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

February 23, 2018

TO: Design Review Board Members

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

SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of the February 5, 2018, 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 approximately 5:30 p.m., and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Other Board members in attendance included Board Vice Chair Gary Strang and Board Members Tom Leader and Stefan Pellegrini. BCDC staff in attendance included Brad McCrea, Andrea Gaffney, Ethan Lavine, and Rebecca Coates-Maldoon. The presenters were Stefan Galvez (California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)), Blake Sanborn (AECOM), Brian Maroney (Caltrans), Robert Beck (Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA)), and Bob Nesbitt (East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD)). Public comment was submitted by Sarah Kuehl (Einwillerkuehl, Inc.).

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

2. **Report of Chief of Permits.** No report was made at this meeting.

3. **Public Access Piers at Retained Foundations of the Former San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span (First Pre-application Review).** The Board reviewed a proposal by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to construct two public access piers — at Yerba Buena Island (YBI) in the city and county of San Francisco and the former Oakland Army Base in the city of Oakland, Alameda County — atop foundations of the former San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge east span. The public access piers would retain foundation structures that are currently required to be removed from the Bay.

The proposed Yerba Buena Island project would include a public access pier with a pedestrian bridge and observation deck, improved Army Road and shared access path, plaza and pier landing area, public shoreline parking, fencing, and shoreline protection. Public access improvements include power outlets for events, a communal table with moveable seating, binoculars, interpretive signage, and other public amenities.

The proposed former Oakland Army Base project would include a public access pier and a sloped walkway approach at Gateway Park. Public access improvements include picnic areas, seating, interpretive elements, a fitness element, an activity zone, public art, and other public amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Rebecca Coates-Maldoon, Coastal Program Analyst, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the location, context, and existing conditions at the Yerba Buena Island and former Oakland Army Base proposed project sites, and summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including the following:

(1) **Yerba Buena Island E2 Proposed Project Site**

(a) Whether the Pier E2 observation area and associated public amenities encourage diverse activities and create a "sense of place" that is unique and enjoyable.

(b) Whether the proposed project provides ample, diverse, and accessible opportunities for water-oriented public use, including picnicking, swimming, non-motorized boating, hiking, windsurfing, and fishing.

(c) Whether the proposed public amenities at the project sites are appropriate and whether they are distributed and designed to meet and balance the needs of the public and natural resources.

(d) Whether the proposed public amenities are designed appropriately for the microclimate of the site, considering wind, shading, and noise.

(e) Whether the design at the YBI site allows adequately for the future programming of the Torpedo Building.

(f) Whether the design of the parking lot, public path, and landing area at the YBI site creates an appropriate sense of arrival to the Pier E2 observation area.

(g) Whether the proposed rock retaining walls at the YBI site are designed appropriately for the public access use of the site.

(h) Whether the connections between the various public areas are designed appropriately, including the proposed access gates.

(i) Whether the proposed roads and public sidewalks are designed to appropriately and clearly connect to the nearest public thoroughfare and Bay Trail connecting pathways.

(j) Whether the proposed public areas, paths, road, and landscape features (including the proposed fence) are designed to maximize views to and along the shoreline.

(k) Whether the public areas and amenities are appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise.

(2) **Former Oakland Army Base E21-E23 Proposed Project Site**

(a) Whether the proposed public pier at Piers E21-E23 and associated public amenities encourage diverse activities and create a "sense of place" at the Oakland site, which would be unique and enjoyable.

(b) Whether the proposed project provides ample, diverse, and accessible opportunities for water-oriented public use, including picnicking, swimming, non-motorized boating, hiking, windsurfing, and fishing opportunities.

(c) Whether the proposed public amenities are designed appropriately for the microclimate of the site, considering wind, shading, and noise.

(d) Whether the design at the Oakland site allows for appropriate integration and connections with the future Gateway Park.

(e) Whether the connections between the various public areas are designed appropriately, including the proposed access gates and picnic berms.

(f) Whether the proposed roads and public sidewalks are designed to appropriately and clearly connect to the nearest public thoroughfare and Bay Trail connecting pathways.

(g) Whether the proposed public areas, paths, road, and landscape features are designed to maximize views to and along the shoreline.

(h) Whether the public areas and amenities are appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise.

b. **Project Presentation.** Yerba Buena Island E2 Proposed Project Site. Stefan Galvez, Environmental Manager, Caltrans, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the background and next steps of the proposed project. By direction of the chair, Mr. Galvez pointed out the changes made since the November 6, 2017, briefing. He stated the retention of Piers E2, E19, E20, E22, and E23 was still being studied in November. It has since been determined that Piers E2, E21, E22, and E23 will be retained and Piers E19 and E20 will be removed.

Blake Sanborn, Lead Landscape Architect, AECOM, continued the slide presentation and discussed key stakeholders, context and history, site plan, existing conditions, proposed features, and access options. He stated the EBRPD will ultimately operate the former Oakland Army Base side and Treasure Island Community Development will ultimately operate the YBI side. Salvaged Bay Bridge steel will be repurposed for guardrails and site furnishings for both sides of the project.

