

# San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

June 30, 2017

**TO:** Design Review Board Members

**FROM:** Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; [larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov))  
Andrea Gaffney, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; [andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov))

**SUBJECT: Draft Minutes for June 5, 2017, BCDC Design Review Board Meeting**

1. **Call to Order and Safety Announcement.** Design Review Board (Board) Chair Karen Alschuler called the meeting to order at the Bay Area Metro Center, 375 Beale Street, Yerba Buena Room, First Floor, San Francisco, California, at 5:35 p.m., and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Other Board members in attendance included Tom Leader, Roger Leventhal, and Jacinta McCann. BCDC staff in attendance included Jhon Arbelaez-Novak, Andrea Gaffney, Brad McCrea, Jaime Michaels, and Hanna Miller. The presenters were James Anderson (Hercules Bayfront), Chris Barton (East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD)), David Biggs (City of Hercules), John Gibbs (Wallace, Roberts, and Todd (WRT)), Patrick Miller (2M Associates), Bob Nesbit (EBRPD), and Michael Vidra (BKF Engineers). Also in attendance were Jeff Bond (City of Albany), Ben Botkin (San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail), Robert Cheasty (Citizens for East Shore Parks (CESP)), Tom Colton (Bay Area Sea Kayakers (BASK)), Lee Huo (Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)), Lyle Johnson (kiteboarder), Hugo Larman (resident), Jim McGrath (San Francisco Board Sailing Association (SFBSA)), Susan Moffat (resident), Andrew Sullivan (resident), Sally Tobin (BASK), Kirk Van Moon (resident), Penny Wells (BASK), and Barbara Williamson (BASK).

Andrea Gaffney, BCDC Bay Design Analyst, reviewed the safety protocols, meeting protocols, and meeting agenda.

2. **Report of Chief of Permits.** Jaime Michaels, the BCDC Chief of Permits, presented her report:

a. The Engineering Criteria Review Board (ECRB) met on May 24th to review seismic criteria for the ECRB Terminal One Project. The project will be presented to the Board later this year.

[info@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:info@bcdc.ca.gov) | [www.bcdc.ca.gov](http://www.bcdc.ca.gov)  
State of California | Edmund G. Brown, Jr. — Governor



**DRB MINUTES**  
**June 5, 2017**

b. The city of San Leandro significantly revised their residential and commercial development proposal at the old municipal marina, based on Board comments and suggestions. The revised project will be presented to the Board later this year.

c. The California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) briefed staff last Thursday about a conceptual proposal to retain four or five of the old Bay Bridge piers to be reused for public access. The proposal will be presented to the Board at a future date.

### 3. **Approval of Draft Minutes for May 8, 2017.**

**MOTION:** Ms. McCann moved approval of the Minutes for the May 8, 2017, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as presented, seconded by Mr. Leader.

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 4-0-0 with Board Chair Alschuler and Board Members Leader, Leventhal, and McCann voting approval with no abstentions.

4. **Albany Beach Restoration and Public Access Project, Cities of Albany and Berkeley, Alameda County (Second Review).** The Board held their second review of a proposal by the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) to redevelop the EBRPD's Albany Beach Park and incorporate it into the McLaughlin Eastshore State Park in two concurrent phases. The proposed project would include parking, beach overlooks, beach enhancement, a fenced area around the enhanced dunes, rain garden, and seasonal wetland, a vault toilet, and a San Francisco Bay Trail extension. Public access improvements include a vehicular entrance, a 20-vehicle parking area, two beach access points from the Bay Trail, and other public amenities.

The revised project presented at this meeting adds a gate at the entrance to the driveway and parking lot so that the parking area may be closed to vehicular access during crowd-gathering and staging during events, moves the parking and turnaround further north to allow for additional public open space in the southern beach section, changes the bicycle racks to the inverted-U rack system, increases the pathway turning radius at Buchanan Street to a 40-foot radius to allow easier use by oversized bicycles, increases the launching space and removes some of the access control railing for improved kitesurfer launching, revises the planting palette, and includes three access gates in the access control fencing to allow access for maintenance, outdoor education classes, and scientific research.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Hanna Miller, the BCDC Coastal Program Analyst, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the location, context, property ownership, and existing conditions of the proposed project. She summarized the changes made to the design since incorporating the Board's comments from the April 17, 2017, meeting, which were included in the staff report.

