

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 28, 2018

TO: All Commissioners and Alternates

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 June 11, 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 Cheryl Barton, Jacinta McCann, and Stefan Pellegrini. BCDC staff in attendance included Rebecca Coates-Maloon, Walt Deppe, Andrea Gaffney, and Ethan Lavine. Port of San Francisco Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC) members in attendance included Dan Hodapp, Jeff Joslin, and Kathrin Moore. The presenters were Sean Buran (CIM Group), Joanne Hayes-White (San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD)), Alan Kawasaki (Shah Kawasaki Architects), Sarah Kuehl (Einwillerkuehl, Inc.), Anthony Rivera (SFFD, Chief Deputy), and Magdalena Ryor (San Francisco Public Works (SFPW)). Also, in attendance was Stuart Morton.

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

2. **Report of Chief of Permits.** Ethan Lavine, BCDC Coastal Program Manager, presented his report:

a. Sam Stewart will join the BCDC Regulatory Unit team and Morgan Chau (phonetic) will join the BCDC as a Permit Analyst next month.

b. The Commission will review the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, Phase Two, and the Mission Rock Mixed-Use Development Project at the June 21st meeting.

c. The Commission will review the Caltrans Project to reuse and rehabilitate piers from the old Bay Bridge at the July 19th meeting.

info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov
State of California | Edmund G. Brown — Governor



DRB MINUTES
June 11, 2018

3. **Approval of Draft Minutes for May 7, 2018, Meeting.**

MOTION: Vice Chair Strang moved approval of the Minutes for the May 7, 2018, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as presented, seconded by Ms. McCann.

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 5-0-0 with Board Chair Alschuler, Board Vice Chair Strang, and Board Members Barton, McCann, and Pellegrini voting approval with no abstentions.

Dan Hodapp, chair of the WDAC, led the WDAC in the approval process for the February 26, 2018, WDAC meeting minutes. He reviewed the purview of the WDAC. Mr. Hodapp recused himself from discussion and decision-making for the remainder of the meeting.

4. **Pier 22.5 Fireboat Station; City and County of San Francisco (Second Pre-Application Review).** The Board and the WDAC jointly conducted their second pre-application review of a proposal by the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), and Port of San Francisco (Port) to construct a new fireboat station in the Bay at Piers 22.5 and 24, adjacent to the historic Fire Station 35 on the northeast San Francisco waterfront. The proposed project would include a two-story fireboat station on a steel float, an access ramp and gangway, and a public observation deck. Existing finger piers at the site would be demolished.

The revised project presented at this meeting changes the location of the two 48-inch guide piles on the inland side of the float to be located closer to the pedestrian gangway; reduces the height of the fireboat station from 34 feet to 31.6 feet at the parapet; reduces the length of the fireboat station from 151 feet to 139.3 feet; increases the number of beds from 28 to 35; modifies the exterior design to include silver-ribbed metal panels, a steel plate, and 50 percent more glazing on the ground floor; pulls back the fence line on the marginal wharf towards the water to create additional public access space; retains the marginal wharf south of the existing fire station for public access; increases the public observation deck from 951 square feet to 1,920 square feet; shifts the artwork concept in location and purpose to emphasize the history and operations of Fire Station 35 and its fireboats; and moves the Extractor Room to the historic Fire Station 35.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Rebecca Coates-Maldoon, BCDC Principal Permit Analyst, provided an overview of the project, with a slide presentation, and summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the project:

(1) Avoids and minimizes potential view impacts from the shoreline with respect to its orientation to the shoreline, building massing, proposed building materials, guide piles, and other design considerations, and preserves and enhances the view corridors to the Bay along the pedestrian promenade and Harrison Street, and otherwise maximizes views to the Bay

(2) Explores alternative designs to balance the operational and functional needs of the project with the Commission's mandate to protect and enhance the visual resources provided by the Bay

(3) Includes float and fireboat station designs that are sufficiently transparent and appropriate in terms of height, bulk, and location to minimize potential adverse impacts to Bay views, given the operational needs