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

(1) **Yerba Buena Island E2 Proposed Project Site**

Mr. Pellegrini asked for clarification of the treatment on the pedestrian bridge that connects the existing pier to the landing. Mr. Sanborn stated it is the same unit paver that is on that portion of the observation deck.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the platform that spans that distance is concrete. Mr. Sanborn pointed to locations on a presentation slide and stated the material that is indicated to be Number 1 is the unit paver. It extends from a portion of the pier across the bridge, and occupies the landing and the sloped walkway. At that point, it becomes standard concrete.

Mr. Strang asked if the NaturalPAVE is also concrete. Mr. Sanborn stated it is stabilized decomposed granite (D.G.), which is the hardest version of it.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the initial discussions about the adaptive reuse of the historic Torpedo Building. Mr. Sanborn stated discussions are ongoing at this early phase of the project. Conduit for future sewer lines are included in the project design to allow the building to be repurposed without ripping up portions of the project.

Ms. Alschuler asked if a representative from TIDA was present who could share the future programming possibilities for the Torpedo Building that are currently under discussion. Robert Beck, Director, TIDA, stated it is too early to identify programming. The site is subject to Tidelands Trust, and any development would be subject to approval from Caltrans since it is underneath the Bay Bridge structure. Mr. Beck stated the preliminary thought is that there will be some sort of public amenity, such as a dining establishment, that would be complementary to programs occurring on the pier.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the square footage of the Torpedo Building. Mr. Beck stated it is approximately 11,500 square feet.

Mr. Strang asked about the height of the platform at the Torpedo Building and sea level rise. Mr. Beck referred to a presentation slide and stated the existing grade is approximately 10 feet NAVD88. Future sea level rise adaptations will be required for the Torpedo Building going forward. Studies will be done later this year on the historical structure to help determine what can be done in the future. One of the challenges is the lack of land around the site.

Mr. Strang asked about the water level relative to the platform. Mr. Sanborn pointed out features on Presentation Slide 16 and stated the pier is at 17.8 feet, the platform is at 17.6 feet, the stairs and landing bring it down to 12.6 feet, and then there is a gradual slope to 10 feet NAVD88, which meets the existing grade. Ms. Gaffney pointed out that the grey area on the slide signifies the proposed fill while the black area is the existing grade.

Mr. Strang asked about the origin of the fill. Mr. Sanborn stated it will be clean, imported fill.

Ms. Alschuler asked if that fill will be used for the road, parking area, and curve. Mr. Sanborn stated it will be used for those locations and will meet the existing grade. He pointed out where the fill and existing grade will meet on a presentation slide. He pointed to the section that will be built up.

Mr. Leader stated it looks like the floor of the Torpedo Building is low for future sea level rise. He asked if that will create a problem for future programming. Mr. Beck stated there appear to be two options – raising the finish floor elevation or providing a sea wall for perimeter protection of the building side from storm surge. These options will require further study. He stated part of the development of Treasure Island is the creation of a community facilities district (CFD), which will help in the adaption of sea level rise changes over the next 100 years. The intent of the CFD is to generate a reserve of $250,000 for future sea level rise adaptations at Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands.

Ms. Gaffney stated the designers chose the highest potential sea level rise projections and chose to clear the bottom of the structure with that elevation, which is why the pier plaza is high.

Mr. Strang asked about the number of bicycle parking spaces proposed. Mr. Sanborn stated there are approximately twelve. He pointed to bicycle parking areas on the presentation slides.

Mr. Strang asked what the security fence is meant to separate visitors from. Mr. Sanborn stated this zone used to be occupied for military purposes and, as a result, testing is ongoing in terms of what is underneath the project site. There is concern about public access to that potential material. There is also sensitivity about access to the water at this location since the Coast Guard is immediately adjacent to the site.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the height of the security fencing that is depicted as a dotted line on the presentation slides. Mr. Sanborn stated discussions between the project proponents and the Coast Guard are ongoing about appropriate fencing options. The fence around the existing Coast Guard facility is approximately eight feet tall with a barbed wire reel on the top, which is not preferred at the project site for appearance and view reasons.

Ms. Alschuler stated one of the staff questions for this site is if the rock retaining walls are designed appropriately for the public access use of the site. She stated the rock walls were not depicted in the presentation slides except for a small section of proposed riprap. Mr. Sanborn stated the rock retaining walls are additional reinforcement from riprap.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the rock retaining wall is above the pathway or below it. Mr. Sanborn stated the wall helps meet sea level rise criteria. The top of the bank needs to be raised in areas of added fill. Riprap will be added at those locations at a 2:1 slope.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the riprap is below the cut-off edge. Mr. Sanborn stated riprap will be added to the existing embankment in areas of added fill.

Ms. Alschuler asked where the rock wall is located. Mr. Sanborn stated the foundation wall of the abutment on the back side of the landing helps support the pedestrian bridge. Riprap will be used to help conceal it for visual appearance.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the appropriateness of fishing from the location. Mr. Sanborn stated piers that are built purposefully for fishing tend to dissuade individuals who visit for other purposes. This pier will be part of the San Francisco Bay Trail and, as such, will support a variety of visitors. Pier 1, on Treasure Island, is substantially larger and may lend itself better for fishing activities.