Ms. Miller made a correction to the existing conditions on page 2 of the staff report included in the meeting packet that state “the public enters the beach area via an unpaved trail at the terminus of Buchanan Street and through the dunes.” She noted that the area is currently paved and additionally the public has access to the dunes through the existing Golden Gate Fields parking lot. She also presented a snapshot of activities observed along Albany Beach and the shoreline at the Golden Gate Fields property from Sunday May 21st.

b. **Project Presentation.** Chris Barton, the Environmental Programs Manager at EBRPD, introduced the members of his team. He provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the planning, early project development, and the public access project design process to date for the proposed project.

Patrick Miller, Owner of 2M Associates, the landscape architect for the project, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the revisions made to the design based on Board guidance, coordination with Albany residents, and responses to issues in the April 17th Staff Report.

Bob Nesbit, Assistant General Manager at EBRPD, made closing remarks and summarized the project presentation. He thanked the Board and the public for improving the design through their comments and suggestions. He highlighted three points:

(1) The design is locked into the current project description based on the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

(2) The settlement agreement included the conditional granting of an easement for the trail segment between Gilman Street to the beach area by Golden Gate Fields to the EBRPD.

(3) The design description is the result of a seven-year public process period before pursuing the EIR and settlement agreement.

Mr. Nesbit stated the proponents continue to engage members of the public for their input. He stated certain members of the kitesurfer community made comments on how to further improve the design for kitesurfers. He suggested that the Board approve<sup>1</sup> the revised design as presented, but stated the proponents would be willing to agree to make the kitesurfers’ suggested changes, if the Board agrees to them.

c. **Board Questions.** Following the presentation, the Board asked a series of questions:

Ms. McCann asked about the trail sections denoted in white as interim sections. Mr. Barton stated many of those sections of trail are relocatable, which allows flexibility to realign them in the future, required in the settlement agreement with Gold Gate Fields.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Design Review Board (DRB) neither approves nor rejects projects on behalf of the Commission. The DRB advises the commission on the adequacy of the proposed public access as it relates to the Commission’s guidelines, policies, and regulations.

Ms. Alschuler stated the presentation indicated that those areas were prone to flooding. Mr. Barton stated the northern parking lot, denoted by the blue area in the slides, currently does not drain well and will be underwater with sea level rise. The strategy is to adapt over time.

Mr. Leventhal asked if the intent of the access control fence is to block sand. Mr. Barton stated the access control fence will surround the dunes, rain garden, and existing wetlands, both to keep people and dogs out and to be part of the sand control system. Slats within the chain link matrix have been proposed to help control the sand until vegetation is established to help stabilize the dunes.

Mr. Leader asked what prevents the parking from being moved further north. Mr. Barton stated reasons include grade, drainage, and proximity of accessible parking to the beach entrance.

Mr. Leader asked if the twenty-foot drive aisle space is wide enough for vehicles to back out of the parking spaces. Mr. Barton stated this distance meets all of the requirements.

Mr. Leader asked about the open use area. Mr. Barton stated the area is a shared-use recreation site that can be used for any purpose from kitesurfing to picnicking. The proposed surface material is native grasses.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the 120-foot circle diagram for kitesurfing. Mr. Barton stated kitesurfers require at least a 115-foot radius for safety.

Ms. Alschuler asked if parking spaces with longer time limits will be provided for kayak users. Mr. Barton stated there will be five time-limited spaces, three accessible spaces, and twelve to fifteen unlimited spaces. The turnaround can also be used for loading.

Ms. Alschuler asked about beach mats. Mr. Barton stated a beach mat is a long-lasting wooden track that can be rolled out on sand to provide a flat, stable boardwalk and would be provided at the beach overlooks, extending to the water.

d. **Public Hearing.** Ms. Alschuler stated the Board has reviewed copies of public comment letters, which were included in the meeting packet.

Jim McGrath, representing the San Francisco Board Sailing Association (SFBSA), stated his comments were included in a letter sent to the Commission. He stated the importance of Policy 3A6 that protects special aspects of recreational resources such as the wind and sand and the ability to rig equipment; the two designs do that. He stated most of the SFBSA members are satisfied with the big picture but would suggest multipurpose areas, workable parking spaces, on-site storage, and a vendor for non-motorized boating. The SFBSA supports the design with these suggestions included.

