

# 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 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: Approved Minutes of April 8, 2019, 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 Bob Battalio, Jacinta McCann, and Stefan Pellegrini. BCDC staff in attendance included Rebecca Coates-Maloon, Andrea Gaffney, Megan Hall, Yuriko Jewett, and Ethan Lavine. The presenters were Steven Grover (Steven Grover and Associates), Sarah Kuehl (EinwillerKuehl, Inc.), Diane Tannenwald (City of Oakland), and Patrick Van Ness (Signature Development Group). Public comment via email was submitted by Stewart Port. Also in attendance were Daniel Franco, Lee Chien Huo (San Francisco Bay Trail Project), Naomi Schiff (Coalition of Advocates for Lake Merritt), Sandra Threlfall (Waterfront Action), and David Wofford (East Lake Neighbors).

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

2. **Report of Chief of Permits.** Ms. Gaffney presented the report:

a. The next Commission meeting will be held on April 18th. The Commission will consider the vote for the Pier 22.5 Fireboat Station, City and County of San Francisco. The public hearing was on April 4th.

b. The May 6th Board meeting is cancelled. No projects are currently scheduled for Board review.

c. The next Board meeting will be held on June 10th.

info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov  
State of California | Gavin Newsom – Governor



**DRB MINUTES**  
**April 8, 2019**

### 3. Fill for Habitat Bay Plan Amendment Briefing

a. **Staff Presentation.** The Board received a briefing on the status of the San Francisco Bay Plan Amendment to Address Fill for Habitat Restoration Projects. Megan Hall, BCDC Coastal Scientist, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the project goal, amendment process to date, Bay Plan sections currently under consideration, challenges that have come up through the amendment process, and next steps.

Ms. Hall asked two questions for Board discussion:

- (1) How might the allowance of more fill for habitat projects intersect with the DRB?
- (2) In what ways can the DRB play a role in the assessment of restoration project design?

b. **Board Questions.** Following the briefing, the Board asked clarifying questions on the material presented:

Mr. Battalio stated his understanding that fill is acceptable for shore and flood protection devices as long as it is the minimum necessary. He asked if there would be an incremental increase in fill that would be acceptable if there was an incremental increase in another output, such as ecology. He provided the example of a horizontal levy, which takes up more space but provides more benefit so more fill could be justified.

Ms. Hall agreed that projects that use more fill than potentially would be used for a structural solution would be permissible under the current policies and laws because the minimal amount necessary as interpreted can flex with goals and outputs of the project. There are discussions to potentially add policy language that would reflect the desire that, even if the project is not the bare minimum that could be met with structural-only solutions, it would be permissible to have a larger footprint for added benefits.

Mr. Battalio stated the Natural Shoreline Infrastructure Guidelines that came out of California's Fourth Climate Change Assessment included the concept that natural infrastructure, such as a beach, takes space. He stated the irony is that often there is no space in locations being redeveloped or rehabilitated. That raises the question of retreat, which is not generally desirable, but without retreat, locations cannot be expanded into the Bay to provide enough space for natural infrastructure into the future.

Mr. Battalio stated the Hayward Area Shoreline Planning Agency (HASPA) raised the term that has since been dropped: steepening. One way to steepen is by using coarser sediments – sands and gravels. There were historically more sand and coarse sediment beaches in the Bay, which provided ecology, recreation, and shore protection.

Ms. Alschuler asked if staff has looked at the big-picture demands on the Bay and how much additional fill might be needed over the years similar to the forecasts for sea level rise.

Ms. Hall stated the San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI) has recently been doing work on calculating sediment deficit and how much fill may be necessary. She stated she attended a workshop where she heard 200 to 300 million cubic yards may be required long-term. She stated SFEI has yet to release their work. Massive volumes seem to be required.

Ms. Alschuler stated not enough attention has been paid to the creeks. She asked if strategies for getting more sediment and removing blockage have been considered.

Ms. Hall stated, to the extent possible by changing policies rather than being project proponents, staff is looking at the component to meet regional restoration goals and restore complete ecosystems and is encouraging applicants to think as much as possible about how to reconnect the natural watershed and sediment processes to ensure that habitats are sustainable. She agreed that, without creek connections, the chances of getting sediment are much lower.