Mr. Strang asked about water access. Mr. Sanborn stated water access is not proposed as part of this project.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the San Francisco Bay Water Trail comes along the edge of this project and if a place for watercraft to tie off is included in the design. Mr. Sanborn stated it is not anticipated that that would be a big draw. There is sensitivity with the Coast Guard. Water Trail users will be more likely to take advantage of Clipper Cove Beach, which is a more sheltered, protected spot and has proposed water craft access and a vehicle parking area.

Ms. Alschuler asked if individuals could hang their bicycles on the shuttle at the landing location to return uphill. Mr. Beck answered in the affirmative.

Ms. Alschuler asked if there is an area for food service or for food trucks for events. Mr. Sanborn stated there is room for vehicular traffic.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the pump station. Mr. Sanborn stated the pump station will be rebuilt in that location. It is below grade and will be surrounded by retaining walls. A fence will be constructed.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the edge underneath the words “waterfront promenade” on a presentation slide. Mr. Beck pointed out two utility buildings that belong to AT&T. The larger one is no longer in service. The project proponents are in discussion with AT&T about the possibility of demolishing it.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the six-foot concrete sidewalk along Army Road. She asked if it is intended to be a pedestrian path. Mr. Sanborn pointed out the location of the pedestrian path and stated it is 12 feet wide. He stated it is NaturalPAVE and sidewalk.

Ms. Alschuler asked, other than repurposing some of the old Bay Bridge steel, what tells the story of the history of the location. Mr. Sanborn stated the Torpedo Building is listed in the National Register of Historic Places and should not be underestimated. There also will be interpretive exhibits. Also, the view to the new bridge speaks to the timeline of progress.

Mr. Leader asked who determined the program for this project location. Mr. Sanborn stated a number of presentations on the project have been public. The program to date was designed through a process of listening and learning from stakeholders such as TIDA.

Mr. Leader asked about the types of input the public provided. Mr. Galvez stated they have not heard from the public in general. The process has been fully agendized, but mainly the input received was from stakeholders.

Mr. Leader asked what the stakeholders' key points were that they wanted to see in the project. Mr. Sanborn stated they wanted the location to be flexibly programmed to hold various events. Earlier designs included more public amenities on the pier.

Mr. Strang asked if there is any significance to the diagonal paving pattern across the pier. Mr. Sanborn stated the diagonal coincides with the axis toward the new tower of the Bay Bridge.

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

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

(1) Would the proposed design for the Pier E2 observation area and associated public amenities encourage diverse activities and create a "sense of place" at the YBI site that would be unique and enjoyable? Does the proposed design adhere to the world-class open space and park network designed for Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island?

(2) Does the proposed project provide ample, diverse, and accessible opportunities for water-oriented public use, including picnicking, swimming, non-motorized boating, hiking, windsurfing, and fishing?

(a) Would the public benefit from water access at the Pier E2 observation area and landing site, such as the provision of a connection point for kayakers from the Clipper Cove Beach and Treasure Island Marina areas and Water Trail sites?

(b) Would the public benefit from fishing amenities at this site?

Mr. Pellegrini agreed that there are other places in close proximity that are more appropriate to water access and fishing and that the location is targeted for a range of public activities.

(3) Are the proposed public amenities at the project sites appropriate and would they be distributed and designed to meet and balance the needs of the public and natural resources?

Mr. Strang stated it would amplify the sense of place if there was a strong relationship to what was happening in the Torpedo Building. Historically, there was a lot of steel involved with the site; he suggested increasing the use of steel, having something that is quite bold, and including some of this at the scale of the bridge pier.

(a) Is the proposed communal table an appropriate amenity for the use and enjoyment of the Pier E2 observation area? Is it of an appropriate size and scale?

Mr. Pellegrini stated he liked the heartiness of the design but wondered what that means for a communal table. Having things that are not fixed might allow people to wander away with loose pieces or the loose pieces may find their way off the pier; he asked how that would best be managed. He stated he liked the idea of a central area that can be used for teaching, eating, and meeting individuals, but was skeptical of free, loose pieces.

Mr. Strang asked if there is a way to think about the floor of the communal table as a bigger, more primary form to really notice the bridge and know to go there. He stated this site will be popular with bikers. It is important to attract people there, and to know it is there and that it is a place of importance that has been marked through something bold and emphatic. The current design of the pier makes a delicate reference to what was there, but lacks the connection to the primary, massive scale and engineering aspect of it.

Ms. Alschuler stated maybe it is something that is visible that carries through on the path that is done with steel or related to the Torpedo Building that announces itself elsewhere.

Mr. Strang stated the flexibility of the platform and large scale of the communal table is good. He stated some Board members reacted positively to something large and bold of the scale of the bridge that speaks to the sky and huge structures around it at the November presentation. He stated concern about the residential scale in the amphitheater area that seems out of place. He suggested keeping it tough, bold, and durable.

Ms. Alschuler stated the design should be not only bold and durable but thought-through for families with children. Families must somehow gather around that big piece of steel.

(b) Would the public benefit from other public amenities at the YBI site, such as a restroom or drinking fountain, given the location of the site?

Mr. Pellegrini stated the YBI end of the project being more rural (remote) seems appropriate in terms of the decisions not to include higher-maintenance facilities such as restrooms or water concessions in this location. It feels appropriate because it will be close to urban inroads in the future.