Kirk Van Moon, Oakland resident, stated there are few areas on the East Bay with safe launches for kitesurfing. He stated the open meadow area is a good solution.

Ben Botkin, the Planner for the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail (Water Trail), spoke in support of the proposal. He summarized the Water Trail's designation process and stated Albany Beach joined the Water Trail as of last Friday. He stated all sites are designated conditionally and he was pleased that Albany Beach was designated with concerns for kitesurfing.

Andrew Sullivan, Albany resident, stated he favored the design to the right (with the Bay Trail aligned westerly, closer to the beach.) He stated there is a benefit to locating the trail on the opposite (western) side, as it is in that design, because the sandwall acts as a barrier to the open meadow space for safer launching. Vegetation is a key component - level space with short grass or sand is required for safe launching. Kites cannot launch in high-grass areas because their lines can become entangled in the grass.

Sally Tobin, a member of the Bay Area Sea Kayakers (BASK), pointed out on the presentation slides where kayakers park on the Golden Gate Fields property. She stated the concern about unloading kayaks onto a cart while in the turnaround space, pulling the cart over the Bay Trail, not being able to cross the sandwall to access the beach, and pulling 14- to 20-foot kayaks through the public area to access the beach.

Penny Wells, a member of BASK, stated if the design works for kiteboarders, it will work for sea kayakers. There will be no conflict of use because kiteboarding only works with wind and kayaking works better without it. She stated the loading area in the turnaround is not sufficient because kayakers most often kayak in groups of eight to ten. She suggested increasing the parking time limit to six hours, having more parking where the 20 parking spaces are, and including 30-minute parking spaces for unloading.

Tom Colton, a member of BASK, agreed with the last few speakers. He stated the concern that kayakers will be unable to use the parking area due to its popularity but will continue to use the Golden Gate Fields existing lots to the east and south, if allowed. He stated it would be helpful to maintain access from the Golden Gate Fields parking areas for kayakers to pull their kayaks through the area on carts.

Barbara Williamson, an Albany resident and member of BASK, stated BASK has approximately 750 active members. Albany Beach provides a protected, central location for all levels of kayakers.

Jeff Bond, Community Development Director for the city of Albany, stated the meeting packet contains a resolution approved by the city council encouraging the EBRPD and the BCDC to consider relocating the parking to the Buchanan Street right-of-way. He stated the city will work to implement it if the project goes that way.

Susan Moffat, an Albany resident, stated residents appreciate the adaptation efforts that have been made but there are still basic issues that can be addressed through workshops. She suggested allowing the space next to the beach to revert back to beach. She presented a slide presentation of an alternative plan that will provide that opportunity. She suggested adding kayak storage to the design.

Hugo Larman, an Albany resident and landscape architect, suggested that the proponents consider using city of Albany land, which the city is willing to donate. He stated a special expansive beach is a better use of the land than parking, if access needs can be solved. The best way to showcase the beautiful views is to open it up. He stated, since there is no irrigation water on site, the green areas will not remain green. Sand is a more practical, usable surface.

Robert Cheasty, the Executive Director of the Citizens for East Shore Parks (CESP), spoke in favor of the proposed plan and the alternative community plan. He stated small craft users have been waiting for improvements at this site for years.

Lyle Johnson, kiteboarder, spoke in support of both designs.

Lee Huo, the Bay Trail Planner at the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), stated the challenge of balancing the use of the space for the greatest good. He spoke in support of the general design. He urged the proponents to consider anticipating potential conflicts between the different types of users, such as Bay Trail and Water Trail users, and trying to minimize that to ensure public safety.

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

(1) Would the Albany Beach Park and Bay Trail maintain the current uses, encourage more diverse activities, and create a “sense of place” which is unique and enjoyable?

Ms. McCann stated the flexible open use area contributes to a sense of place, depending on the type of surface treatment. She suggested grass lawn, if it can be irrigated, or sand rather than native grasses.

Mr. Leader agreed with the plan to use less asphalt and to retain enough parking and access for kayakers and kitesurfers. He stated that he would like to see the parking move further north and that the proposed parking spaces will be needed for short-term loading/unloading use in this popular area. He stated taking the city of Albany up on their offer and putting the longer-term parking to the north would be of greater use in the future. He suggested following the alternative plan that the kitesurfers prefer. He suggested elevating the open-use trail by two to three feet as a way to eliminate conflicts with individuals on the bike trail. He stated that he was worried about what the open-use area would become if there is no irrigation.

