

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

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: Approved Minutes of the January 22, 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, Tom Leader, and Stefan Pellegrini. BCDC staff in attendance included Brad McCrea, Andrea Gaffney, Ethan Lavine, and Erik Buehmann. Port of San Francisco Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC) members in attendance included Dan Hodapp, Laura Crescimano, Jeff Joslin, and Marcia Maytum. The presenters were Cathie Barner (Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy), Jim Bensman (IMA Design), Peter Brastow (San Francisco Department of the Environment), Scott Cataffa (CMG Landscape Architecture), Jennifer Devlin (EHDD), Jeremy Regenbogen (Macchiatto), Justin Semion (WRA), and Dilip Trivedi (Moffatt & Nichol). Also in attendance were Sharon Beals (Golden Gate Audubon Society), Alex Merrit (Sheppard Mullin), Denise Rasmussen (Alcatraz Cruises), and Noreen Weeden (Golden Gate Audubon Society).

Andrea Gaffney, BCDC Bay Design Analyst, reviewed the safety protocols, meeting protocols, and meeting agenda. She proposed moving Agenda Item 2, Approval of Draft Minutes, to after Agenda Item 4. Board members and WDAC members agreed.

She stated Jaime Michaels retired in December. She introduced the two new Chiefs of Permits, Erik Buehmann, the Chief of Federal Consistency and Permits, and Ethan Lavine, the Chief of Bay Resources and Permits.

The next Board meetings will be held on February 5th and 26th. On February 5th, the Board will review the Yerba Buena Island portion of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge pier retention for public access. On February 26th, the Board will review the San Francisco Firehouse 35 at Pier 22-1/2, which will be a joint review with the WDAC, and Pier 70, which will be a joint review with the new WDAC.

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



DRB MINUTES
January 22, 2018

Dan Hodapp, Chair of the WDAC, introduced the members of the WDAC in attendance. WDAC members approved the August 7, 2017, WDAC Meeting Minutes as presented.

2. Approval of Draft Minutes for December 11, 2017, Design Review Board Meeting. Ms. Barton referred to the fourth paragraph on page 5 and asked to change “a challenge for maintenance” to “a challenge because it is susceptible to value engineering.”

Ms. Alschuler referred to the second paragraph from the bottom on page 4 and asked to change “inner-city ferry” to “intra-city ferry.”

MOTION: Mr. Leader moved approval of the Minutes for the December 11, 2017, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as updated, seconded by Mr. Pellegrini.

3. Briefing on the “San Francisco Blue Greenway Restoration and Revegetation Guidelines for Contaminated and Impacted Areas.” The Design Review Board and the Port of San Francisco’s Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC) received a briefing by Peter Brastow, Senior Biodiversity Coordinator, San Francisco Department of the Environment, with a slide presentation, on the recently published San Francisco Blue Greenway Restoration and Revegetation Guidelines for Contaminated and Impacted Areas (https://sfenvironment.org/sites/default/files/fliers/files/sfe_ej_bluegreenwayguidebook_final_102417.pdf.) Mr. Brastow demonstrated the SF Plant Finder website (<http://sfplantfinder.org/>), a toolkit for creating habitat and greening. He stated the SF Plant Finder website is complementary to the Guidelines document.

a. Board and WDAC Questions. Ms. Alschuler stated the Guidelines document looks like it will be useful. She asked if detailed examples are planned for other areas along with Yosemite Slough. Mr. Brastow stated Yosemite Slough was an example used in the Guidelines document of a severely contaminated area that is undergoing remediation and restoration.

Ms. Alschuler stated the DRB and WDAC have projects within and without of the Blue Greenway area. She asked if there are specific parts of the Guidelines document that are applicable to increasing public access. She noted she found the map and plant lists particularly important. She asked if the Guidelines document will be presented in schools of architecture or in landscape architecture meetings. Mr. Brastow stated he is open to presenting it to individuals and organizations that would be implementing the Guidelines.

Ms. Barton stated she is interested in who the other planting resources are within the city. She asked what leverage can be gained through the city to make this plant-list approach successful. She stated native plants require native soils and there are very few of those available. Mr. Brastow stated the need to figure out the leverage points.

Ms. Barton asked what city department is working on the science of soils and soil remediation. Mr. Brastow stated it is primarily the Department of Public Health.

Ms. Barton asked how the plant lists are working with Bay Friendly and other entities. Mr. Brastow stated there is an attempt to cross-pollinate within the city family and encourage companies such as Bay Friendly Landscapes to use the Plant Finder.