Ms. McCann stated there is an important intersection between the restoration projects, particularly where access comes into play. She agreed with Ms. Alschuler about the need to understand how much shoreline access might be under threat in the next fifty years because much of the San Francisco Bay Trail has been the result of development projects where the project proponents have long gone. The question about how access will be protected and who will pay for potential fill becomes a large issue.

Ms. McCann stated there seems to be a need for the type of expertise to undertake habitat fill projects and the type of contractors who would do that work to expand. Another thread to this would be to think about how projects are undertaken because of the level of skill that would be required. Not all contractors have the potential to scale up to deal with the issues.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the Board often reviews projects looking at opportunities for public access within the confines of each project while, at the same time, looking at a broader area of the shoreline in incremental pieces. He used the significant portions of the Alameda shoreline as an example.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if there is a role that staff can play in guiding the Board toward regional shoreline or landscape strategies that would be appropriate that may not be apparent within the individual confines of one project but may have other approaches that may be directed toward multiple projects, such as operational landscape units. He asked if the Board should be made more aware of these opportunities and educated about them.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about excavation and if there is attention where the Board is looking to maximize public access and often discusses getting the Bay Trail and public access right to the edge, but questioned projects where the shoreline profile is more subtractive. He asked if fill is being removed from an area to reconfigure, where that goes in terms of maximizing public access, and if there are situations where the Board would need to consider retreating from the shoreline where it is today in order to have a more resilient structure over time.

Ms. Hall stated there are situations where that would be the case. It would be project-dependent in terms of whether public access is feasible on that area that has now moved back from the shoreline.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he was thinking about the nuance of guiding future policy direction for public access, what that looks like, and what words should be used in the Bay Plan to describe how one might make those choices.

Ms. Hall stated it would be important to keep those things in mind for when this more holistic public access and sea level rise adaptive conversation is revisited. Other types of things need to be planned for beyond restoration.

Mr. Strang stated this was a helpful and timely presentation and conversation. He stated many of the projects the Board has seen recently have riprap shores that go back many decades. The Board has questioned applicants about strategies other than keeping it as is. Giving the Board tools to make suggestions to applicants would be helpful.

Mr. Strang stated the presentation materials indicate that much of this fill would come from sediments that already exist in the Bay but also that there was a shortage of sediments. He stated his impression that there were literally mountains of sediments that had washed into the Bay during the Goldrush era and after. He asked if that is what Ms. Hall was referring to in her presentation.

Ms. Hall stated hydraulic mining in the Sierra Mountains resulted in a massive pulse of sediment starting around the mid-1800s, which drastically changed sediment dynamics in the Bay until the mid-20th Century. Then, around that time, changes in land use, intensive damming of rivers, and the decrease in hydraulic mining resulted in a decrease in sediment concentration.

Ms. Hall stated the current state of the sediment is more like the natural condition but, because there is not a connection of creeks, the right sediment sources currently are not coming into the Bay. She stated there was a significant decrease in sediment concentration during 1999 and 2000 but it has been holding steady since then.

Ms. Hall stated dredging will continue in the Bay for a number of reasons. Much of where sediment can be taken from is using the sediment that is already being dredged. She stated there theoretically is a shortage of sediment for what may be required for sea level rise adaptation.

Mr. Strang stated it would be interesting to predict the long-term implications of that process.

Ms. Alschuler stated everything across the BCDC and what the Board is doing will interface with the issues of equity and other things that have come forward. She stated the Board will be looking to staff for possible regional implications of the intermediate decisions for planning and access to different populations.

4. **Approval of Draft Minutes for March 11, 2019, Meeting.** Mr. Strang referred to the bottom of page 15 that states “Mr. Strang stated how the railing for the retaining wall is designed is an important element.” He stated there is a promenade with a continuous railing and he suggested stepping it down to minimize the presence of that railing. He stated instead of saying “a step down in the section for an ah-ha moment,” he meant to say “ha-ha wall.”

**MOTION:** Mr. Battalio moved approval of the Minutes for the March 11, 2019, Design Review Board meeting as revised, seconded by Mr. Strang.

