The Design Review Board held a second design review of the Berkeley Waterfront and Ferry Pier project, a proposed electric ferry service located at the Berkeley Marina, in the City of Berkeley, Alameda County. The project proposes demolition of the closed fishing pier and the construction of a new 1,080-foot-long public pier with pedestrian access and a ferry terminal, connected to a 400-foot-long breakwater. The proposal also includes improvements to the surrounding Berkeley Waterfront, including a public plaza, improved site circulation and transportation infrastructure, a Bay Trail extension, parking lot renovations, and new landscaping.

- a. **BCDC Staff Presentation.** Lindsay Martien provided a staff introduction to the Berkeley Ferry Pier Project.
- b. **Board Clarifying Questions from Staff Presentation.** No clarifying questions.
- c. **Project Proponent Presentation.** Liza McNulty, Capital Improvement Program Manager, City of Berkeley Parks, Recreation & Waterfront Department led the presentation. She was joined by James Connolly, Project Engineer, COWI and Cathy Garrett, Landscape Architect, MIG/PGA.
- d. **Board Clarifying Questions from Project Presentation.**
 - 1) Kristen Hall asked for clarification of the various parking scenarios proposed for the project. She asked the team to point out where the parking for the recreation users are located. The project team responded that the Skates/N Lot, north of University Avenue allocates 140 spaces. 65 of those spaces will be reserved for anyone, not just ferry riders, and will be paid, full day parking and 75 spaces will be free, time limited parking also for anyone to use. South of University Avenue the project is proposing 460 parking stalls. 200 of those stalls will be paid, full day parking. Approximately 110 stalls along Seawall Drive will be free, time limited parking for recreation users. The team noted the [Draft Parking Management and Implementation Plan](#) was released to the public on May 8, 2026 and is currently under public review. They also noted that the Draft Parking Management and Implementation Plan has allocated 150 parking spaces for the future tenant of the HS Lordship restaurant, which would be a separate project with its own BCDC permit. They clarified that if the restaurant does not open, then other parking management tools such as time limits will be used in the interim.
 - 2) Jacinta McCann asked if the 150 stalls would be exclusive to the restaurant. The project team confirmed that the intension is for the 150 stalls to be exclusive to the restaurant, but this quantity would be subject to other future approvals, including BCDC.
 - 3) Stefan Pellegrini asked the project team to describe the area of fill on the landside of the pier given the increase in elevation. The project team responded that the elevation at University Avenue is +11.5, the plaza space will be used to meet the grade of the pier with a uniform 2% slope. They noted that other benefits of regrading the plaza include improvements to geotechnical conditions and addressing the liquefaction risk for the area.

- 4) Stefan Pellegrini asked if the Bay Trail extension to the south also raises the shoreline edge. The project team responded that the trail from the pier is designed to smoothly transition to natural grade to the south, the elevation is nominally at +14.5.
- 5) Stefan Pellegrini inquired about the flow of pedestrians from the parking lot to the bay edge. He note sections 2 and 3 from the exhibits have a planted buffer or a fence to delineate the edge condition, and he asked the project team to describe how people move from parking area to the Bay Trail. The team responded that in general, the Bay Trail is at top of curb which will be a change from the road grade. They noted that new crosswalks will be installed to the north and south.
- 6) Stefan Pellegrini asked if east-west connections midway through the lot have been considered. The team confirmed that currently east west connections are only at north and south ends of the parking lot in the interest of maximizing parking.
- 7) Gary Strang asked to clarify that the loss of trees in the parking area is due to the grading. The project team responded that the tree removal is needed to remove the berm and reconfigure the Bay Trail.
- 8) Gary Strang requested confirmation that the trees will not be replanted. The project team stated that some trees will be replanted, noting that the arborist assessment of the existing trees identified all the trees in the area are in decline.
- 9) Gary Strang noted that all the solar panels are canted and oriented to the east and asked if there is a scenario where they are canted to the south. The team stated that the technical analysis identified this direction of the cant for cost benefit analysis, the south cant was not studied.
- 10) Gary Strang further noted that a southern cant of the panels could break up the massing. The team noted that solar panels are an optional feature and the building permit for the project will not include it. The team noted that the solar panels would be a private/public partnership and WETA is still analyzing the benefit costs for the power it generates. This proposed design is based on placing solar panels on the proposed parking lot configuration, other configurations have yet to be studied.
- 11) Cody Anderson noted that the improvements to the parking lot appear to only include resurfacing, striping and the solar panel installation. He asked if there was a lower area for stormwater management and in general if the team could clarify the stormwater management obligation. He commented that when you change the perimeter, it also changes the gravity flow of water across the site. He requested