Ms. Alschuler stated having the entrance at the north end will cause congestion problems at the single beach access point for various types of users. It would be better to have separation once individuals arrive at the site. Extra access is required at least for a drop-off area and some parking. She suggested marking locations for kayaks to cross to increase safety and to eliminate confusion.

Ms. McCann stated the roundabout is a logical place to unload kayaks. She suggested a zone of striping across the trail as a safety measure. She pointed to a potential open up an area for kayak crossing.

(2) Are the proposed public amenities at the total project site appropriate for the area and would they be distributed and designed to meet and balance the needs of the public and natural resources at the beach area and in the water? Given this beach is a planned Water Trail site, are there additional public amenities that would enhance the site?

The Board members agreed that the current iteration of the plan is more balanced with the addition of more active areas.

(3) The sandwall will help keep sand off the trail, but also limits access to the beach. Would the public benefit from the addition of a step on the bayward side of the sandwall to facilitate movement from the turnaround and green open space area to the beach?

Mr. Leventhal stated the design should be based on wind direction. The wind in this area is from the west and south and will blow sand over the road and trail. He used Chrissy Field as an example. He stated his concern about the movement of the sand. Fences capture sand; the sand builds up into sand ramps that individuals and animals will walk over. The permeable access fence around the dune will require more maintenance until dune vegetation grows in. He suggested expanding the vegetative dunes to spread out the sand and relying less on linear barriers.

(4) Are the dimensions and paving materials of the Bay Trail path adequate and appropriate for public use and enjoyment? In particular, are the compacted gravel shoulders an appropriate material?

The Board members agreed that the compacted gravel shoulders are reasonable.

(5) There are several areas that are currently accessible from adjacent properties in which access may be limited by the proposed design of the Bay Trail. These areas include the fishing peninsulas and smaller pocket beaches, the existing overlook at Fleming Point North Vista, and general waterfront access from Golden Gate Fields. What or where are the appropriate/adequate connections to adjacent uses along the Bay Trail?

Board members were interested in facilitating crossing from the road and trail over to the beach, preferably gathered near the overlook, to incorporate kayak and disability access areas.

Ms. Gaffney stated Golden Gate Fields has requested maintenance access points along the trail.

Ms. Alschuler stated the comments heard today indicate that there may not be enough access and do not.

Ms. McCann stated all users should have access so if some type of access needs to be created to navigate a slope to prevent users from being precluded, it should be provided as part of the plan.

(6) Is the proposed parking at the Albany Beach Park adequate to support anticipated visitors and appropriately located?

This question was addressed in Sections 4(c) and 4(d), above.

(7) The proposed design limits access to the expanded dunes and wetland/rain garden area. Given that this is a designated Park Priority Use Area, does the proposed design include the appropriate mix of open and closed areas?

Ms. Alschuler stated there is a question about monitoring and maintenance, how long the fence will remain, and whether it will have slats.

Mr. Leventhal stated the concern about the sand buildup and ramping, as he discussed above.

(8) Are the plantings appropriate for the beach and dunes and along the trail in light of their intended uses as dune enhancement, wetland planting, and sand buffer along the trail?

Mr. Leventhal suggested the use of creeping wild rye. He asked for cross-sections all the way through to get a sense of the elevation changes of the dunes.

Mr. Leader stated the concern about the lack of irrigation.

(9) Would the public benefit from an accessible beach mat at the overlook on the beach? Should the beach mat at the northern spur trail extend to the water?

Ms. Alschuler highly recommended having the two beach mats as presented today.

(10) Given the existing beach will likely be inundated by projected sea levels at mid-century, the expanded beach on the acquired parcel adjacent to the existing beach serves as a resilient adaptation for maintaining beach and water access. Is the acquired parcel adjacent to the beach being maximized for recreational use in consideration of rising sea levels?

Mr. Leader stated it is enough for the future.

Ms. Alschuler stated the open-use area can be resilient for a longer period of time.



(11) Interim Bay Trail sections will be flooded before the permanent trail sections, disconnecting the trail in sections. Is the proposed San Francisco Bay Trail appropriately designed to be resilient through mid-century to future sea level rise and flooding?

Ms. McCann stated the need for an adaptation for interim Bay Trail section flooding. The trail will have to be raised in the current location or moved to another location.