Mr. Strang stated the Guidelines document is an unbelievable resource. He added to Ms. Barton's discussion on native soils. He stated the type of landscape restoration described is outside the landscape industry and is highly crafted, such as using the same gene pool, collecting seed, and taking cuttings. He stated this requires nurseries, a certain type of landscape contractor, and maintenance. He stated the need to understand that the delivery method is completely different and there are a set of resources that are out there. There are nurseries around the Bay that need to be made aware of this so they know that they can make this happen as an alternative to conventional landscaping. Mr. Brastow stated Literacy for Environmental Justice has a nursery at the state park out of which they operate and contract growing that has been growing for the city. There are other nurseries around the Bay that do locally-based collection and restoration products.

b. **Public Hearing.** Noreen Weeden, Golden Gate Audubon Society (GGAS), stated GGAS has been working in the Bayview and Hunters Point communities for many years and have been providing comments on the Blue Greenway and Yosemite Slough restoration. She stated there were 118 bird species living in Yosemite Slough prior to restoration efforts. She stated GGAS would like to continue to evaluate and monitor the impact the restoration efforts have on birds, other wildlife, and humans.

Ms. Weeden stated GGAS supports interpretive signage to include information on the natural history of the shoreline; adaptation to climate change and sea level rise, especially living shorelines; and the planning goals, particularly those focused on native plants. She stated the need for the plans to consider the transition of the wetland to the transition in upland zones since climate change will have impacts. Plant selection can make a difference in how challenges are addressed.

Ms. Weeden stated birds are currently nesting on abandoned piers and non-operating light poles near Yosemite Slough and Herons Head Park. She stated the need to provide replacement nesting habitat for these species as the shoreline is improved for humans.

Ms. Weeden stated GGAS supports the restoration of weedy areas with native plants and the removal of contaminants. She stated the trail building and restoration work should be phased and planned to lessen impacts on single species, such as amphibians or jackrabbits, and should not flush out nesting species. She stated the need to consider where the kayak launches and fishing areas are located at designated water access points to make them friendly to wildlife.

Ms. Weeden stated GGAS supports the replacement of lawns. Native grasses and a variety of coastal scrub species are drought tolerant and beautiful to view while they provide habitat value.

Sharon Beals, GGAS, stated all projects currently being worked on in these areas should be made aware of the Guidelines document. She suggested a conference among the agencies to spread the word about the good information included in the guide.

4. Alcatraz Landing at Piers 31, 31 1/2, and 33, City and County of San Francisco, and Joint Review with Port of San Francisco WDAC (Fourth Pre-Application Review). Mr. Hodapp recused himself from project review to comply with conflict of interest rules.

The Board and the WDAC held their fourth pre-application review of the proposal by the National Park Service (NPS), Port of San Francisco, and Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy for a redesigned ferry terminal to service Alcatraz Island and other points at Piers 31, 31 1/2, and 33, on the northeast San Francisco waterfront. The proposed project would create three berths to expand ferry service, reconfigure and redesign the embarkation area at Pier 31 1/2, create a public plaza, and rehabilitate and reuse portions of the Piers 31 and 33 bulkhead and shed buildings. Public access improvements include an interpretive exhibit area, a plaza, multi-level seating, a café and gift shops, public restrooms, and vehicle and bicycle parking spaces.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Ethan Lavine, Chief, Bay Resources and Permits, noted that the narrative response to BCDC and WDAC comment provided in the August 7, 2017, meeting was included at the back of the meeting exhibit package. He provided an overview of the project, accompanied by a slide presentation, highlighted major project changes since the last review, and summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the project:

(1) Encourages movement to and along the shoreline and provides for effective circulation through the site

(a) Feels inviting, provides a clear connection to the site from Herb Caen Way and The Embarcadero, and provides a sense of arrival and a unique sense of place

(b) Is sufficient for navigating to the public amenities, such as public restrooms, bicycle parking, and ADA parking

(c) Includes queuing areas that are designed to maintain continuous shoreline public access both now and in the future

(d) Includes design considerations to make the disconnected public access between the Pier 33 shed and the Civic Plaza waterfront more inviting to the public

(2) Utilizes forms, materials, colors, and textures that are compatible with the Bay and adjacent development

(a) Strikes the correct balance between maximizing user comfort by designing the concrete canopies, enclosed on-deck café, and glass panels in the queuing areas for the wind and weather, and includes canopies that provide adequate solar access and minimize shading of on-pier public access areas

(b) Appropriately incorporates lighting and planting into the site

(3) Preserves and enhances the view corridor to the Bay between the Pier 31 and Pier 33 bulkhead buildings and otherwise maximizes views to the Bay

(a) Designs and sites the seating areas on the Civic Plaza to minimize the potential adverse impacts to Bay views

(b) Minimizes potential adverse impacts to Bay views by incorporating sufficiently transparent and appropriate improvements, such as the on-deck café and queuing areas

(4) Incorporates design features that adequately interpret the unique historical and cultural aspects of the pier structures and the story of Alcatraz Island

b. Project Presentation. Cathie Barner, Vice President, Projects and Stewardship, Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, introduced the project team.