Mr. Strang stated a restroom is required for bicyclists who come to the location to spend time and eat lunch, even if it is a portable toilet. He suggested setting up the basic infrastructure for visits and worrying about the secondary elements as the site is road-tested to see how it is used.

(c) Would the design minimize impacts of the proposed public access on wildlife and sensitive habitats, including the riprap proposed for the beach and shoreline area?

(4) Are the proposed public amenities designed appropriately for the microclimate of the site, considering wind, shading, and noise? Are the sites designed appropriately for nighttime safety and visibility?

Mr. Pellegrini stated his concern about maintenance considering the ruggedness of the site, and the potential for what it might be like in the middle of the night.

Ms. Alschuler stated the facility is well-protected and the relationship to the Torpedo Building is important. There will be shade moving across the site from the bridge but it is nice to have a tree.

Mr. Strang stated the planting is contained. There is a tree and there are plantings in wood boxes. He suggested that the planting be in the ground. The planting should focus more on restoration than on ornamental planting.

Mr. Strang added to his comments on fundamentals. He suggested a way to walk to the water easily. It is a natural draw to scramble down the riprap. If it is not provided, individuals will do that anyway.

(5) Does the design at the YBI site allow adequately for the future programming of the Torpedo Building?

Mr. Pellegrini stated something that caused concern in the interim is that opening up public access to this point will invariably open up public access to the Torpedo Building, which feels a little sensitive in terms of controlling access to this area or what happens if that becomes a public target for vandalism or other things. He asked if there is a way to ensure the historic asset can be preserved or not damaged once public access is increased to this portion of the island.

Mr. Leader stated he is concerned about who will visit the location and why. He stated it is unfortunate that what will happen to the Torpedo Building is unknown. What ultimately is done with it could have a strong relationship to the rest of the programming of the site. It leaves the Board guessing. He stated he wished they could be designed together.

Mr. Leader suggested there is no need to dictate the type of concessionaire, but to have an attitude or idea about it.

Ms. Alschuler agreed and stated it would finish this off beautifully and maybe help raise funds for the Torpedo Building.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Torpedo Building could be brought in now. There is an amphitheater to sit in looking at the Torpedo Building, which could be there for a long time by itself. She suggested putting a scrim in front of it and telling a story about that building and what happened in it or having it work as a backdrop for showing films. It would be great if the site became a destination where schoolchildren would go as a mystery spot. The Torpedo Building is an incredible attraction.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Coast Guard is also a mystery spot. Most people know very little about it and it will now suddenly be visible. She suggested including information about the Coast Guard at the site. It is part of the environment that people will see. She agreed that this location will be popular with bikers.

(6) Does the design of the parking lot, public path, and landing area at the YBI site create an appropriate sense of arrival to the Pier E2 observation area?

Ms. Alschuler stated the route is challenging. It is important to mark the route clearly and make it interesting and exciting. She asked about the stairs. Ms. Gaffney stated there are four stories of stairs.

Mr. Strang stated the bicycle parking is huge because there may be hundreds of bicycles there on weekends, especially if there is a shuttle to get back. The steps and residential-style planters may be too dainty. He suggested more bicycle parking spaces and focusing on basic things to make this place function as a bicycle destination.

Mr. Leader agreed that this site will be a popular bicycle destination.

Mr. Strang stated the flexibility of the platform and large scale of the communal table is good. He stated some Board members reacted positively to something large and bold of the scale of the bridge that speaks to the sky and huge structures around it at the November presentation. He stated concern about the residential scale in the amphitheater area that seems out of place. He suggested keeping it tough, bold, and durable.

Ms. Alschuler stated the design should be not only bold and durable but thought-through for families with children. Families must somehow gather around that big piece of steel.

(7) Are the proposed rock retaining walls at the YBI site designed appropriately for the public access use of the site?

(8) Are the connections between the various public areas designed appropriately, including the proposed access gates?

Ms. Alschuler asked if the gate that can be closed is meant to stop cars from driving on the stabilized D.G., and if it will need to be opened by visitors to the site or if it will remain open. Mr. Sanborn stated pedestrians walk around the locked gate.

Mr. Sanborn stated there is no gate on the shared path at the crossing. He pointed out the location of the locked gate off the vehicular drive on a presentation slide.

Ms. Gaffney asked if bicyclists would have to come up on the sidewalk. Mr. Sanborn stated the most direct route of entry for bicyclists is by the vehicular road.

Ms. Alschuler stated visitors will arrive at the locked gate and think the location is not accessible.

Mr. Leader asked why it must be a locked gate. He suggested removable bollards. Mr. Sanborn stated it was looked into and it was determined that operationally a gate was less work for maintenance crews.

Mr. Leader stated it is a gate that is not connected to a fence.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the security fence runs there, too. Mr. Sanborn stated it is only in the topography section. It starts sloping on the side of the six-foot paved walkway.

Ms. Alschuler asked how far the fence runs. Mr. Sanborn pointed to the location on a presentation slide. It runs as far as the utility buildings.

Ms. Gaffney asked for input on the security fence.