clarification for the biofiltration for C3 requirements, and if the project is still meeting discharge requirements and not stuck with localized flooding. The project team responded that the parking stalls are all proposed to be pervious paving to reduce the amount of C3 treatment area. The design assumes they have to meet all the runoff requirements with no exceptions. There are multiple outfalls around the peninsula, and there is an existing storm drain/subdrain system under the parking lot. The team clarified that some of those outfalls will require rehabilitation, but the project is not proposing new outfalls as part of this project.

- 12) Cody Anderson followed up by inquiring if there will be flapgates to prevent the system operating in reverse. The project team confirmed there will be no flapgates.
- 13) Jacinta McCann asked if the solar panels required energy storage on site such as large batteries. The project team noted that onsite batteries would probably be included in the cost benefit analysis. They would likely be located in the parking area itself in a small, enclosed space.
- 14) Jacinta McCann noted the project has a long horizon and she asked if there was a timeline for how long the solar would be in place, she noted with technology changes there may be a more efficient way to capture energy, for example. The team responded that the challenge with solar design is the quickly changing technology and that it is often a design-build scenario, but generally solar panels have a 30-year timeline. The decision to install them is related to its useful life. The team noted that the panels are an optional add on to the project and were designed around the base design. The electricity demand for this area of the site will come from WETA, the City of Berkeley and the private restaurant.
- 15) Jacinta McCann asked if there will be additional signage for the different parking scenarios on site will accompany the existing wooden signs. The project team responded that kiosks and typical parking lot signage related to time limits will be installed.

e. Public Comment

- 1) Jim McGrath, Save the Berkeley Pier. He noted he has provided comments under the project's draft EIR public review process. He highlighted the difficulties with the City of Berkeley being the lead agency rather than WETA, stating that unless WETA adopts a project description that has an electric ferry as a project element or mitigation measure, there is no guarantee that there will be an electric ferry. He noted that WETA has studied how people arrive at ferry terminals throughout the bay and these weren't included in the City's analysis. He stated he plans to submit

a study to BCDC staff for review to show how many people arrive at other ferry sites by car and another study to show the mode split issues with the fishing community. He also noted that the proposed parking described this evening is difficult to comment on related to public access and recreation since the draft parking study was released only a few days ago for public review. He noted that he visits the site approximately 150 times a year and that in-car viewing is an essential part of public access to the bay since the environment has strong winds and is cold. He expressed concern that the data and numbers don't add up and the ferry parking needs would usurp the recreational parking spaces. He stressed that the utility of public access depends on being able to get to it and feels that this proposal would displace recreation users. He also expressed concern that the proposed solar panel orientation would impact wind availability and will provide additional comments for the design proposal. He stated that he will also submit additional comments related to recently released parking study.

- 2) Paul Kamen ceded his time to Jim McGrath.
- 3) Camille Antinori, Berkeley Waterfront Community Coalition. She represents an organization that cares for the Berkeley waterfront, its recreation and the community that uses the space. She noted that she submitted a report and public comment letter under draft EIR public review process. She stated that she believes that the project is a major displacement of recreation for the area and that the ferry service is the reason for this displacement. She noted equitable public access issues and that in-car viewing spaces which have been in place for many years are being reduced. She noted that many Berkeley users are over the age of 50 and stated that a regional adequate alternative for recreation users that come here for walking, boating and sightseeing. She conducted a study that randomly selected 200 anglers and found that the demographic is for anglers that frequently use the site now without the availability of the fishing pier are low income, more non-white than the average Berkeley profile. She noted those who she interviewed comes as often as 30 times a year and prefer to Berkeley location to fish and have concerns about the ferry terminal. She noted the 199 Seawall lot (restaurant) will be bringing in landside improvements, but the improvements are not dependent upon this proposed project. She stressed the need for the value of recreation; noting that this is a. already highly activated site and is a regionally significant recreational resource.
- 4) Carla Woodworth ceded her time to Camille Antinori.