(4) Includes a pier-supported public observation area, marginal wharf public access, and Bayside History Walk components that provide the best opportunity to enhance shoreline public access and enhance Bay views in the vicinity of the project site

(5) Takes advantage of views to the Rincon Point Open Water Basin to the north of the site

(6) Incorporates unique and special amenities in the public observation area, marginal wharf public access, and Bayside History Walk components that will draw the public to the site, and incorporates forms of historical, cultural, and natural resource interpretive expression

(7) Includes revised location and fence design around the historic firehouse that will minimize potential adverse impacts to Bay views, and creates a sense of public connection at the proposed public access space, while maintaining public safety

(8) Appropriately designs public access to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise

b. **Project Presentation.** Magdalena Ryor, Project Manager, SFPW, introduced the project team.

Anthony Rivera, Chief Deputy, SFFD, provided an overview of the existing facility and current and future staffing.

Alan Kawasaki, Project Architect, Shah Kawasaki Architects (SKA), reviewed the Responses to Board Summary and Conclusions from the February 26, 2018, meeting, which were included in the meeting packet. He provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the existing site, site plan, and changes made to the design since the last presentation.

Joanne Hayes-White, Chief, SFFD, spoke in support of the proposed project and thanked the DRB and the WDAC for their consideration.

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

WDAC member Jeff Joslin asked if the louvers currently being incorporated are intended to be operating or fixed. Mr. Kawasaki stated they are intended to be fixed. They are designed at a tilt for added diversity to the façade.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the dilapidated pier next to Structure 24. Ms. Ryor stated the building farther south is technically the Pier 24 Annex. The dilapidated piece of the pier is a former portion of Pier 24.

d. **Public Hearing.** One member of the public provided the following comment:

Stewart Morton, a member of the Northeast Waterfront Citizens Advisory Group, spoke in support of the proposed project.

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board and WDAC members responded to questions from the staff report as follows:

Visual Impacts:

(1) Has the revised fireboat structure been sited and designed to avoid and minimize potential view impacts from the shoreline with respect to its orientation to the shoreline, building massing, proposed building materials, guide piles, and other design considerations? Conversely, does the revised design preserve and enhance the view corridors to the Bay along the pedestrian promenade and Harrison Street, and otherwise maximize views to the Bay?

(2) Are there alternative designs that should be explored to balance the operational and functional needs of the project with the Commission's mandate to protect and enhance the visual resources provided by the Bay? Does the revised proposal for use of the historic Fire Station 35 complement the proposed uses for the new fireboat station?

(3) Are the revised improvements, including the float and new fireboat station, sufficiently transparent and appropriate in terms of height, bulk, and location to minimize potential adverse impacts to Bay views, given the operational needs?

WDAC member Kathrin Moore stated the moving of the fence creates a completely different project. She stated she could not be more delighted to see the mission of the building as being a floating pier and the land side being given a generous foreground for individuals to participate in viewing the activities. The opening of the floating building on the north side gives the public the opportunity to look through the building. She stated the revised design addresses many of the points that the WDAC needs to consider.

Ms. McCann agreed. The revised design does a terrific job on the public access on the marginal wharf and embarcadero side. The increased area provides a much better viewing area, the indication of interpretation of what is happening there and the railing detail are good, and the red-painted object (AWSS) has been brought into the public realm. She asked about the management of the secured access space for emergency vehicles. Ms. Gaffney noted the need for parking an additional fire engine on the north wharf when the regular engine is away for service, but that parking of non-emergency vehicles has an upland alternative location. Ms. Alschuler noted that we should aim for the maximum amount of public access feasible on the wharves while allowing for the necessary functions of the firehouse. Mr. Rivera stated the SFFD and the development team extensively discussed this area. The conclusion was that the north side needs to be kept secure for maintenance on the engines and for responding units. Engines do not lock. Rescue squads are currently parked in the parking area on the south side behind locked gates. That space will now be designed for public access. This is a working firehouse; part of that work requires a secured area to maintain the equipment and to receive specialized equipment deliveries.