Mr. Strang stated it is fine to have a deterrent there, but the security fence needs to be minimized. He asked about the extent of the risk.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the area will be staffed for safety. Mr. Galvez stated that is not part of the plan at present. The project proponents are working with the Coast Guard, the DTSC, and the Water Board to determine the extent of the contamination and potential cleanup options.

Ms. Alschuler suggested measuring the risk and not just planning for the worst.

Mr. Leader asked if a three-foot fence would be enough of a deterrent. Mr. Galvez stated they are looking into those details right now.

Ms. Alschuler stated the fence should be easily seen through and as low as it can be to still be safe with no barbed wire.

Mr. Strang stated in general it is an industrial site and that is part of the great strong character of it, but some of the proposed furnishings are urban and delicate. He stated the need to find a uniform language to pull it all together for a better design that is easier to maintain. He stated preserving the industrial character is more important than urbanizing it.

Mr. Leader agreed. He stated the operative word is “tough” because that is the nature of this site.

Ms. Alschuler agreed and stated the operative words are “tough,” “bold,” and “durable.”

Mr. Leader suggested creating a program for the Torpedo Building that could feed the programming for the site and suggested a public artist who could work both sides of this project: to work with steel, scale, and recollection on both sides to become a memorable ensemble.

(9) Are the proposed roads and public sidewalks designed to appropriately and clearly connect to the nearest public thoroughfare and Bay Trail connecting pathways? Are parking facilities for all transit modes sufficient for anticipated use of the site?

Ms. Alschuler stated the shuttle will be important.

(10) Are the proposed public areas, paths, road, and landscape features designed to maximize views to and along the shoreline? At YBI, does the proposed cyclone fencing compromise maximum views to and along the shoreline?

Mr. Pellegrini questioned the axial, diagonal break in materials on the pier. He stated he liked the simplicity but it seemed forced given the prominence of the tower. He stated he was not sure something on the ground is necessary to direct views but he was open to how the applicant wants to interpret that.

Ms. Alschuler stated the experience of arrival needs some attention to encourage visitors to look up to see what is happening. Seeing the scale and beauty of the bridge is an incredible, unforgettable lifetime experience.

(11) Are the public areas and amenities appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise?

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Galvez responded positively to the Board's suggestions and stated the design team will take the Board's comments into consideration and will come up with an improved design.

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

(1) Be ready for the groups that will come there.

(2) Make it work for families and children.

(3) Figure out restrooms of some sort.

(4) Increase the bicycle parking, welcome cyclists.

(5) Find an easy way to handle large numbers of visitors.

(6) Make the design Tough, bold, durable.

(7) Put the trees and plants in the ground, less ornamental.

(8) Have a future idea about the use of the Torpedo Building but also bring it into this project using the public arts that are coming to Treasure Island and figure out some way to tell the story of the building and be part of the experience of this place.

(9) Include a concessionaire to provide food for visitors while raising funds for the Torpedo Building.

(10) Design with Hardiness in mind.

(11) Provide a clear strategy for Management of the space.

h. **Project Presentation. Former Oakland Army Base E21-E23 Proposed Project Site.** Blake Sanborn, Lead Landscape Architect, AECOM, and Brian Maroney, Chief Bridge Engineer and Project Manager, CalTrans, continued the slide presentation and discussed pier life, precedent, context, Gateway Park, existing conditions, design proposal, and programming opportunities of the proposed project.

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

j. **Former Oakland Army Base E21-E23 Proposed Project Site.** Ms. Alschuler asked about the changes made since the November meeting. Mr. Maroney pointed to areas on the presentation slides. The staff report states the historic structures would be removed, but the plan is now to salvage them and repurpose them in the future.

Mr. Strang asked for further details on the structure that will be placed on top of the existing piers and if more pilings will be needed. Mr. Maroney stated new piles will be required. The 600-foot pier was broken down into 100-foot spans so it would not visually compete with the new Bay Bridge. It is designed for a larger pedestrian load than normally done across the country. This is the first bridge in California that has been designed for sea level rise.

Mr. Strang asked how deep the concrete beam is. Mr. Maroney stated it is approximately five to six feet deep.

Mr. Strang asked if there were any unusual environmental issues associated with sinking the new piles. Mr. Maroney stated there was nothing new. The largest environmental challenge is the land. The military did not leave the land pristine. There is hazardous material that must be dealt with.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the bridge if sea level rise is higher than 66 inches. Mr. Maroney stated bridges can be raised if necessary.

Mr. Leader asked about the estimated timing for Gateway Park. Bob Nesbitt, Assistant General Manager, EBRPD, stated the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was released last week for a 45-day public review and will continue through the process, with the goal to certify the EIR later this year. That will begin the next phase of raising funding and design. Full park development is still five to seven years out.

Mr. Leader asked about the level of design that has been done on the park to date. Mr. Nesbitt stated the master plan, which is what the EIR was based on, is at an approximately 25 to 30 percent schematic design level.

Mr. Leader stated the master plan envisioned a busy, active pier as a terminal feature. He asked if that is part of this park. Mr. Nesbitt stated it is included in the master plan as it was shown and is anticipated to be 600 feet long. The Bay Trail is included in the plan, which would also intensify and activate the area. It carries underneath the bridge and goes around to the other side to Radio Beach. He stated he did not think that programming and how that would be used had been considered to date.