- 5) Robert Rogers, Bay Planning Coalition. He stated that he urges the Board to advance the Ferry Terminal and Pier Replacement project. He stated that it strongly reflects the BPC mission by advancing balance of economic and environmental policies to support a resilient and economically vibrant Bay Area shoreline. The project restores a major civic asset and restores public connections to the waterfront, while creating a modern multimodal transportation hub. He stated BPC supports the emergency response and evacuation capabilities during disasters that may disrupt surface transportation and that the project will support local businesses, recreation, tourism, and jobs to revitalize Berkeley's waterfront and reestablishing the area as a regional destination.
- 6) Sanjan Shah, Associated Students of the University of California, Berkeley. She encouraged the board to advance the Berkeley Ferry Terminal and Pier Replacement project. The university student body needs high capacity, reliable public transit to access jobs and resources, but the financial burden of owning a personal vehicle can make the region inaccessible to many. This project provides a direct solution to that need by creating a seamless connection from the UC campus to the waterfront while supporting bicycles and micromobility. She also encouraged the Board to listen to the needs of the community in the surrounding vicinity of the proposed project and consider their concerns.
- 7) Erin Diehm, former Berkeley Parks and Recreation Commissioner. She stated that the process was bifurcated from the waterfront planning process since the conversation never included a pier only analysis. In regard to recreation access, the parking along Seawall Drive is heavily used by a wide range of park visitors such as wingers, anglers and swimmers. We know that the parking spaces are in high demand by recreation users and the project significantly reduces these spaces and they will be usurped by ferry riders. She state she feels this violates Policy 9 of the Bay Plan. She cited Figure 42 of the Kittleson report which noted that 1/3 of the visitors to the waterfront are from lower incomes and make less than the Berkeley median household income of \$50-75K a year and with the fee structure and reduced parking this will be a major displacement. She urged the Board to reject the project.
- 8) Julie Allen, Berkeley Marina swimmer. She stated there are almost 400 swimmers in the organized group. She stated that during low tide, the Hs Lordships is the only water access point. She noted that it is more than informal water access, but instead an long time established spot for water recreation users. She noted that many folks are concerned that swimmers weren't included in discussions with the

city until mid-2025 and during those discussions were not allowed to speak to parking despite that access was a big concern for this group. Parking plan shown tonight is the first time being made available to the public. At peak times the Seawall lot is full. This sounds like it will require a lot of enforcement to keep ferry riders from using recreation spaces. City should engage with and be responsive to existing site users.

- 9) Kirk Van Moon, watersports recreation user. He stated he is an avid wing foil and sailing enthusiast and uses both the South Sailing Basin and Hs Lordships launch areas. He stated that he is connected to other water recreation users that use this area and echoes earlier comments regarding disingenuous outreach by the city since he was not aware that there were focus groups related to the plan and Hs Lordships site, for example. He stated that he would like to be involved with this group moving forward as it relates to in-water access and parking to allow for better and continued access to the bay in this area.
- 10) Andrew Sullivan, San Francisco Boardsailor Association. He stated that it is alarming to discuss project level details such as planting and solar panels when the elephant in the room is the parking issue. He highlighted that the project is currently a park that is being transformed into a commuter parking lot. He felt that the design proposal is in conflict with the Bay Plan given that there's a perfectly good alternative by placing the ferry terminal within the marina. It's not necessary to regional transit. He stated the SFBA does not support the project due to the lack of thorough analysis for parking. He stated the reports are based on outdated strategies that are time limited. He noted that Albany Beach has skyrocketed and displaced many boardsailors after basic improvements and revealed the latent demand to access in the area by all diverse population of recreational users. This is an important case study, and the data is available that can place recreational value in the context of the region. It's a regional access point and people are coming to the shoreline to be relieved from heat, for example. He also stated that relocating the ferry to the marina makes more sense since the commercial dock already exists and can provide better connection to the hotel and other amenities.