Jennifer Devlin, Principal Architect, EHDD, stated the major components of the design have not changed significantly since the August review. The 58 comments received in August were organized into eight categories to make today's review process easier. She provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of refinements of the project design broken down into the eight categories: canopy details, seating and bicycle parking revisions, planting additions, plaza materials, lighting plan, railing revisions, signage and wayfinding strategy, and interpretation opportunities.

Scott Cataffa, Principal, CMG Landscape Architecture, stated one of the most exciting parts about the redesign of the project is that public access is nearly doubled by reorganizing current functions. He continued the slide presentation and discussed the design changes made since the August review, such as increasing bicycle parking spaces from 34 to 86, modifying the seating design features at the entrance and on the Waterfront side, and the addition of planters.

Jeremy Regenbogen, Interpretive Designer, Macchiatto Signage, continued the slide presentation and discussed signage, wayfinding features, and interpretive exhibit tools throughout the project. He stated the signage uses an international standard approach with legible typeface and static and electronic information displays. He stated the large rock by the information desk was replaced with a tactile map of Alcatraz for increased interpretive value to anchor the site.

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

Ms. Maytum referred to Presentation Slide 29 and asked if there is further development on the line of influence between this design and the concession in the future. Ms. Barner stated the NPS will issue the concession contract and the Port will have a lease agreement with the concession.

Mr. Joslin asked about the location for the tactile map. Mr. Regenbogen showed a presentation slide of the tactile map, which is a dimensional map of Alcatraz, by the information desk. He stated the placement is intended to be locked in with the information desk so that a facilitator can give interpretive value to it.

Mr. Joslin asked if the signs will be lit. Mr. Regenbogen stated the monument sign will have internal lighting, the wayfinding signage will be ambient lit, and the Queue 1 and Queue 2 signage will be electronically lit to provide destination information for visitors.

Mr. Joslin asked about the height of the hole in the monument sign. Mr. Regenbogen stated the NPS arrowhead hole in the monument is at what is considered an accessible, visible sightline.

Mr. Joslin asked how the up-lighting on the undersides of the canopies is achieved. Mr. Regenbogen stated the fixtures are not set; the design is still at the conceptual level.

Mr. Pellegrini referred to the proposed public access sheet and asked if the white area north of Queue 1 is closed after dark and if pedestrians are allowed continuous access along the water's edge. Mr. Cataffa stated it will depend on how the concessionaire plans to manage security on the boats.

Ms. Barton asked about drainage at the railing area along the edge. Mr. Cataffa stated there are existing drain penetrations into the wharf that will be tied into. Runoff will be treated below deck for discharge.

Mr. Strang asked about the material of the shear wall that the sign is mounted to. Ms. Devlin stated it is exposed concrete but it is not specified whether it is boardform or smooth.

Mr. Strang asked if the "carpet rug" paving in the middle is a change of texture. Mr. Cataffa stated it is a change of texture and finish. The black integral color specification will be used for the perimeter with a seeded aggregate for the carpet piece, which is meant to be more textural and brighter.

Mr. Strang asked who would be responsible for the maintenance of the plantings. Mr. Cataffa stated the concessionaire would have that responsibility.

Ms. Alschuler asked a question for Ephraim Hirsch, an alternative Board member, about the location of all the shear walls. Ms. Devlin pointed out two vertical and two horizontal shear walls on both the left and right sides (canopies) on a presentation slide.

Ms. Gaffney asked a question for Mr. Hirsch about the torsional stability. Ms. Alschuler stated she and Mr. Hirsch identified the force of the shear wall behind the welcome desk since his earlier email, which made him more comfortable. Ms. Devlin stated a structural modeling analysis was completed since August because of the light weight of the shear walls and the thinness of the floating canopy. The two-way concrete slab, post tension at the edge of the canopy, and columns have been added as a result of the analysis.

Ms. Maytum referred to Presentation Slide 19 and asked about the operation of the sliding panels at the seating area on the righthand side. She asked if the line perpendicular to the doors is sliding panels. Mr. Cataffa pointed out the fixed interpretive panels on the slide and the stacking, operable glass façade panel.