Ms. Gaffney stated sections 2, 3, and 8 are not resilient and are not being adapted in the same way because of the settlement agreement for them to be relocated. She asked if Board members agreed.

Ms. Alschuler stated it would have to come with a commitment to maintain the Bay Trail and to have it in an appropriate location for visual and physical access.

Ms. McCann stated she would expect a functional Bay Trail adapted to sea level rise would be part of this agreement, even if it is relocated.

(12) Is the Bay Trail appropriately designed to allow for drainage and stormwater management at adjacent areas, which presently drain to the Bay, or would the proposed design amplify potential flooding issues that could cause maintenance problems for the public access areas?

Mr. Leventhal stated the problem is solved by the rain garden at the northern end but this question cannot be answered because the southern end is not yet defined.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the Board had recommendations on the two design options to address kitesurfing needs.

Mr. Leventhal stated he preferred the design on the right -- the more westerly alignment of the trail.

Mr. Leader agreed since that is the design preferred by kitesurfer experts. He asked about the large green area's elevation and if it will really be green, since it is a prominent feature of the project.

Ms. Alschuler stated the green area should be a multiuse area with materials that support that, including moving of the kiteboard materials. She stated the Bay Trail needs to be well-signed or marked at crossings near the drop-off areas.

Mr. Leader asked if there would be an advantage to elevating the green area over the trail.

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Nesbit responded positively to the Board's suggestions about timed parking, kayakers' turnaround loading, sand drift maintenance, access further south, irrigation, and relocatable trail sections and stated the design team will take the Board's comments into consideration and will improve the preferred righthand design, such as working with the city of Albany on parking and maintenance. He noted that this project was never intended to be a manicured city-style park, will not be irrigated, and will not always be green.

Mr. Leventhal stated concern about planting anything if there will be no irrigation at least until establishment. Mr. Barton stated the community consensus was a wild feeling at the Albany waterfront. The planting areas are in a coastal climate where native plants do well without irrigation once established. He stated crews will bring water tanks during establishment and there will be control access points to discourage individuals from trampling.

Mr. Leventhal asked about the planting of the open area. Mr. Barton stated it will be planted in native grasses and forbs that can be mowed.

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

- (1) The revised design greatly improves the balance of the public and natural resources and sense of place.
- (2) Use a thicker sand barrier for the fences, sandwall, and beach design, in general.
- (3) Include park district maintenance and monitoring of fences that will change over time
- (4) Pay attention to planting in the windrow.
- (5) The gravel shoulders were adequate.
- (6) Assure access for fishing and small beaches.
- (7) Plan for short-term loading and access area parking that works for kayakers.
- (8) Partner with the city of Albany to increase the parking spaces.
- (9) Make the most of the beach.
- (10) A natural multipurpose open area is a good direction. This area might end up as beach and that is ok.
- (11) Assure that the beach mats are accessible.
- (12) Incorporate wild rye in the plant palette.
- (13) Provide irrigation during the landscape establishment period.
- (14) Commit to maintaining a functional Bay Trail long-term.

**5. Hercules Development Block N, Waterfront District, City of Hercules, Contra Costa County (First Review).** The Board reviewed a proposal by Hercules Development Partners to construct a mixed-use residential and commercial project bordered by Refugio Creek, John Muir Parkway, and Bayfront Boulevard. The proposed project would include approximately 170 residences and 6,673 square feet of commercial space. Public access improvements include approximately 12,000 square feet of shared public access adjacent to the Refugio Creekside Trail, including seating, interpretive signage, and other amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Jhon Arbelaez-Novak, the BCDC Coastal Program Analyst, provided an overview of the location, context, and existing conditions of the proposed project. He summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the proposed mixed-use project will provide adequate, usable, and attractive public space; whether the project will provide adequate and appropriate physical and visual connections to and along the shoreline for the public; and whether the proposed shoreline public pathway and other public features will be viable in the event of future sea level rise or flooding.

b. **Project Presentation.** Hercules Speakers: John Gibbs, ASLA LEED AP, the Principal Landscape Architect at Wallace, Roberts, and Todd (WRT), introduced the members of his team.

David Biggs, the City Manager at the city of Hercules, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the city context and support and public realm design of the Hercules Bayfront Creekside Apartments. He stated the Bayfront will be a transit-oriented community with a transportation center that will link ferry, train, and bus transit services plus pedestrian and bicycle connections. When this is accomplished, it will be the first place this occurs on the West Coast of the United States.