Ten public comment letters regarding the project were also received and are attached to this meeting summary.

- Beth Roessner, CEO Berkeley Chamber of Commerce
- Jennifer Cogley, Director Bayer Healthcare
- Rebecca Grove, Waterside Workshops

- Sanjna Shah, University of California's External Affairs Vice President Office
- Jim McGrath, Founder Save the Berkeley Pier.
- Camille Antinori, Berkeley Waterfront Community Coalition
- Ross Libenson, Berkeley Marina recreation user.
- Paul Kamen, Naval Architect.
- Gordan Meyer, Berkeley citizen.
- Alejandro Huneeus, Berkeley resident.
- Doug Yamaoto, current and longtime visitor to the marina.
- Sally Tobin, Bay Area Sea Kayakers.

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

Staff recommended the Board frame its remarks of the proposed public access improvements considering the existing permit requirements and the proposed development project. The Board may wish to refer to the public access objectives found in the Commission's Public Access Design Guidelines. Additionally, please provide feedback on the proposed public access improvements with respect to the Commission's policies on sea level rise, and environmental justice and social equity.

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.

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

- 1) Does the Board have any recommendations on the proposed trail networks and the adequacy of connections to and along the waterfront? Does the various

programming along the edge conditions of the new Bay Trail segment feel cohesive?

- 2) Does the Board have recommendations on the proposed plant and materials palettes?
- 3) Are there questions or concerns from the previous review that the Board would like to revisit? As different design elements have been presented across multiple reviews, does the Board feel that any additional information is needed showing how the design works as a whole?
- 4) Is the design of the proposed solar canopy at the Seawall Drive parking lot configured in a way that minimizes view impacts to the Bay? Are there other layouts that could be considered to help maximize Bay views?
- 5) Is the proposed Pier elevation sufficiently resilient to sea level rise for the life of this structure, given that the existing pier was in use for close to a century? Does the project design overall provide sufficient flexibility for future adaptation to sea level rise?

Trail Network, Circulation and Parking

- 1) Jacinta McCann reiterated that the upgrades to the existing Bay Trail along the waterfront feature three segments and these significant improvements are much needed. She stated that she likes the cross connections the new trail will provide to the unimproved trail to the east and appreciates that there is a clear map to see how the upgrades to Bay Trail will occur over time in general and felt that there are a lot of good attributes.
- 2) Gary Strang agreed, stating he had no concerns and appreciated the thorough presentation. He noted that although the project may need to continue to explore ways to better balance recreation users and commuters, he highlighted that the project does provide an emergency transportation system that arose from the 1989 earthquake, when public transportation became a lifeline for the Bay Area. He stated that he was impressed how thoughtfully the trail is woven together and placed new linkages while maintaining existing connections.
- 3) Jacinta McCann also highlighted the University Avenue crossing and stated that the addition of a wider sidewalk and its connection to the public plaza is a real benefit for pedestrians to gain access to the waterfront.