Mr. Joslin asked about the timbers for the benches. Mr. Cataffa stated the hope to use reclaimed lumber but that has not been sourced yet.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the “carpet” paving joint at the southern end should respond to the change in direction along the Embarcadero. Mr. Cataffa stated it was framed based on the façade of Pier 33, a shed of Pier 31, and the view and orientation to the water’s edge.

d. **Public Hearing.** Denise Rasmussen, General Manager, Alcatraz Cruises, stated Alcatraz Cruises is the present concessionaire and a tenant at this location since 1987. She encouraged including concessionaire input in the planning as early in the process as possible to provide input that may impact the design.

Alex Merrit, Sheppard Mullin, outside counsel for the city of Sausalito, stated the city of Sausalito has filed an appeal of the city’s proposed CEQA document for this project. The appeal is scheduled for a hearing before the San Francisco Planning Commission on February 22nd. He stated the city of Sausalito is concerned about the project proposal to expand ferry service to Fort Baker.

Ms. Weeden asked about lighting. The NPS is a proponent of the Dark Skies Program. She stated the project site is along the major migratory route for birds. She stated some of the lighting, particularly the pole lighting, seems to be a concern for migrating birds. Full cutoff lighting is preferred, and façade lighting should not use up-lighting but should point down. She encouraged interpretive displays about the biodiversity of the birds and wildlife of Alcatraz Island.

Ms. Beals suggested the buildings soon to be demolished at Hunter’s Point Shipyard as a possible source of lumber.

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

Mr. Joslin referred to Question 1 in the Staff Report and questioned the single uniform treatment of paving, given there are three zones within the “carpet” area: the front seating area, the center of the plaza, and the major seating/presentation area (on the waterfront). He suggested a different or a finer-grain treatment for those areas to acknowledge the three distinct zones.

Ms. Alschuler stated there was discussion about using graphics in the pavement for that.

Mr. Leader agreed. He continued with a comment to Question 1 in the Staff Report and stated he liked the carpet area as an organizing tool, but suggested that the graphics in the “carpet” be more insistent in storytelling and mapping so that it would create a pattern of its own.

Ms. Alschuler continued with a comment to Question 1 in the Staff Report and stated the project site is an area where connections are being made to places all around the Bay. She suggested something at the entrance or in the interpretive material that shows the location of the project site in context of the Bay and possible physical and historical destination options around the Bay.

Ms. Barton suggested including a regional context in the destination options.

Ms. Maytum stated the connection part to the other sites of the GGNRA on the righthand side (disembarkation area) is a terrific idea.

Ms. Crescimano continued with a comment to Question 1 in the Staff Report and stated she liked the idea of the waterfront seating raft because it provided an elevated area to get a different vantage point and provided a multipurpose piece for seating/table, but she cautioned that the elevated area dead-ends and individuals may climb or crawl over the side instead of returning down the ramp. She suggested creating a split in the seating raft to make a ramped entrance from two sides and create a flow-through simultaneous with the current design purpose.

Mr. Pellegrini continued with a comment to Question 1 in the Staff Report and stated the importance of keeping the access open between Queue 1 and the ferry gate during non-ferry operating hours. He referred to Presentation Slide 7 and pointed to Float 1 and stated that Mr. Cataffa described the area along the public concourse directly to the south of Float 1 as being closed off when the ferry is not in operation. He asked if the area can be made available to the public at all times except during heavy ferry use. Mr. Pellegrini stated he appreciated that the concrete canopies are designed to be thin, subtle, and transparent. It is important that the public can move around the areas that are designed to be open.

Mr. Pellegrini referred to Question 2 in the Staff Report and stated he appreciated the discussion about noting something else on the “carpet” and that the site is going to be important to a lot of individuals for a lot of reasons. He stated creating a large open space that can be used and interpreted in many ways may be enough to allow that to occur. He stated he is not looking for a lot of programming at the surface from a design standpoint.

Mr. Leader continued with a comment to Question 2 in the Staff Report and stated how much interpretation belongs there (on the plaza) is a judgment call. The question is getting the theme to read stronger and have more richness and graphic presence about it over the whole panel. He suggested a topographical or nautical map. If that much interpretive material was too much, he stated it still needs more contrast of materials - more than only two different colors and finishes of cast in place concrete. Consider more contrasting material types with

enough texture and shadow created to make the “carpet” read as a functional item to organize the space.