Mr. Leader asked about the public outreach discussion workshops. Mr. Galvez stated some of the previous comments apply to both sides about the way the program has been presented. Several presentations have been made to stakeholders and public meetings.

Mr. Leader asked about public comments in support of the proposed programs. Mr. Galvez stated there has been interest but a specific public meeting has not yet occurred. Mr. Maroney stated the public comment he mentioned was not about specific activities but was about sharing that they liked the idea of sharing the Bay. He has not heard one negative comment. A comment heard more than once was that individuals are not wealthy enough to go out on the Bay. The Bay is the greatest natural resource in San Francisco but many individuals do not have access to it. Mr. Sanborn stated another opportunity for public engagement and comments is the Bridge Yard Building. The building is nice and does not have to wait the five to seven years for the rest of the park to be created. The building will be used for interpretation and as a forum to take feedback from the community as the project moves along.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the brown square depicts the parking that will be built closer to the Bridge Yard Building on the third or fourth page. It is not labeled. Mr. Sanborn pointed to the parking area on a presentation slide. He stated the project adds onto the existing parking area.

Mr. Strang asked how far the walk would be from the parking area to the pier. Mr. Sanborn stated the distance from the parking area to Pier E23 is .65 miles, and the distance from the Superman Landing to Pier E23 is .26 miles. Mr. Galvez stated the department was required to build a 42-space parking lot as part of the original permit of the Bay Bridge. A much larger parking area, approximately 100 parking spaces or more, is being proposed in coordination with Gateway Park as a way to maximize the use of the area. Gateway Park plans to develop additional parking areas as part of the Gateway Park Project.

Ms. Alschuler asked if fishing will be allowed off this pier. Mr. Sanborn stated the pier is of a significant length that could support fishing activities.

Mr. Strang asked if bicycle parking is included in the plan. Mr. Sanborn pointed to bicycle parking areas on a presentation slide. He stated it is not a large number.

Mr. Strang suggested additional bicycle parking spaces.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the timing on this project. Mr. Sanborn stated construction will begin in June of 2018. Mr. Maroney stated Caltrans is trying to sign a CM/GC contract in March. The engineering and architectural drawings, preorders, and lining up of equipment and material will happen through June at the project proponents' risk. If all permits are received, the hope is to begin field construction in June of 2018 and to complete the structure side of the construction by the end of 2018. There are hard dates for the construction side, but there is a need to be open about the completion of the artistic elements of this project. Mr. Galvez stated, if the project misses the pile-driving window of June through November, it will have to wait for another year.

Ms. Gaffney asked if the proposal is still to close the pier at night with a gate to limit access. Mr. Nesbitt stated that discussion is ongoing along with other conversations about how to maintain and operate the pier, such as if the pier will be designated a fishing pier, if there will be nighttime events on the pier, and how the pier works in the interim five to seven years before the whole park is completed.

k. **Public Hearing.**Ms. Gaffney read a letter submitted by Sarah Kuehl, Einwillerkuehl, Inc., the designer of Gateway Park, which was included in the meeting packet. Ms. Kuehl wrote in support of the project and provided her analysis and recommendations.

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

(1) Would the proposed public pier at Piers E21-E23 and associated public amenities encourage diverse activities and create a "sense of place" at the Oakland site that would be unique and enjoyable? Does the proposed design adhere to the world-class open space and park network proposed for Gateway Park?

Mr. Leader stated the YBI project consensus was that it would be a busy place for bicyclists. He asked if the Former Oakland Army Base end of the project will also be popular with bicyclists. Ms. Alschuler stated this end may be even more popular. Mr. Strang agreed. The project sites serve a large area of Oakland, which is underserved for open space, and this side of the project in particular is close to the Bay Bridge and is easily accessed by bicycles.

Ms. Alschuler stated West Oakland is nearby, which makes the Former Oakland Army Base site convenient for school fieldtrips. She suggested targeting schoolchildren in the programming. This project will be ahead of the rest of the park and can help hold the story of the park for a long time.

Mr. Leader stated, as long as it is popular with bicyclists and has a population using it, it will be maintained, the public will know the place, and it will get lots of use.

Ms. Alschuler stated not just bicyclists but pedestrians on the bridge will see the destination area below, which will draw them in.

Mr. Strang stated it seems likely to succeed with a built-in user group. He asked how much the anticipated programs for the top of the pier affect what is important to do now, which is to get the structure, bicycle parking, bridge structure, and railing built. The programming will evolve over time. He asked to what extent the programming affects the form of what is being approved tonight, which is the basic infrastructure.

Mr. Leader asked if it would still be popular without the programming.

Ms. Alschuler stated some of that is needed. It is the art piece which needs to be installed. The shade structure will be used by a lot of people for a lot of reasons. She suggested more shade.

Mr. Strang stated Berkeley Pier had virtually no programming and was incredibly popular day and night with no restrictions on use or hours and it took care of itself.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Bridge Yard Building is fabulous. She suggested that it stay open eighteen hours per day instead of opening once in a while for a public meeting.

Mr. Strang questioned the need to install the interactive sculpture yet because it will not have the park adjacent to it.