- 4) Kristen Hall agreed with prior comments adding that she had previously asked to see how all the waterfront recreation knitted together. It was helpful to see all the segments and to make sure continuous access is delivered in a high-quality way.
- 5) Stefan Pellegrini added that the design team should be mindful that the people will gravitate to the view of the edges and will make the shortest route possible from their car. He noted that the design of the buffer between the Bay Trail and the parking will likely need to accommodate people moving through that space.
- 6) Stefan Pellegrini mentioned that the historic context of the site reminded him that the land here was created and had several iterations until today. We are making decisions in a moment of time that will be subject to future change and adaptation. He stated that we can't fill the bay anymore to create more parking, so we need to figure out how to be more resourceful with the land we do have. He relayed that there appears to be a murky story for public access and recreation for the project and it is not completely clear what's being added or subtracted. He noted that regardless of the diversity of recreational users, most people will be arriving by car and parking is limited. The improved bike/ped/ transit access should mean there is a balance or tradeoff with those improvements. The creation of new public space that can be used by more people is merited. Understanding this is difficult to strike a balance for the needs of the different user groups.
- 7) Stefan Pellegrini put the question forward if there was a dynamic and changing user group in the future, how would the City/WETA respond. If the ferry project does not get built or phases out at some point, the City/WETA/other agencies should be willing to manage the space differently based on the user groups invested in the area. Parking can be built as an asset and managed over time that can be more responsive to user demand.
- 8) Jacinta McCann agreed and added that the parking management plan will presumably look at that balance and allocation of parking. She noted that the parking garages built for commercial development are frequently different than the demands. Reality can shift over time, so the hope is that the parking management plan continues to have periodic and reasonable review and adjusted to have a parking strategy that is dynamic and responds to users and intensity of use.
- 9) Gary Strang asked if some of the parking be dedicated to other types of vehicle parking like electric vehicles. He noted we also must consider the impact of self-driving vehicles and asked if there is something that can be done in the short term that allows more people to get there in smaller vehicles.

- 10) Kristen Hall noted that there was a public comment that this is a park being replaced by parking, but it seems that it is a reallocation of existing parking. She stated that maybe there is a sense that the way parking is used now isn't fully understood or appreciated and noted that Alameda Main Street and Seaplane Lagoon terminals which has a 40-50% drive along mode split in areas with not a lot of density and pedestrians and cyclists travel quite a distance in somewhat unimproved conditions to get there. This scenario has a higher density with improved bike lanes, which will invite a lot more people to use the new lanes to access the area. She stated that it feels like a very fair and elegant solution to address the issues raised here in balancing ferry parking with recreational users.

Planting and Materials Palette

- 11) Gary Strang noted that native plants are great, but they like native soil which may be an issue with this site. He asked how the soil will be conditioned to meet that profile. He stated that the plant palette will work here if there is good horticultural maintenance and a good environment. He commented that all plants proposed seem appropriate but noted that some of the inland plants will be exposed to high winds and a marine environment. He emphasized the plants that are "bombproof" like the *Myrica californica* and Monterey cypress, as well as Hollywood juniper are good choices. He suggested looking at the plant palette at Ocean Beach in San Francisco since it crosses over into junipers and relatives of junipers and succulents and yuccas. He stated it's important to be able to shift the palette and think about tomorrow with an emphasis on a good maintenance plan.
- 12) Jacinta McCann stated that she likes that it's a fairly diverse plant palette and that contributes to future proofing the site in general.
- 13) Gary Strang also added that ground hugging trees and shrubs that will respond to the wind exposure may be more appropriate here than the tall canopy trees, but to save as many declining trees as possible and embrace the difficulty of the growing environment

Furnishings and Railings

- 14) Jacinta McCann noted that the materials palette has really advanced since the last review and there is more cohesion with the design and there will be an attractive refinement and simplification of colors. She suggested keeping the magnificent views to the bay in the foreground as much as possible with low key furnishings. The quantities are good as well and notes that it can get windy at this site, but perhaps consider a wind barrier to help with protection

- 15) Gary Strang commented that he likes the silver-grey palette is great since it opens up galvanized and stainless and it goes well with current palette. He appreciated the amount attention to detail for the unique features such as the curves for the pier canopy and the railing to blend with the other features such as the restroom. He encouraged the design team to bring the palettes in line with the other furnishings. He suggested looking into prefab furnishings and making the design pieces match the furnishings you have less control over like the restroom.
- 16) Kristen Hall commented that the addition of a bathroom and rinse-off facilities are welcome amenities, noting that these are the kind of amenities that will encourage the public to stay on site longer.

Lighting and Signage

- 17) Jacinta McCann noted that the public commented that there may be too many light fixtures. She encouraged the design team to look at spacing, while meeting the minimum criteria and not overprovide lighting, but noted that safety is priority.
- 18) Gary Strang stated that he was curious about the ground strip lighting in the plaza and stated that maintenance and durability should be a priority. He expressed concern that lights making direct contact with the ground is a commitment to maintenance.
- 19) Jacinta McCann also added that she appreciates the effort given to signage and likes centralizing the signage program in key areas.