Ms. Maytum continued with a comment to Question 2 in the Staff Report and stated the change in the placement of the shear walls and the thinness of the columns makes this what will be an exceptional place. She stated, although the lease will have language and the intent is to execute this design, it is not clear that this design team will be the one to execute it. She requested having this design team, which put forth this well-considered vision, as a reviewing group at a minimum to make sure that the intent of the design reviewed today is executed. She suggested putting in something that ties this intent with an oversight by the group who created it.

Mr. Joslin continued with a comment to Question 2 in the Staff Report and stated he asked about timbers for a reason. He stated generally, as a rule, the larger and more permanent the timber, the deeper individuals carve into them. He stated the timbers may be worth reconsidering in light of the Chrissy Field approach as an extension of the rest of the vocabulary.

Mr. Joslin referred to Question 3 in the Staff Report and discussed the evolution of the views. He stated the views from the water were helpful. If that view is accurate, the canopy in relation to the top deck of the ferry coming in is in exactly the right place. It was a helpful and meaningful change both in terms of opening that view and the invitation to the water from Herb Caen Way and elsewhere coming into the site.

Mr. Strang continued with a comment to Question 3 in the Staff Report and stated he agreed with the previous comments. The way the buildings have developed – the transparency, lightness, and elegance – is perfect. The large-scale middle furnishing ties into the scale of the buildings, ferries, and landscape. He stated the benches with the planter boxes are the one thing that is a small residential scale, especially in front of the café. He suggested fewer, larger planters for greater impact, better scale, and easier maintenance.

Ms. Alschuler stated the tables and chairs may constrict the path on the disembarkation side. She agreed that fewer, larger items would help guide that path.

Ms. Barton suggested removing the umbrellas on Herb Caen Way because of scale and wind.

Ms. Crescimano referred to Question 4 in the Staff Report and encouraged going beyond the immediate or obvious histories for the interpretive component and looking at it as different people seeing themselves in those histories, whether the range of the ecological history and different stories that can be told there.

f. **Applicant Response.** Ms. Barner responded positively to the joint Boards’ suggestions. She stated the design team will take the Boards’ comments into consideration and will come up with an improved design. She asked if the Board comments could be clarified with staff and that today could be the conclusion of the review process.

Ms. Maytum stated she felt comfortable with the staff review. She suggested an update to see the final results as it becomes real as a concession plan.

The Board members agreed.

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

5. **Alameda Shipways Residential Project at 1100-1250 Marina Village Parkway, City and County of Alameda (First Pre-Application Review).** The Board held their first pre-application review of a proposal by Steelwave Acquisitions, LLC, and the city of Alameda to construct a multi-unit residential development and waterfront park. The proposed project would involve demolishing all existing shipway wharf structures and constructing a 329-unit residential development, consisting of four buildings ranging from four stories to six-stories in height. Public access improvements include a waterfront park, auxiliary public access paths to connect the park to Marina Village Parkway including a Bay trail extension, an open lawn with public art, finger piers, multi-purpose sloped lawn areas, seating and picnic areas, a children's play area, a kayak rental and storage barn with wash-down area, and a boat dock for hand-launch boats.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Erik Buehmann, Chief of Federal Consistency and Permits, stated the project site is part of the larger Alameda Marina Village Master Plan Development Project for which the Commission issued a permit in 1980 authorizing construction of residential development and public access areas. He provided an overview of the project, accompanied by a slide presentation, and summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the project:

(1) provides adequate, usable, and attractive public space for the public's use and enjoyment of the shoreline

(2) provides usable and inviting public spaces that are oriented to the Bay, incorporates unique and special amenities that draw the public to them, creates a "sense of place", is safe, and feels public

(3) maximizes views and physical connections to and along the shoreline for the public

(4) designs walkways and trails to physically and visually connect to the nearest public thoroughfare and Bay Trail connecting pathways

(5) allows for hand-launched watercraft and water taxi service

(6) provides other water-oriented recreation opportunities

(7) maximizes public use while maintaining the structural integrity of the waterfront park and accommodating potential adaptation to sea level rise

(8) accommodates sea level rise and/or flooding

b. **Project Presentation.** Jim Bensman, IMA Design, the landscape architect for the project, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the location, existing conditions, the previously-approved Alameda Marina Village Master Plan Development Project, the existing pile plan, site plan, circulation, and amenities. He stated there are two existing pedestrian pathways – one from the northwest and another from the southeast – that abut the property.

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

Ms. Alschuler asked how the project will feel public and inviting considering the distance from the main road. She suggested that the welding platform be fitted for events and festivals with power, water, and lighting availability to help make the project part of the life in the area.