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

5. **Brooklyn Basin, (Oak to Ninth) Development Project, South Park and Channel Park, City of Oakland, Alameda County (First Post-Permit Issuance Review).** The Board held their first post-permit issuance review of the design by Zarsion-Oakland Harbor Partners (formerly Oakland Harbor Partners, LLC), the City of Oakland, and the Port of Oakland, for the South Park and Channel Park areas of the Brooklyn Basin project. The approximately 8.27-acre proposed parks include shoreline pathways for pedestrian and bicycle access, shoreline parking, public plazas, and areas for special events. Public access improvements include a viewing area with public seating, picnic areas, and other public amenities. The Board reviewed these portions of the Brooklyn Basin project prior to permit issuance in 2007.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Yuri Jewett, BCDC Shoreline Development Permit Analyst, introduced the project, discussed the Channel Park and South Park areas, which are Phases 3 and 4 of the Brooklyn Basin project, and summarized the issues in the staff report including whether the project:

(1) Encourages diverse activities and creates a “sense of place,” which is unique and enjoyable, and inviting to the public.

(2) Creates diverse recreational opportunities for all people, regardless of race, culture, age, ability, and income level.

(3) Designs the Bay Trail to provide sufficient space for pedestrians and bicyclists to navigate the trail safely.

(4) Designs the proposed parks to enhance the pleasure of the user and viewer of the Bay.

(5) Designs the proposed shoreline appropriately to recruit tidal marsh vegetation along Channel Park.

(6) Designs Channel Park to align with the future public access to be provided by the Lake Merritt Bridge Connector project.

(7) Enhances the parks by including other site amenities.

(8) Designs the public access areas to be resilient and adaptive to future flooding.

b. **Project Presentation.** Patrick Van Ness, Vice President of Forward Planning, Signature Development Group, introduced the project team. He asked the Board to take into consideration that, in 2007, some of the approved uses in the BCDC permit have since been determined by the California State Lands Commission staff to be inappropriate for State Lands-encumbered property. The dog park, bocce ball court, and children's play area have been removed from the plans as they were not allowed per State Lands staff guidelines.

Sarah Kuehl, EinwillerKuehl, Inc., the Landscape Architect for the project, suggested that the Board evaluate the project for South Park and Channel Park in the context of the five new parks in this area. She stated Estuary Park is under development by the city of Oakland, Shoreline Park is currently under construction, and Clinton Basin has not substantially changed at this time. Each park is intended to have a strong character and project proponents have thought about a sequence of events connected by a trail rather than trying to put all of these characters into any one of the parks. The plan is for a family of parks with variety of programs and some repeating elements.

Ms. Kuehl provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the background, context, existing site conditions, and a detailed description of the proposed projects at the South Park and Channel Park areas. She noted that South Park was originally labeled as meadow but is more accurately labeled as a native coastal garden.

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

Ms. Alschuler suggested having a discussion about the bridge connection after a broad discussion of the project. She reminded Board members that the discussion will include both South Park and Channel Park.

Ms. McCann stated the presenters indicated there is no timeline for construction of the parks. She asked about the conditions that will create the timeline and if the two parks will be constructed at the same time.

Ms. Kuehl stated the parks will not be constructed simultaneously. The timeline is triggered by development milestones. The project moves forward when a certain number of units have been developed and sold.

Ms. McCann asked if the park design will be refined further at that point in response to the buildings.

Ms. Kuehl stated the hope that it would. She stated there has been a level of development on the parks at this point that is in keeping with the level that was done and approved previously. The thought is that, as more is learned and as building outlines are created rather than parcel outlines, things will be refined significantly more.

Ms. Alschuler stated the staff report indicated that South Park would be completed during Phase 3 and Channel Park would be completed during Phase 4 but that Clinton Basin has not gone ahead. She asked about the status of Clinton Basin.

Ms. Kuehl stated Clinton Basin is complicated. Project proponents have come back to Board staff with an update on Clinton Basin and it was not seen as significantly different from what had been previously approved; therefore, it was not coming back before the Board at this time. It will come before the Board in the future because the buildings that are facing Clinton Basin will require review. The Board may see all parts of it when reviewing those four buildings.

