

# SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600 • San Francisco, California 94102 (415) 352-3600 • Fax: (415) 352-3606 • www.bcdc.ca.gov

March 28, 2014

**TO:** Design Review Board Members  
**FROM:** Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; lgoldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)  
Ellen Miramontes, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; ellenm@bcdc.ca.gov)  
**SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of March 10, 2014 BCDC Design Review Board Meeting**

1. **Call to Order and Attendance.** The Design Review Board's Chair, John Kriken, called the meeting to order at approximately 6:40 p.m. Other Design Review Board members in attendance included Ephraim Hirsch, Jacinta McCann, Roger Leventhal and Gary Strang. BCDC staff in attendance included Bob Batha, Joe LaClair, Michelle Levenson and Ellen Miramontes.

2. **Approval of Draft Minutes for the October 7, 2013 and February 10, 2014 Meetings.** The Board approved the minutes from these two meetings with no revisions.

3. **Briefing Regarding San Francisco Bay Plan Policies on Climate Change.** The Board members received a briefing regarding amendments that were made to the San Francisco Bay Plan in 2011 to address climate change. In particular, policy changes that affect public access requirements were reviewed.

a. **Staff Presentation.** The Commission's Chief Planning Officer, Joe LaClair, provided the presentation. Mr. LaClair discussed sea level rise predictions and the potential negative impacts. He explained that today's extreme flood events represent approximately the same flood risk as predicted mid-century high tides. He explained that sea level rise will negatively impact existing public access areas and that future shoreline protection needs may also have negative impacts on existing public access. He stated that current Bay Plan policies require the viability of proposed public access be assessed in light of sea level rise and that projects should either plan for adaptive management of public access or provide alternative equivalent access nearby in the future.

b. **Board Questions.** The Board members asked several questions.

Mr. Leventhal asked whether views are considered to be a part of existing public access to which Mr. LaClair affirmatively responded.

Mr. Kriken asked whether there is a government requirement for a comprehensive strategy to address sea level rise. Mr. LaClair described various efforts underway, including the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority, in which many agencies have joined together in cooperation to address sea level rise. Mr. Kriken further asked whether the Commission's policies to minimize fill would be changed in order to allow for sea level rise adaptation responses. Mr. LaClair explained that the Bay Plan currently allows fill for shoreline protection to prevent flooding and also that fill for marsh habitat areas may also be allowed to serve as a nature-based shoreline protection solution.



*Making San Francisco Bay Better*

**DRB MINUTES  
March 10, 2014**

Mr. Leventhal inquired as to what numbers the Commission is relying upon now for sea level rise predictions. Mr. LaClair explained that the policies do not direct the use of certain numbers but rather direct the use of science-based predictions and also that the Commission discourages against using the lower end of the predicted ranges.

Mr. Strang asked whether Treasure Island's development proposal was based on a 16-inch-rise at mid-century and a 55-inch-rise at end of century. Mr. LaClair stated that the project was designed to a 36-inch-rise prediction and explained that many people are designing to a 36-inch-rise for the end of century.

Mr. Kriken asked whether there would be a need for inland lakes or reservoirs to capture water from extreme floods. Mr. LaClair responded that was correct and further explained that in some areas, such as Mission Creek in San Francisco, there are barriers that may prevent stormwater run-off and these barriers need to be addressed.

c. **Public Comment.** Three members of the public made comments.

Keith Madding stated that "King Tide" is not a proper term and asked why this term is being used when the term "Spring Tide" should rather be used. Mr. LaClair acknowledged that "King Tide" is not the correct technical term but explained that this term had become popular in recent years and seemed to resonate with the public. Mr. Leventhal further noted that the correct technical term is actually "Perigean Spring Tide."

Sue Hestor asked how the State is currently addressing the requirements of the Burton Act, given that it predates BCDC and sea level rise. She noted that the San Francisco waterfront is primarily hardscape and there is little opportunity for marshes to be incorporated along its shoreline. Mr. LaClair explained that the Commission's planning division is working closely with many cities and discussing how to undertake adaptive planning measures in the face of sea level rise.

Bright Winn asked, when a 55-inch-rise is predicted, whether the high tide is placed above that number to which Mr. LaClair responded affirmatively.

4. **Presentation on the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail.** The Board members received a presentation on the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail including: a brief history and overview of the trail; a description of who the trail serves; the process for implementing the trail; the Commission's and the Design Review Board's roles regarding the trail; and various design considerations that are relevant to the trail.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Ellen Miramontes introduced Ann Buell, Project Manager with the California State Coastal Conservancy, and Galli Basson, Water Trail Planner with the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), who jointly provided the presentation.

b. **Project Presentation.** Ms. Buell began by describing the water trail concept and shared that there are more than 600 water trails in the United States. She shared a map of all the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail sites envisioned and then described how the Water Trail began, based on the vision of a local group called Bay Access, Inc. She described all of the non-motorized small boat types that use the Water Trail, including stand-up paddle boards, kite boards, windsurfers, kayaks, canoes, rowboats, dragon boats, sculls, whale boats and outrigger canoes. She talked through how sites are included in the Water Trail and explained that the trail is currently being implemented. The project is steered by a Project Management Team that includes: the State Coastal Conservancy as the lead, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the Division of Boating and Waterways and BCDC. She also explained that there is an Advisory Committee made up of stakeholder representatives. Finally, Ms. Buell shared a map indicating the eight sites that have been designated to date.