Ms. Barton stated she was previously concerned about the views down Folsom and Harrison but the new design does just the opposite - the project will pull individuals down to the water's edge to explore. She stated the design is wonderfully improved.

Physical Public Access:

(4) Does the revised public access proposal (including the pier-supported public observation area, marginal wharf public access, and Bayside History Walk components) provide the best opportunities to enhance shoreline public access and enhance Bay views in the vicinity of the project site, or are there additions and/or alternative improvements and locations that should be considered? a. Would the public benefit from additional perimeter access on the north side of the marginal wharf next to the historic fire station, when use conflicts are not present? (The extra rig is parked on the wharf when the station's rig goes in for service. The rig is parked outside because it is a larger vehicle that does not fit in the firehouse.

Mr. Strang stated his appreciation for the improved design of the floating firehouse. He stated the metalwork is bulky. He suggested changing the design to improve transparency and making the design on the north and south either a floating dock or a shed instead of a hybrid between the two because of the scale of the bridge and the pier behind.

Mr. Pelligrini stated he was happy that the comments made at the February meeting resulted in a constructive improvement. He suggested additional seating in the new public areas either to the north or south of the building. He stated the solar exposure on the south side is good. The north side provides an area with a framed view of the open water basin, which was not there before.

(5) Does the revised public access take advantage of views to the Rincon Point Open Water Basin to the north of the site?

(6) Does the proposed public access (including the public observation area, marginal wharf public access, and Bayside History Walk components) incorporate unique and special amenities that will draw the public to the site? Are there additional opportunities to increase historical, cultural, and natural resource interpretation on site?

Mr. Pellegrini stated his understanding that there is a tension between maximizing public access at the edge and allowing maritime uses that restricts public access to continue the tradition of the working waterfront. He stated he liked the idea of getting something that is larger than it is now on the north side of the building but not allowing the full north edge to be publicly accessible. It is a positive thing to consistently see the public pieces of furniture framing the view, which counterbalances the need to open the edge along the north side of the building in a public way.

WDAC member Moore stated it speaks to the dynamics of the operation. Individuals of all ages like to look at fire engines - this project will attract attention.

WDAC member Moore asked why pieces of equipment on the roof of the floating firehouse are now visible, particularly on the rendering looking south towards the

building on Exhibit 11. Mr. Kawasaki referred to Slide 14 and stated the revised design lowered the parapet, which allows pieces of the equipment to be seen. Also, in order to reduce the plan, it was necessary to move the generator to the top floor, which was not there in the previous design.

WDAC member Joslin stated the comments from the February meeting were appropriate and the responses to those comments were substantial and appropriate. He stated the redesigned project is highly successful. Moving from the concept of a floating building to a barge, and moving from the terra cotta to the fins is highly appropriate, and the fins not being operative is the right idea. He asked about the material and color of the base and ensuring that they are distinct enough at the base.

(7) Does the revised location and design of the fences around the historic firehouse minimize potential adverse impacts to Bay views, and create a sense of public connection at the proposed public access space, while maintaining public safety?

Mr. Strang asked about the railing treatments. He stated the pickets are chunky - he suggested winnowing them down to approximately an inch. He questioned the marine feel since there is not a lot of differentiation between the two ends of the building. The landward side is treated very much the same as the waterward side.

Mr. Strang stated the project does not contribute to the view other than to frame it, and it does not contribute to the view at all at night. He suggested turning the corner with some of the glass at the second level rather than simply carrying the wall up, opening the waterside end of the building up, and creating a sense of transparency and providing a sense of the landscape components that are on the other side of the Bay.

Sea Level Rise:

(8) How could the revised public access for this project be appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise?

Ms. Alschuler commented that it is a floating building but has limits as to how far it can float in terms of time at the site. At some point, adjustments will have to be made on the posts to allow it to rise.