Ms. Alschuler stated it is better to prepare the water taxi location earlier rather than later. She asked if the site is ready to support a water taxi service or if a facility would be required. Mr. Bensman stated the project site is a stop along the way. Marine engineers are evaluating the size of the platform.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the Bay Trail. She stated there is a pathway that comes halfway into the site that connects east to west but the Bay Trail is shown along the road where there would be very little awareness of the water. Mr. Bensman stated the trail along the road is the current Bay Trail. It stops up the street along Marina Village Parkway. The extension will come through the tunnel to Oakland in the future.

Ms. Alschuler asked staff if they received a comment from the Bay Trail. Ms. Gaffney replied that staff has not received comment from Bay Trail. Ms. Alschuler stated the need to better understand public shoreline paths and the Bay Trail locations. Justin Semion, WRA, stated he is similarly unclear on whether it is the Bay Trail to the east. He stated the Bay Trail is currently mapped along the street at the bottom of the parcel. He stated that does not mean that individuals will not use the shoreline path.

Ms. Alschuler stated this is an amazing and unusual site. It has a big story to tell because of the way the shipways go into the water and the buildings continue that same angle. In 2000, the proposal said there was some deterioration but they would add asphalt, make access ways, and let individuals view that condition on the site even though office buildings were going to be constructed. She asked why some part of it could not be retained today other than the sheet pile at the far edge. She asked if the proponents considered keeping anything to tell the story of this site on the Bay. She stated the Commission is interested in people understanding the Bay and its evolution as part of healthy living for the whole community. Mr. Bensman stated there were considerations to keeping that early on, but one of the big considerations was, in all the other plans seen, adding anything beyond those buildings pushes the structure to the waterfront. So, what is being proposed is pulling that back, removing the headhouses, and creating a park so individuals can be at the water rather than pulled back.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the park will sit on new piles. Mr. Bensman pointed to the locations on a presentation slide of the new sheet pile along the edge and along the amphitheater, which will be backfilled; then, sloping down into the water will be either the preferred articulated concrete block or riprap creating an area for a landscaped edge of saltgrasses and cordgrasses. He asked Dilip Trivedi to discuss the building deterioration issues.

Dilip Trivedi, Vice President and Coastal Engineer, Moffatt & Nichol, the engineer for the project, stated the entire site is on piles that are beyond salvaging. The facility is 80 years old and is on timber piles. To retrofit the craneways or extend the life of the area any further would require new piles. The plan, as the developer has proposed it, is to completely remove all piles, pile caps, girders, and deck, and fill the site.

Ms. Alschuler read the Existing Pile Plan from page L5 of the Staff Exhibit, included in the meeting packet. Mr. Trivedi stated the buildings will be on piles, and the park will be on new fill.

Mr. Strang asked how to determine where the shoreline is when the entire site is on pilings. He asked if the shoreline is out so far because the site is covered with concrete. Mr. Trivedi stated the network of structures kept the water out when it was originally built. The sheet pile is at a low elevation. At low tide it does not block water from coming in, so the water comes up on the slipways and reaches to the extent shown in blue on the presentation slides, which is high tide.

Mr. Strang stated he was trying to clarify if the shoreline is at the edge of the pier or at the edge of the land, when there is a pier over the water. Mr. Trivedi stated there is a system of shear walls on which the crane structures used to travel. This was a solid edge as built, but there has been deterioration over time so water now comes in. Ms. Gaffney stated the waterline is being measured from the sloped concrete slabs, but the craneways have walls encasing them.

Ms. Alschuler suggested discussing the shipways and craneways separately. She asked about keeping the piers. The plan is to take the existing piers out and then put varied lengths of piers in the same location. She stated, even though the sheet piling is out there, none of the piers go out that far. Mr. Trivedi agreed and stated it would all be new construction, including the concrete piles.

Ms. Alschuler asked if a person representing the design or development idea for the site was present. Mr. Bensman stated he is the landscape architect. He stated the idea is that the existing craneways are in complete deterioration and to repair them to new where they are safe for individuals to be on would be an exorbitant cost for the project. He stated the paragraph on page L5 of the Staff Exhibit indicates that they are unsalvageable at this time.

Ms. Alschuler stated it is early in the review process. She suggested a conversation between an engineer on the BCDC staff and proponents' engineers. She asked, if what was described about the entire site structure not being salvagable is true, how the story of this site will be told. She stated her preference to save some component of the site.

Mr. Strang asked about the dialogue with the city of Alameda. Mr. Bensman stated the city likes the design and will regroup after today's review.

Ms. Barton asked about the rationale of the stepping up of the architecture toward the water as opposed to stepping down. The six-story buildings are on the water and the four-story buildings are on the road. Mr. Bensman referred to a presentation slide and stated it is stepped up to increase views for the individuals in the back of the building.