Ms. Basson then described the benefits for designated sites, including signage, brochures, information posted on the Water Trail website and eligibility for grant funding. She explained that one role of both the Commission and Design Review Board could be to advocate for water access on the Bay as a form of public access required for permitted projects. The Board's specific role is to advise on site design and proposed improvements related to Water Trail sites. When reviewing Water Trail sites, the Board should consider other recreational uses in the area, safety, wildlife impacts, aesthetics and views. She further described the variety of launching facility types and other amenities needed such as parking, restrooms, boat storage, staging areas and accessibility features. Finally, Ms. Basson walked the Board through a few existing sites including Alviso Marina, Kennedy Park in Napa and downtown Napa.

c. **Board Questions and Discussion.** The Board members asked a few questions and made a few statements.

Mr. Kriken stated that the Board has a long-standing history of promoting water access and it is wonderful to see these Water Trail efforts underway.

Mr. Hirsch asked where the grant funding comes from. Ms. Buell explained that the Conservancy provides the funding and ABAG administers the grants.

Mr. Strang asked when the vision for the Water Trail began. Ms. Buell explained that Bay Access, Inc. formed in the late 1990's and the Water Trail legislation was enacted in 2005 through Assembly Bill 1296.

d. **Public Comment.** There were no public comments.

5. **Bay Trail Alignment along Marina Boulevard Between Scott and Baker Streets, City and County of San Francisco. (First Review)** The Board conducted a review of proposed Bay Trail alignment options along Marina Boulevard, between Scott and Baker Streets, presented by the City and County of San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department and Public Works Department. The review was in response to Special Condition II-B-3 contained in BCDC Permit No. 2007.003, issued by the Commission on November 4, 2010, for the San Francisco Marina West Basin Expansion Project. This Special Condition requires the permittee, the City and County of San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, to finalize a conceptual design for the Bay Trail along this section of Marina Boulevard.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Michelle Levenson introduced the project and the issues identified in the staff report.

b. **Project Presentation.** Cristina Olea, with the City of San Francisco Public Works Department, presented the project. Ms. Olea described the process that the Public Works Department and the Recreation and Parks Department have undertaken to determine the extent of use (e.g., vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian) at the site. Ms. Olea stated that usage counts were conducted during spring, summer and fall months. In addition, two public meetings were held at which time public input was solicited regarding current and future use of the trail.

c. **Board Questions.** Because there were several public speakers, the Board members held their questions regarding the presentation until the public had an opportunity to speak.

d. **Public Comment.** The following members of the public made comments:

Bright Winn: Mr. Winn stated that he has had a boat at the marina for the past 40 years. He stated that he was concerned about pedestrian and bicycle conflicts. He stated that he favors the installation of a dedicated, striped bicycle lane along Marina Boulevard, rather than a shared bicycle and pedestrian trail.

Alan Cavey: Mr. Cavey stated he has been a tenant at the marina for 50 years. He stated that he believes it is important to park a vehicle near the boats to load/unload supplies. He stated that he believes that a bike lane should be placed along Marina Boulevard and located outside of the trail.

Dick Robinson: Mr. Robinson stated that he is a nearby resident, slip holder, and a member of the St. Francis Yacht Club. He stated that the parking analysis used as the basis for the Public Works Department study may be inaccurate as the renovation of the marina was not complete at that time. In addition, he stated that relocation of the parking spaces would also require the removal of benches that were required by the BCDC permit issued for the marina renovation. He stated that the marina tenants paid for the marina improvements and that parking to facilitate marina use should not be removed.

Grace Knight: Ms. Knight stated that she is a slip holder in the marina and a walker. She believes that there is no problem with the shared use of the trail between vehicles and pedestrians. She believes that there is an issue along the trail with high-speed bicyclists.

Maureen Gaffney: Ms. Gaffney stated that she is with the San Francisco Bay Trail. She stated that at no other location along the 333-mile-long Bay Trail is usage as high as along this section of the San Francisco waterfront. She also stated that at no other location along the Bay Trail do pedestrians and bicyclists share the trail with vehicles. Ms. Gaffney stated that the Bay Trail has been involved with the project for the past ten years and that the Bay Trail voiced their concerns regarding vehicular use on the trail during the environmental review process. She further stated that thousands of pedestrians and bicyclists use this part of the trail on some days and it is "inherently unsafe" to include cars with the trail users. The Bay Trail believes that Option 2A (relocate all parking to Marina Green parking lot) would be best.

Janice Li: Ms. Li stated that she is a community organizer with the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition. She stated that the data collected during the usage study supported that the design of the trail should reflect the usage of the trail. She believes that Option 2A would provide "a high quality bicycle, pedestrian, and general visitor experience" as required by the permit.