Ms. Gaffney stated, in terms of a float and the ability to adapt to the end-of-century sea level rise, the float is capable of adapting and moving up and down. It is the landside connection and public access that is in question. Public access is a requirement of the permit. The resiliency and adaptive nature of the public access must remain in place for as long as the authorized use is in place. The staff question is about the resiliency and adaptability of the public access.

f. **Applicant Response.** Ms. Ryor responded positively to the Board and the WDAC's discussion and suggestions. She stated the project 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) It was excellent to see a concise presentation.
- (2) The revised plan made changes for the better, such as moving the fence back to provide additional public access.
- (3) Focus on the maritime character of the floating structure and the public enjoyment of the public access area.
- (4) If the north side will be used for parking and maintenance of equipment, ensure that the part that stays public will be made the best as possible.
- (5) Include interpretive understanding of the area.
- (6) Individuals already love coming to this location; the improvements will allow many individuals to come and watch the working waterfront.
- (7) Work together to make the north side clearly inviting to the public.

Ms. Gaffney asked the Board and the WDAC if they would like to see this plan again. Board and WDAC members collectively stated they do not feel they need to see the project again prior to construction.

5. Jack London Square, F3 Hotel Site; City of Oakland, Alameda County (First Post-Permit Issuance Review). The Board held their first post-permit issuance review of a proposal by the CIM Group to construct a new boutique hotel and adjacent public access areas at Jack London Square. The proposed project would include a six-story, 155-room boutique hotel. Public access improvements include an approximately 27,000 square-foot waterfront public access area referred to as the “Estuary Green,” a Bay Trail segment, and additional adjacent public access improvements.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Walt Deppe, BCDC Coastal Program Manager, stated this project came before the Board in 2004, prior to the issuance of the permit. Project proponents returned for Board review in anticipation of development. He introduced the project and summarized the issues in the staff report including whether the project:

- (1) Encourages diverse activities and creates a “sense of place” that is unique, enjoyable, and inviting to the public at the Estuary Green
- (2) Provides obvious cues that the palm garden is part of the open space for public access
- (3) Includes boardwalk design and alignment that activates some of the existing public access areas that are currently underused
- (4) Includes improvements that are inviting to the public at Water and Alice Streets that help create a consistent streetscape to the overall Jack London Square area

(5) Provides enough usable open space at the Estuary Green to allow for a festival zone to function for special events while maintaining a 20-foot-wide unobstructed corridor for the public to walk through

(6) Creates diverse recreational opportunities for people of all races, cultures, ages, abilities, and income levels

(7) Enhances the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay

(8) Encourages diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline and connects to the nearest public thoroughfare where convenient parking or public transportation may be available

(9) Includes an appropriate maintenance design to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise

Mr. Deppe referred to page 5 of the staff report, where it states that no adaptation plan has been proposed for the public areas. He noted that the updated exhibit, which was included in the meeting packet, does include a discussion on adaptation.

b. **Project Presentation.** Sean Buran, Vice President, CIM Group, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the background, site plan, and surrounding projects in Jack London Square.

Sarah Kuehl, Einwillerkuehl, Inc., Landscape Architect, continued the slide presentation and discussed furnishings, circulation, landscaping, views, Water Street and the San Francisco Bay Trail, programming, arrival plaza, and dedicated public access areas of the proposed project.

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

Ms. Alschuler asked about Water Street as a garden alley, which is how it's shown in the drawings, but in the past, it's been shown in the permit drawings as more of a street. Ms. Alschuler asked if the hotel opens up onto Water Street. Ms. Kuehl pointed to a walkthrough and stoop areas on the presentation slides. The two buildings of the hotel separate and the landscape and circulation pulls all the way through the site from the waterfront to Water Street.

Ms. Kuehl stated it is not natural to step out onto Water Street from parts of the hotel due to grade changes.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the existing riprap on the site. Ms. Kuehl stated a small amount of the existing riprap line will be removed because it is at the edge of the project.

Ms. Alschuler asked who will maintain the public space. Ms. Kuehl stated the proposed project will be maintained by CIM Group.