Ms. Gaffney asked if there is a zoning requirement to step down onto Marina Village Parkway. Mr. Bensman stated he did not know but would look into it.

Mr. Leader asked if there has been a systematic evaluation of the stability of the existing structure and if there are areas that could be re-purposed. Mr. Trivedi stated a detailed condition assessment of the entire structure has not been done. Earlier studies have been done for prior developers over the years that assessed the timber structures, which have deteriorated. He stated they would not meet the seismic code or settlement or height parameters for sea level rise.

Mr. Leader stated it is not just about how much the wood has rotted; and questioned if it is also the configuration that is no longer feasible. Mr. Trivedi agreed.

Mr. Pellegrini stated one is a fixed dock will provide boat access. He asked what the other three docks would be used for. Mr. Bensman stated all four are fixed piers. He stated the idea is to take advantage of the area that can be built in currently and to get individuals out to the water's edge.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if kayaks can access the water from all of the piers. Mr. Bensman pointed to the kayak launch pier on a presentation slide and stated it would have a dual-use platform for kayaks on one side and a water shuttle on the other.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if there are ramp areas along the water's edge where individuals can drag a kayak in and out. Mr. Bensman stated not currently.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the retention of the sheet piles along the top requires that any access into the water must be outside of that point. Mr. Trivedi stated the primary driver is the depth of water. He pointed out the concrete slabs, which are the slipways, and the current estuary on a presentation slide.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the concrete slabs of the shipway will still be there. Mr. Trivedi stated they will not be there but the sheet pile, which is buried steel below low tide will remain. He stated the need to go beyond the sheet pile (further into the channel) to get adequate depth to put in a dock and have low-tide access for the water taxi.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the area (former slipways) will have basins during low tide. Mr. Trivedi stated the area will be mud flats at low tide.

Mr. Strang asked if there is a requirement to remove all the piers and slipways or if some of them can be left in place.

Ms. Alschuler asked to go back to the overall plan and discuss the building form in relation to public access. She stated, since the project adhered to the current sea level rise assumptions, around the edges of the project will be a five-foot blank wall. She asked if there is any place that will be broken through or where the design will include a nice edge. Mr. Bensman stated the architect is working on what that wall will look like, such as having crenulation like a sheet pile or something that speaks to the ship concept. He stated plantings against the wall will reduce the mass of the wall.

Mr. Leader asked how the varying lengths of piers were determined. Mr. Bensman pointed to the pier that gives access to the water shuttle and kayak launch on the presentation slides that earlier iterations began with and stated other piers were slowly added. He pointed to another pier and stated it was pushed further out to allow for fishing off the end of it. Others were kept close for cost-effectiveness.

d. **Public Hearing.** Ms. Beals stated she can see that there is an interest in honoring the history of the waterfront and the historical use of the land. She asked the Board to consider the history before that. She stated there is an opportunity to expose mudflats and habitat for the 150 species of birds that would occupy some of that newly-recreated shoreline. She suggested that the lawn protrusion into the water be a beach and an opportunity for individuals to experience wildlife.

Ms. Beals stated her concern about the water taxi, given the many shorebirds and water birds in that area. She asked to ensure consideration for lighting for migrating birds at night. She asked that the building glass used be nonreflective and bird-friendly.

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

Mr. Leader asked the Board if they are satisfied with the statement on page L5 of the Staff Exhibit that it is not salvageable.

Ms. Alschuler stated she is not and stated part of the recommendation should be that staff have a conversation with the engineer who did the study or analyzed the previous studies.

Mr. Leader stated the site may not be put back the way it was, but there are salvageable things that could be part of the historic story.

Ms. Alschuler stated the original architect did an amazing thing with the early buildings and was creative. She suggested using this work as an inspiration and using the sides that must be built up as an opportunity to do something that relates to that history or shape. She wondered if the craneways could stay there.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the Board's ability to assess the adequacy of public access is hindered by the lack of knowledge about the existing structural system, because what the Board would like is the public access to somehow relate to the structural skeleton of the site. He asked why these things should be relied upon to organize the site and if there is a better way to think about the site, if none of it is salvageable.

Ms. Alschuler asked that that conversation happen to get real information about the site's overall structural integrity and to seriously look at one part of the site versus another. If there is information that any of the existing structure can be salvageable, the Board would like to see this project again and would like to see what could be done with that.

Mr. Leader stated he thought advocates of the Bay Trail would attend this meeting.

Ms. Alschuler asked for more information about the Bay Trail through the site.