Andy Thornley: Mr. Thornley stated that he worked on this issue for seven years when he was with the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition. He is a frequent bicycle rider along this stretch of Bay Trail. He believes this section of the Bay Trail is a very special place and should be made "excellent for all." He stated that there should not be any vehicles on this section of the trail and that the slip holders should have parking in another area of the marina.

Keith Madding: Mr. Madding stated that he has been a harbor tenant since 1999. He believes that there is no safety issue between vehicles and pedestrians. He believes that the bicyclists should be moved onto the street. He stated that there is parking along the south side of Marina Boulevard and suggested that this parking be removed in order to accommodate bicycle lanes on the street.

Christine Tozzi: Ms. Tozzi stated that she feels a strong connection to this area and the water. She stated that the marina is public and she currently has a boat in the marina. She needs parking close to her boat and is concerned about her safety if she would have to park further away. She also stated that more boats will be berthing in the marina and there needs to be adequate vehicle parking for all of the slip holders.

Paul Manning: Mr. Manning stated that a 20-foot-width of the trail was conveyed to the City of San Francisco Public Works Department approximately 20 years ago. This property is part of the Public Trust and, as such, parking for a marina is an appropriate use of this land under the Public Trust. He stated that with marina renovation and other improvements,

parking has been taken away. He stated that a \$23 million loan from California Boating was obtained for the marina renovation and must be repaid. He stated that if there is no vehicular parking, people will not want to berth their boats at the marina and the City of San Francisco will have trouble paying back the loan. He stated that there are no statistics regarding accidents between vehicles and pedestrians and bicyclists. He supports the installation of a stop sign at Scott Street and a posted speed limit for bicyclists.

Bruce Stone: Mr. Stone stated that he is president of the Harbor Association. He stated that he is a hiker, biker and boater and can appreciate all perspectives. He stated that there is room for a dedicated bike lane on Marina Boulevard. He stated that the historic railway tracks located underneath the trail should not be an impediment to relocating the berth-holder parking to the edge of Marina Boulevard. He stated that these tracks have already been cut out in many locations. He stated that commuter parking is occurring in the marina parking lot. He stated that parking was removed to accommodate the BCDC-required benches and has observed that no one uses the benches.

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board members discussed the following:

Mr. Hirsch inquired as to the Bay Trail standards. Ms. Miramontes stated that the Bay Trail had guidelines but not specified standards. Ms. Gaffney from the Bay Trail affirmed this. Mr. Hirsch stated that the presented options were not an improvement over existing conditions. Mr. Hirsch presented an additional option that would relocate the vehicles to the middle of the trail and the pedestrians along the water and the bicyclists adjacent to Marina Boulevard.

Ms. McCann inquired as to the width of the pedestrian and bicycle lane adjacent to the Marina Green. Ms. Olea stated the width at that location is 21 feet. Ms. McCann stated that as a runner, she believes that it is difficult to navigate bicycles within this area. She inquired as to whether there was any information regarding accidents along the trail. Ms. Olea said that she wasn't aware of any accidents involving vehicles and pedestrians or bicyclists.

Mr. Leventhal stated that he believes that Option 2B started to address the usage issue. He suggested that there could be one lane in for off-loading only and no parking would be allowed. He also inquired as to whether a loading zone area and off-site parking had been investigated.

Mr. Kriken stated that one should look to the designated area for bicyclists along Market Street (e.g., green paint, vertical sticks, etc.) for guidance on usage issues.

Mr. Hirsch stated bicyclists and pedestrians were not compatible in this area.

Mr. Strang stated that it didn't make a difference whether parking or loading is sited along the trail because both options result in occupying width for a drive aisle lane. He proposed an Option 5 which would locate bicyclists and pedestrians along the water and vehicles along Marina Boulevard.

Mr. Kriken stated that parking should be allowed in some areas but leave other areas open in order to provide "windows" to the boats and the water beyond.

Ms. McCann stated that more study should be conducted into separating bike usage and the feasibility of putting a commuter bike lane along Marina Boulevard should be explored.

Mr. Kriken stated that bike usage should be moved onto Marina Boulevard or adjacent to the roadway.

Mr. Hirsch stated he believes that the issue at hand is separating the pedestrians from the bicyclists.

Mr. Kriken stated that the Board would like to see the project again.

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

(1) Bicyclists and pedestrians should be separated. Maintaining permit parking only is acceptable.

(2) Consider switching the location of the drive aisle and the parking lane. Consider moving parking closer to center and providing a greater width for pedestrians on the waterside while moving bicyclists to the street side.

(3) Consider moving the loading area to the street edge.

(4) Consider providing a dedicated bicycle lane in street.

(5) Consider separating the fast and the slow bicyclists into distinct areas.

(6) The Board would like to review revised designs.

g. **Project Proponent Response.** Ms. Mary Hobson with the Recreation and Parks Department explained that they can only pursue options that fall within their property boundaries and so they would not be able to propose bicycle lanes in the street as part of the solution.

6. **Adjournment.** Mr. Kriken adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ELLEN MIRAMONTES  
Bay Design Analyst

Approved, with no corrections, at the  
Design Review Board Meeting of April 7, 2013.