Ms. Alschuler asked what the edge will look like at the corner of Alice and Water Streets. Ms. Kuehl stated the ground floor is for parking with the hotel above it. She pointed to a corner area and stated there is no parking in that area, where the lobby of the hotel is planned. There currently is planting to screen the parking from Alice Street but there is no solid facade at the ground floor.

Ms. McCann asked about the northwestern end of the site with the hotel pulled back. She asked how that will look, how it will interface with the new public space that has been created, and what the relationship is between that building moving out into public space and the various paths. Ms. Kuehl stated the city of Oakland discussed this in detail. The thought is that the building is accessible and fairly public. The idea at the northwest corner is that it could have a café or juice bar and conference and meeting rooms that are more public than the rest of the hotel.

Ms. McCann asked if the green area with the stepping stones between the boardwalk and the timber decking will be fenced. Ms. Kuehl stated there is a fence to secure the pool. The goal was to ensure it felt planted and that visitors were in a garden rather than on the pavement at Jack London Square.

Ms. McCann stated her understanding that the decomposed granite path will be removed and a path will be built that meanders inland. Ms. Kuehl agreed and stated it is not much more inland than the current path.

Ms. McCann asked if the existing path is closer to the water than the boardwalk. Ms. Kuehl stated it is but not significantly.

Mr. Strang asked for more detail on how the public and private areas are divided and where the fence is located. Ms. Kuehl pointed out the public and private locations and the proposed fence on a presentation slide.

Mr. Strang asked if individuals would appropriate half the private area with the proposed fence going through the middle. Ms. Kuehl stated it may be too generous but the idea was to make the planting area feel like it benefited both sides equally.

Ms. Alschuler asked where events would happen and the number of individuals it would hold. Ms. Kuehl listed possibilities such as fitness fairs, dog shows, events with booths along the length of the boardwalk, or events on the water.

Mr. Strang asked about the festival zone designation. Ms. Gaffney stated the permit defines festival zones and their square footage. The question is if it is worth keeping the festival zone in this area given this area is now being developed, if it will be a valuable asset, if the design is flexible enough to allow for events to happen in this area, and the types of events that may occur.

Ms. Kuehl stated the festival zone is only 12,000 square feet, not the 27,000 square feet. The project site provides a different type of location for events that may work better for medium-scale events.

Ms. Barton asked who is the demographic that surrounds and uses Jack London Square. Ms. Kuehl stated it is diverse. Jack London Square is used as a public park in many ways and many nonresidents use it. There are also a number of office tenants who use the workout facilities. Many sites along the estuary are being converted from industrial sites similar to around the Bay, which will make an enormous difference in how Jack London Square is used.

Ms. Gaffney stated the BCDC planning group did vulnerability mapping of the area to understand if there are communities without access to transit, the languages spoken in surrounding communities, and the age in population. There is not yet a significant population on this side of 880.

Ms. Alschuler asked what about the design will make members of the public comfortable to visit. Ms. Kuehl stated the plan that connected trails, playgrounds, and fitness will bring enough programming to the area to draw the public in.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the permit provides guidance for the width of Water Street. Ms. Kuehl stated there is a stipulation for emergency vehicle access but the BCDC permit contains a mention of the area as public access. He also asked about the circulation path from the Ferry, and Ms. Kuehl responded that Water Street is intended to be the primary promenade. Mr. Pellegrini further asked about arriving at the site from the Amtrak Station and the north/south bicycle network. Ms. Kuehl noted the challenges from crossing the railroad tracks and mentioned a planned stair access at Harrison Street. She noted Clay Street as the primary north/south access.

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

e. Board Discussion. Ms. Alschuler suggested looking at the water edge (Estuary Green) separate from Water Street.

The Board responded to questions from the staff report as follows:

Physical and Visual Access:

(1) Would the proposed design for the Estuary Green encourage diverse activities and create a “sense of place,” which is unique and enjoyable, and inviting to the public?