James Anderson, Manager, Hercules Bayfront, LLC, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the project background, public access features, and view corridors of the project. He stated the architecture is intended to be traditional and complement the historic waterfront buildings.

Michael Vidra, the Project Engineer at BKF Engineers, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the sea level rise issues, current FEMA map data, base flood elevation, and adaptation measures of the proposed project.

c. **Board Questions.** Following the presentation, the Board asked a series of questions:

Mr. Leader asked how wide the lower trail is. Mr. Anderson stated the existing trail is 10 feet of asphalt with 2-foot gravel path shoulders for a total of 14 feet.

Ms. McCann asked how the width was determined. Mr. Anderson stated the existing creek trail was built at 14 feet, which is a standard Class I trail.

Mr. Leader asked about parking. Mr. Anderson stated there is no shoreline parking but parking is available along the street.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the configuration of the buildings was designed in consultation with BCDC staff. Mr. Anderson stated the shape of the building was determined ten years ago when the BCDC did not have jurisdiction. Since then, there have been several meetings to incorporate the shoreline band into the development.

d. **Public Hearing.** No members of the public addressed the Board.

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

(1) Would the proposed mixed-use project provide adequate, usable, and attractive public space for the public's use and enjoyment of the creekside (shoreline)?

Mr. Leventhal suggested moving the private spaces around or extending the public space through the middle area (near the trellis.)

Ms. McCann agreed that the eastern side is impressive. She stated having range of character and urban transitions along the trail and promoting public access and visual enjoyment is appropriate. She stated concern that there may be a perception that the upper trail is private because of the intentional landscape design. She asked if there is flexibility in the placement of the gate at the trellis area to gain more public access. She suggested paying attention to the detailing along the trail so the full potential of the trail is realized in addition to the great urban benefits being provided.

Mr. Leader asked if the distance along the red line (delineating the public access) is fixed and if the middle area with the trellis is restricted only to the front steps. Mr. Anderson stated the red line is based on balance of private amenities and visual access.

Ms. Alschuler suggested opening up the west end with minor adjustments to the building to welcome people coming in from the transit center. She stated having two levels is a wonderful idea, but the upper path is too narrow and invites looking into building windows.

A Board member asked if the existing path is too low. Mr. Anderson stated there is currently no funding to elevate the path. Creek changes due to straightening and railroad bridge construction might change future FEMA maps to address those concerns and extend the life of the existing path.

Ms. Alschuler suggested more public-inviting amenities at the ground level of the development.

Ms. McCann stated the access to the lower trail will be clear coming across the bridge; the character is more unclear in the plaza area.

Mr. Leader stated the higher area will tend to wall people out and does not feel public. He suggested reducing the difference in height. The proponents stated the accessible pathway for the units is required at that grade.

Ms. Alschuler stated the need to have a sense of welcome along the edge of the project at both the creek and upper levels since this design does not work to have a path through the center of the development. She stated the five-foot elevated walkway is narrow.

Ms. McCann suggested incorporating lighting for individuals to stroll along the lower path in the evening. Mr. Anderson stated lights are mounted on the buildings and some staircases but none are on the current path.

Mr. Leader stated the stairways wall people out. He suggested including intermediate landings on the stairways.

Ms. Alschuler suggested that the fence is too close to the property line.

(2) Would the proposed project provide adequate and appropriate physical and visual connections to and along the shoreline for the public?

The Board did not address this question.

(3) Would the proposed shoreline public pathway and other public features be viable in the event of future sea level rise or flooding?

Ms. Alschuler stated the change in the dogleg of the creek will be essential to protect that area and extend its use.

f. **Applicant Response.** The proponents responded positively to the Board's suggestions throughout the Board Discussion sections, above.

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

(1) All Board suggestions were in favor of increasing the sense of welcome along the edges in the public areas such as moving a fence, reshaping a building, adding a use, ensuring that the full potential of the trail is realized, and having an overall adaptation plan for the future.

(2) The five-foot path is too narrow.

(3) Incorporate lights along the path between the stairs.

(4) Incorporate landings on the staircases.

(5) Verify the elevation number for the site.

(6) Push the fence in the trellis plaza area back.

The Board stated they do not need to see this plan again, if their suggested changes are made.

6. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:45 p.m.