Solar Canopy and Bay Views

- 20) Kristen Hall noted that there are limited views with the existing trees in place now and that the exhibits show that replacing it with the solar installation wouldn't be too different to view impacts. She recommended that a cohesive approach given that it will be a prominent feature.
- 21) Jacinta McCann echoed previous comments and encouraged further study of the panel orientation and to break down lengths and massing. She felt that understanding how a reconfiguration will impact the availability of parking should be evaluated with all the competing needs of the site.
- 22) Jacinta McCann noted that the proposal already shows tree replacement of a higher quality and commented that softening the impact of the solar panels with tree planting that frame views to the bay would be ideal.

- 23) Cody Anderson noted that typically sheet flow from the panels directly onto asphalt or pedestrian circulation would lose fair amount of value in specifying pervious paving for the parking spaces. He recognized that while solar panels are not a certainty at this point, looking at runoff from the solar panels may require mitigation and should be considered.
- 24) Stefan Pelligrini noted that there are opportunities to highlight or take advantage of views, and it could help guide key design decisions such as the configuration of the parking lot and where adding breaks in the solar structures make sense. There are clear opportunities to look directly at the Golden Gate Bridge and places closer to Hs Lordships can provide a more panoramic view of the City, for example.
- 25) Jacinta McCann agreed and added that taking into account the various ways to approach the waterfront and a compilation of these opportunities to optimize views should be considered.

Sea Level Rise

- 26) Cody Anderson noted that the description of grade constraints of grades and the comparables around the bay is clear, but there's never an easier time to meet +17.5 than right now. He stated that if it is possible to achieve +17.5 with the understanding that the conforms can be adjusted in the future that is preferred. He added that it never gets simpler or less expensive to make modifications later.
- 27) Kristen Hall commented that sea level rise was discussed at length at the previous review since the emergency services and transportation component needs to have a robust resilience strategy. She asked if there is more room in the plaza to include transitions and steps that could help meet the conforms and afford the slope to get up higher. She noted that the Sea Plane Lagoon terminal in Alameda is a good example to follow.
- g. **Board Summary.** Jacinta McCann provided an overall summary of the key issues raised during the review:
- 1) Parking is a finite resource that will require management over time, it should be dynamic.
 - 2) The proposed trail network is great, and the design team did a good job defining and enlarging the Bay Trail to make it easier for multi-modal use to benefit the recreational users of the area.

- 3) Planting for the project must thrive, and the Board encourages providing a good growing medium, maintenance and identifying species that can withstand the challenging shoreline conditions.
- 4) Solar panels will require further study when appropriate, given that they are an addition to the project and will be installed on a different project timeline. Breaking down the massing to encourage cross views and selecting appropriate planting to shield scale of solar and frame Bay views.
- 5) Pervious paving at the parking area and evaluating how stormwater management will work with the addition of the solar panels including sheet flow to ensure the system performs as required.
- 6) Facilities such as restrooms and rinsing stations are welcome additions to the project. The seating and picnic areas are also welcome and will make users more comfortable and the quantities of the amenities look right.
- 7) Pushing height of plaza to +17.5 to match the grades of the pier, keeping in mind emergency nature of this area and that raising things higher now will be easier and less expensive.
- 8) Recommendations for taking advantage and using views to inform design decisions and parking configurations. Being mindful of the opportunity to reinforce major views.

The Board agreed that the project does not need to return to DRB, and that the project proponent further the design with staff.

- h. **Project Proponent Response.** The project team thanked the Board for the comments and recommendations. The team added that that they will take a look at the raising the elevation of the plaza but noted that one constraint is vehicle access on the pier must be provided to meet fire and life safety requirements. The team also agreed with the board that the parking scenarios are dynamic and that the transportation demand management needs to be looked at with a long-term lens. The team noted that they have intentionally left open spaces in the design to allow for growth of other modes, loading zones and other potential needs to accommodate the changing conditions on the ground.
- i. **Adjournment.** Gary Strang motioned to adjourn. Kristen Hall seconded. Meeting ended at approximately 8:00 p.m.