Mr. Leader agreed and asked if it would be installed just to wait seven years to be used. Bicyclists would use the park no matter if the park took ten years to be created.

Ms. Gaffney stated there is a sign on the Bay Bridge for pedestrians to plan for two hours walk out to YBI and back. She stated the length of travel time is underestimated. The Former Oakland Army Base site allows the public access to the water in a similar experience but is a shorter distance – the end of it can be seen.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the site can be seen while driving over the bridge.

Mr. Leader stated it can be seen from the righthand side of the eastbound lane.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the habitat area that was at the end of the pier at the November briefing. Mr. Galvez stated the habitat enhancement is no longer part of the proposal. There are requirements in the permit for a shore bird habitat and alternative locations are being identified.

(2) Does the proposed project provide ample, diverse, and accessible opportunities for water-oriented public use, including picnicking, swimming, non-motorized boating, hiking, windsurfing, and fishing opportunities?

(a) Would the public benefit from water access at the Oakland site, such as a kayak launch?

(b) Would the public benefit from fishing amenities at this site?

Ms. Alschuler stated there should be water access and fishing allowed.

Mr. Strang agreed with including small craft water access and the ability for individuals to walk right to the water's edge.

(3) Are the proposed public amenities designed appropriately for the microclimate of the site, considering wind, shading, and noise? Are the sites designed appropriately for nighttime safety and visibility?

Ms. Alschuler asked the same question as she did about the YBI site – how does the public know to visit the Former Oakland Army Base site? She suggested something can be done with light to announce it and, to keep the public coming back, there could be something different happening at the site every month.

Mr. Leader suggested something more bold and emphatic to make it even more memorable and unusual. He suggested bringing in an artist who works with steel at the scale of a bridge could be great on both ends of the project (Yerba Buena and Oakland).

Mr. Strang stated this side seems like it could be simpler than the other side (Yerba Buena) because, for one thing, there are incredible pylons, which are huge even in themselves, and then the water playing off the underside of the bridge is intriguing. There is more going on at this side – it more animated and interesting and has a huge monumental structure, which is very present in a way that it is not on the other side.

Mr. Strang stated incorporating Bay Bridge steel in a large enough scale to be meaningful would be great.

Mr. Leader stated it needs to be something more than a guard rail to make it more meaningful.

Mr. Strang stated many of the proposed improvements are delicate and are a nice counterpoint to the massive pylons. He suggested something that mitigates between the light railing and lights and the massive structures around the site.

Ms. Alschuler agreed. She suggested that it be something to draw attention and tell the story.

Mr. Strang stated, at the same time, just getting the bridge built is a huge engineering and construction undertaking. It should be the first priority. The bridge is beautiful in its own way. It will be light and delicate compared to the adjacent concrete structures. That will add to the appeal.

Ms. Gaffney asked Mr. Strang for more detail on his comments on the pylons and how that relates to the pier, programming, and activities. Mr. Strang stated it is a beautiful architectural structure, is huge, and is almost a sculpture in itself. The lightness of the bridge contrasts with that and the improvements of the lighting and railing are delicate. That could be a nice combination. It seems like, given the number of unknowns, from the way it looks today to the way it is going to be in seven to ten years, that structure would undergo some sort of adaptation. He encouraged some of that to be incorporated, like some ability to adapt or a strategy for knowing new structures can be attached without causing major problems by including extra sleeves for utilities that are unimagined at this time. It should be built for the long haul.

Ms. Alschuler stated it is important for the EBRPD to gather the community together to discuss the programming and how it will be used.

Mr. Strang stated his comments are similar to the YBI project side. The top of the pier is designed, detailed, and programmed without knowing who the constituency is and how they will behave. He stated, as much as he appreciates the design work, the important elements are the basics – bicycle parking, bathroom, drinking fountain, and shoreline pathway to get out on the water. They are the same basic elements recommended on the YBI project side so that individuals can use it in its raw form for the first few years. The projects are easier to program after the constituency develops. If the pier is designed in such a way that there is a railing and lighting, it can be adapted for a second-tier structure such as shade canopies. It can

be engineered in a way with base plates and outlets every so often to make it a flexible piece of infrastructure. A railing stanchion can be made into a shade structure support and can adapt. Those items can come back for review at another time. It is hard to commit to support without knowing the other things that will develop.

Mr. Sanborn stated he appreciated the conversation. He stated, to get to this point, there have been numerous concepts that the team has been working on over the last few months. He stated the team had the same conversation as the Board is having today. There were versions that were much more intense in terms of programming and furnishings, et cetera, but then determined not to assume too much and went back to a simpler plan. He stated the version seen today is the simplified version. The simple shade structure at the midway point, the room for having the market at the front end, and having the sculpture two-thirds of the way down should be included in the project now along with lighting, water, and electricity. The design team is comfortable with what was presented today and does not think it will interfere with adapting programming over the next few years.

Mr. Leader suggested a structural design that will allow it to be altered over time by building in flexibility at the front end, such as installing a series of plates for shade structures.

Ms. Alschuler stated the idea of a tool kit or set of parts for added future flexibility is a good idea. She suggested shade, comfort, wind protection, and something that is fun as elements to include right away to make the destination an attraction.

Mr. Leader stated he liked the fitness program element.