The Board responded to questions from the staff report:

(1) Would the proposed project provide adequate, usable, and attractive public space for the public's use and enjoyment of the shoreline? Are there other amenities that would improve the public's enjoyment and use of the shoreline?

Mr. Pellegrini stated the site is approximately 600 feet wide and provides an opportunity to increase the permeability in terms of the access between the parkway and the Bay. The idea of having one or more public paths that go through the site would be helpful and two public routes at the shoreline – one that is closer to the shore and one that is more urban. He stated the parti could allow that to happen, especially because the throughput for public access goes through the middle of the site. It suggests that the access going through the middle could become more public and everything on the north side of that might also be more publicly accessible. It would also allow public access where the path has a better relationship to the architecture so that, instead of traversing along a retaining wall, the public access could be where the project entrance is and the front entrance could be very attractive for portions of this project.

(2) Does the site layout provide usable and inviting public spaces that are oriented to the Bay, incorporate unique and special amenities that draw the public to them, create a "sense of place," are safe, and feel public?

Mr. Strang stated the unique and special amenity of this site is the amazing, cultural, historical form of the site and should be used as a design resource. To provide a design that does not leverage the history seems like a wasted opportunity. Aside from that, there is a practical side that there would have to be cost efficiencies in doing less demolition and putting that money into creating meaningful amenities, which is turning some of it over to habitat. Both of those approaches could be done for less cost and still maintain some of the story. Once

the decision has been made to remove everything and the cost of that, then a large simple move would have to be made, such as a huge aircraft carrier-sized garage with buildings on top. Those things go hand in hand. He stated that minimizing the demolition could glean a more articulated and affordable building approach.

Mr. Leader suggested using the piers as an artificial reef and improving the story by digging into habitat more. Even if the piers cannot be rebuilt the way they were, there are good stories to be had that are not as expensive.

Ms. Barton agreed and stated it will attract residents to such a unique place.

Ms. Barton stated the open space, play area, and picnic area have no relationship to the on-land elements or the edge conditions. They could be articulated in different ways based on what the edge condition is.

(3) Are the proposed paths, walkways, and planting areas designed to maximize views and physical connections to and along the shoreline for the public?

(4) Are the proposed walkways and trails adequately designed to physically and visually connect to the nearest public thoroughfare and Bay Trail connecting pathways?

(5) Are the boat dock and associated amenities designed sufficiently to allow for hand-launched watercraft and water taxi service?

Ms. Alschuler stated it has to be water-taxi ready now.

(6) Are the other piers sufficiently designed to provide other water-oriented recreation opportunities, both passive and active?

(7) Are the shoreline treatment options appropriate for maximizing public access, while both maintaining the structural integrity of the waterfront park and accommodating potential adaptation to sea level rise?

Mr. Leader stated, if there was a story, to go for it and make it strong and interesting.

(8) Are the public areas appropriately designed to accommodate sea level rise and/or flooding?

Ms. Alschuler stated the diagrams suggest the open space will be gone in the future with rising sea level.

Ms. Gaffney asked whether the design of the edge of the welding platform is valuable or could be reconsidered and adapted for projected sea level rise.

Mr. Strang stated there should be higher areas to maintain some open space above higher sea level.

Ms. Alschuler agreed and stated higher areas could be interesting. She stated the green lawns feel as though they are front lawns for the apartments, not inviting to the public.

Mr. Leader stated the lawns do not seem appropriate along the shoreline or drought-tolerant.

Ms. Alschuler emphasized the importance of anticipating and addressing sea level rise now to ensure that the water side of the project remains public.

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Bensman stated his appreciation for feedback on discussion points such as the scale of the structures and public access points. In response to staff recommendations, multiple structures have been planned, the unit count has increased, and the parks have been widened.

Mr. Trivedi referred to the only other precedent for a site like this, Pier 70 in San Francisco.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board's suggestions to keep the piers available in the future can also help to cut costs.

Mr. Bensman stated he will bring another design back for the Board to address. He asked if it is better to rebuild an unsafe structure or to demolish it and design anew.

Mr. Strang stated his expectation that something would be retained. In the case of Piers 15 and 17, remnant pilings were retained to rebuild upon and are useful for habitats and understanding the tide.

Ms. Barton stated looking at a more natural area might be a good solution. However, there is still the problem with the castle-like mass of the building. She suggested that interest may be found in the relationship between the buildings and the ground.

Ms. Alschuler stated cutting through the center and connecting the paths east/west and north/south may be a good solution.

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

The Board asked to see this project again.

6. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREA GAFFNEY
Bay Design Analyst

Approved, with minor corrections at the
Design Review Board Meeting of February 26, 2018.