Mr. Strang stated the design is interesting. He agreed with the proposed site being different from other Jack London Square destinations. He suggested trying to understand the kind of space the proposed site creates and the kind of opportunities it presents.

Mr. Strang stated the proposed site is wide enough to linger there and perform various activities but also feels like a wide pathway. He stated the question is if individuals will really come there to exercise. He stated the need to look at the qualities of the space so that it can transcend time and can change as the neighborhood changes.

Mr. Strang stated he first envisioned the area that is labeled as a meadow as a restoration zone, which seemed like a great idea. Ms. Kuehl stated it used to be that way, but there was a comment in the process that requested more public access; DRB feedback on how to keep the area public and yet natural would be helpful.

(2) Does the proposed design for the Estuary Green provide obvious cues that the palm garden, is part of the open space for public access?

Mr. Strang stated the bench is a barrier and the area labeled “palm garden” has an unclear purpose. Ms. Kuehl stated the middle is not intended to be publicly accessible.

(3) Does the proposed boardwalk design and alignment activate some of the existing public access areas that are currently underused?

Ms. McCann stated she sensed a strong move to create a sense of place with the boardwalk and struggled to balance that with a public space that benefits everyone. There are spaces that could be developed further to fit the design into the context of its surroundings. She suggested considering how to make it more easily approached particularly on the northwestern end, which has many junctions - right angles with the existing waterfront trail, the dock, and the angled path. She asked how the three-foot-wide trail through the meadow works. There currently is not a clear concept that holds the entire meadow and palm garden areas together.

Mr. Strang asked if the boardwalk is wood or concrete. Ms. Kuehl stated the ideal is all wood, but some concrete may be required.

Ms. Kuehl stated feedback on the boardwalk and measuring public access would be helpful. In many ways, the planted area does not marry well with the 27,000 square feet. The public can enjoy all of it but cannot walk on all of it. She asked how public access is measured.

Ms. Gaffney stated staff requested that the meadow have usable public access because the existing path is close to the water. One of the goals of the Bay Trail is to be as close to the water as possible. Staff felt the space in the meadow and palm garden should be as physically usable as possible rather than just viewable open space.

Ms. McCann suggested thinking about the boardwalk as something that could have variations in how it is expressed. There might be boardwalk that is true boardwalk wood that begins to split off as it gets to the edge, such as planting strips within the boardwalk. The ends of the boardwalk do not seem as strong as the idea of a boardwalk near the water. She suggested modifying that. Ms. Kuehl stated the festival zone should be removed because the 20-foot width is being driven in part by that.

Ms. Alschuler stated her understanding that staff is looking for access into the planting area but either by peeling off into a couple of locations or developing further locations such as the picnic area at the bottom, which could become something larger closer to the water. She suggested including three locations closer to the water with a soft, natural edge.

Ms. McCann stated the two types of green jump – the meadow and the palm garden move across the boardwalk. She suggested evening them out by including trees and layering in more variety that different individuals would find appealing for different reasons.

(4) Do the improvements proposed for Water Street and Alice Street help create a consistent streetscape to the overall Jack London Square area, that is inviting to the public?

Ms. Alschuler stated hotels are welcome near waterfronts but there is a barrier between the hotel and the major public area on the waterfront. Maybe it should mix it up more such as steps up to some amazing place in the public area of the palm garden to invite individuals of all ages to do different things throughout the whole site.

Mr. Pellegrini expressed appreciation for the horizontal separation between the boardwalk and planting levels, preserving privacy between the hotel and boardwalk. He stated his concern that the existing line of the boardwalk is emphasized too much as a way to organize access around the site.

Ms. Alschuler stated the pier seems like it is forgotten in the plan as the public is being turned away from it. More usable space can be integrated into the design to include the pier with the reworked space that Mr. Pellegrini discussed. Ms. Alschuler suggested overlaying the existing public access with the proposed public access to better understand how the paths change in relation to the waterfront.

Mr. Strang stated the turnaround at the termination of Alice Street, the arrival plaza, and the picnic area could be merged into a more coherent destination.