Mr. Strang stated it is helpful to hear that these programs are thought through and are supportable. He stated the only reason he was suggesting simplifying was if those things are happening at the expense of something else that is fundamental.

(15) Does the design at the Oakland site allow for appropriate integration and connections with the future Gateway Park?

Ms. Alschuler stated Ms. Kuehl raised some important points. The most important may be recognizing and ensuring that the connection under the bridge to the other side will happen. Ms. Alschuler agreed that it is important for the park to be connected with a pedestrian way under the bridge and for it to be a comfortable experience.

(4) Would the public benefit from temporary amenities, such as a restroom or drinking fountain, before Gateway Park is built?

Ms. Alschuler suggested restroom facilities for visitors.

(5) Are the connections between the various public areas designed appropriately, including the proposed access gates and picnic berms?

Ms. Alschuler asked about the location of the 200-foot ramp. Mr. Sanborn stated it is past the 600-foot bridge. He pointed to the location on a presentation slide where the ramp begins to ascend to the bridge. He stated Ms. Kuehl may be indicating that there are accessible trails on another side.

Ms. Alschuler asked how the proposal works with that. Mr. Sanborn pointed to the location on a presentation slide where the site meets grade level. He stated it would be possible to navigate around. He stated it is unclear what the potential grading would be for Gateway Park to address sea level rise. The reason this project had to create a berm is to get up to a suitable level. He stated Gateway Park may need to be raised up to end up at the same elevation as this project to address the same problem. In that case, there would be no barrier between the sides. It is more about phasing.

Ms. Alschuler stated there now is a big berm at the project site. Mr. Sanborn stated there is, which is a grand move, but over time it will be an adapted edge. There is nothing to preclude the addition of a ramp through the berm if that is where the point of connection will be. The EBRPD is at 20 percent design. This project needs to go in first and, if this project goes in first, it is important to get the public up there. Rather than estimating if and where a ramp may be needed and adding that in now, it should be made into a landform that could be altered as needed.

Ms. Alschuler stated the soil could be eroded away over the years before Gateway Park is in place. She suggested that the paving treatment of the pier should extend a little further back into the site so it is a larger move into the park, not an appendage. It would make it easier for individuals to get onto it in the interim.

Ms. Alschuler stated Ms. Kuehl suggested integrating the proposed terraced access ramp. She asked what the terraced access ramp is. Ms. Gaffney stated it is the area near the earthwork berms on the side of the sloped walkway, which were described with terraced picnic areas in the description provided to staff.

Ms. Alschuler asked if there is any reason why it could not be done. She suggested looking at that to soften it.

Mr. Strang suggested some accommodation for a shoreline trail. The berm could affect that, which would possibly preclude that if it was not worked in at the beginning. Beyond that, if the berm were to be more developed in the future, it is important to ensure the berm is not destabilized by reshaping it later.

Ms. Alschuler agreed with education related to the restored ecology that is there and the way it is going to evolve.

Mr. Leader asked who makes the determination between what will be included in the current construction project and what will be added later, such as the lighting, fitness equipment, and other amenities.

Mr. Galvez stated what will be built is what was shown in the presentation.

Ms. Alschuler asked about including the AECOM plan for recreational facilities and the shade structure.

Mr. Galvez stated part of this discussion is if the Board would support that type of programming. If that is the case, then some of those features could be incorporated.

Ms. Gaffney stated the proponents have gone through a costing exercise that includes what was shown. Mr. Galvez asked the Board to discuss specific features they would like to see that can be built. If the Board approves the ideas in today's presentation, that would be the next step.

Brad McCrea, BCDC Regulatory Program Director, stated, in the permitting and application process, the project proponents are working toward a design about what will be included in that application. The Board's impressions and advice about this proposal are part of that process. In the BCDC permit, upon Commission approval, there would be authorization for the structure and a requirement for a certain number and types of amenities on top of it. That proposal is very much based on the Board's comments. After that, there is a phasing aspect. The ideas brought up tonight are interesting – the idea that the types of improvements and program could evolve. The permit could even be structured in a way that allows for flexibility around programming, and says that, 'after it is built or as these ideas are developed, the proponents will come back to the Board with proposed program elements or improvements for further review.'

Ms. Alschuler stated basic requirements for programs, festivals, and other activities should be suggested that will run in the interim, since it will be five to seven years before the park will be created.

Mr. McCrea stated staff's expectations are that people will use this before Gateway Park is built. The project will be seen from the bicycle path and draw people in. Staff expects the project to be heavily used even without the park.

(6) Are the proposed roads and public sidewalks designed to appropriately and clearly connect to the nearest public thoroughfare and Bay Trail connecting pathways? Are parking facilities for all transit modes sufficient for anticipated use of the site?

Ms. Alschuler suggested a few parking spaces to make it more accessible and a commitment in the permit to provide water access and a restroom.

(7) Are the proposed public areas, paths, road, and landscape features designed to maximize views to and along the shoreline?

(8) Are the public areas and amenities appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise?

m. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Galvez thanked the Board for their input. He responded positively to the Board's suggestions and stated the design team will take the Board's comments into consideration and will come up with an improved design that will provide something to the community that they really want.

n. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board did not summarize their conclusions.

4. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:45 p.m.