Mr. Pellegrini stated concern that the area on the north side (at Water Street) will feel more like a landscaped edge at the street level and not something that feels active and public.

Mr. Pellegrini stated it would be great to include private balconies with a low landscape buffer on the residential frontage.

(5) Does the proposed design of the Estuary Green provide enough usable open space to allow for a festival zone to function for special events while maintaining a 20-foot-wide unobstructed corridor for the public to walk through? (The permit allows for 11,810 square feet for the festival zone, while the boardwalk only provides for approximately 1,300 square feet of space at the widened corner.)

Mr. Pellegrini asked if including a zone up on the hotel level that is generally open to the public but that the hotel could close for private events would meet the existing requirements for a festival zone. Mr. Lavine stated the proponents were authorized to establish a festival zone in this area but the permit does not require a festival zone here. Ms. Gaffney stated the required public access is a specific square footage. Additional public space outside of that, such as a mixed zone area that could close down for private events, is allowable.

Mr. Strang stated it seems that the garden space is functioning as a buffer between the hotel and the public space. He suggested considering ways to get maximum public benefit out of that space.

(6) Do the proposed public access improvements create diverse recreational opportunities for people of all races, cultures, ages, abilities, and income levels?

Ms. Alschuler emphasized that the plan should include opportunities for a variety of users whether it happens by reconfiguring the texture and major paths or by emphasizing other locations.

Mr. Strang stated Jack London Square still remains a regional destination. He stated the need for it to be available to as many different types of individuals as possible. He stated even the images selected conjures certain types of use that brands and characterizes the space.

Physical and Visual Connections:

(7) Is the proposed project designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay?

Mr. Pellegrini stated the boardwalk and garden areas currently are not as flexible or usable as they could be. He suggested a north-south publicly-accessible entrance from Water Street. He suggested making more of a vertical, rectangular space, particularly with a public use area at one end of the L-shaped building and the entrance to the hotel walkway that is located in the center of the parti, even if it is sitting up on a plinth above the boardwalk, to create a public space that the boardwalk and the direction of the Bay Trail can move around as opposed to letting the diagonal access across the space be the overwhelming driver.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the orientation of the boardwalk should not be allowed at the expense of a high-quality geometric public space in this location. The fear is that the current garden design will only be used as a buffer between the hotel and the boardwalk when it has the opportunity to be used more broadly.

Mr. Strang asked Mr. Pellegrini if he is suggesting a north-south publicly accessible entrance from Water Street. Mr. Pellegrini stated the triangular spaces north of the hotel and at the corner of the boardwalk suggests more can be done to get additional public space.

Ms. McCann stated the shapes should reflect the bold angle while integrating some of these other ideas. She asked about human comfort, such as shaded areas.

Ms. Barton stated the boomerang shape shifts the landscape from hard to soft. She agreed that including human comfort features would add another level to the design. She suggested that the landscape get wilder toward the hotel at the fence to make it distinct. The boardwalk has its own environment on both sides.

(8) Would the proposed public access improvements encourage diverse Bay related activities and movement to and along the shoreline and connect to the nearest public thoroughfare where convenient parking or public transportation may be available?

Ms. Alschuler stated concern about the garage depending on where it is visible.

Ms. Gaffney stated this is a permitted plan; there may be an amendment to identify where the public access has been reconfigured and how to modify the festival zone, but what has been authorized is generally consistent with the permit. She stated the next step is plan review.

Mr. Pellegrini stated, depending on compliance with the existing permit, the DRB may need to see this proposal again.

Sea Level Rise:

(9) Are the public areas appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise from a maintenance perspective?

The project proponents provided an updated exhibit demonstrating adaptive measures for sea level rise.

f. **Applicant Response.** Ms. Kuehl responded positively to the Board's discussion and suggestions. She stated the project team will take the Board's comments into consideration and will come up with an improved design.

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board requested to review the project again. (Please refer to the Board Questions and Discussion.)

6. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:00 p.m.