Ms. Gaffney stated Clinton Basin was reviewed at staff level and was determined to be generally consistent with the authorization and intent of the design and not to elevate it up to the Board for review. She agreed that the parcels along Clinton Basin are now starting to come in for preliminary review. Those need to be assessed to determine how they are in relation to the authorization and design intent. Those may be brought back to the Board for review.

Mr. Strang asked to what extent the project proponents have had contact with the neighbors that are between the two parks and how that has influenced the programming of the parks, if at all.

Ms. Kuehl stated there are a number of individuals who attend the public meetings. She asked if Mr. Strang was referring to the Fifth Avenue community.

Mr. Strang stated he was referring to the Fifth Avenue residential parcel.

Ms. Kuehl stated she has had contact with the community residents who attend the public meetings, particularly an individual who is interested in birds. She stated there has not been a standalone public meeting with the Fifth Avenue community but there were many decisions made prior to this in agreements that set up the rules in terms of how the properties interface.

Mr. Strang stated there are the individuals who live there and then there is the property owner. Ms. Kuehl stated the original owner has passed away and it is now in a multi-family-member trust, so it is complicated.

Ms. Alschuler stated, in the various illustrations provided including the broad view on the cover of the package, there are a variety of different assumptions about water use and water access. The presentation today did not show any water use or access at the two park locations. She asked Ms. Kuehl to help the Board understand the variance between the two plans in the context of the two parks and water access. She asked if any additional access for recreational or other use of the water will happen when these two parks are constructed.

Ms. Kuehl stated the design as currently shown has the Clinton Basin Marina. There is evolution in this with additional thinking about what water access should be that will perhaps come forward in the marina design. There has been a discussion about what to include and, since nothing is underway, the presentation showed the original assumption in the prior Roma plans, which are the truest at this point.

Ms. Alschuler stated her assumption that there is no marina around Shoreline Park but only at the Clinton Basin location and the existing marina at the end of Fifth Avenue.

Ms. Kuehl stated the existing marina at the end of Fifth Avenue is a private marina and needs to be upgraded. There is a proposed new marina in Clinton Basin, but there is other thinking about a marina and where it should go. She stated she was unable to include it in her presentation because it has yet to come forward.

Ms. Gaffney stated the current BCDC permit does not authorize a marina. It authorizes the removal of the docks in Clinton Basin. She agreed that the exhibits indicate that a marina would be planned at a future date but it has not yet been authorized.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the programming planned at Parcels L, K, and M, which is the development adjacent to the two parks. There is a policy included in the meeting packet that talks about the massing of buildings next to parks. She asked if the decision to increase the paved area and festival area to the north of Parcel M is related to the massing of that building and if shadow studies have been done. She asked if those areas are all residential or if they have other uses. She also asked what the thinking is that would enliven these parks.

Ms. Kuehl stated those areas are all residential. Parcels L, K, and M are perhaps even more residential than other places. There is retail along Brooklyn Basin Way and along the waterfront. The activation at Parcels L, K, and M might include waterfront restaurants or cafés. It is up to the developer who does that parcel to determine what to do.

Ms. Kuehl stated Parcel M is one of the sites that is slated to be a tower site but may not be in the end. The thinking about what that (parking/event) space should be is partially related to the scale of the buildings but more related to the idea of wanting individuals to feel that they could come here by bicycle, public transit, or car and feel like there is a destination for everyone. That is what is driving most of the thinking.

Mr. Battalio asked to return to staff Exhibit A, the prior Roma plan sketch. He noted that on the left side of the image there is a honeycombed hatching. He asked if that is rock or sand. Ms. Kuehl stated there are not too many rocks there, but there is quite a bit of sand, trash, and slumped asphalt.

Mr. Battalio asked if the pictures shown during the presentation were of the location shown on Exhibit A. Ms. Kuehl stated they were.

Mr. Battalio asked where the beach is that was in that picture. Ms. Kuehl pointed out locations on her presentation slide where it listed the existing wetlands to remain and a location where the beach is accumulating in the area. She noted that the hatched area is partly in that location.

Mr. Battalio stated what is seen naturally are littoral ridges or beaches with wetlands behind them. Sometimes those wetlands do not have enough area and tidal prism or volume of water that goes in and out with each tide to maintain an opening through the end so they are perched. Having a beach does not preclude having a wetland behind it, although it may be different than what was anticipated.

Ms. Kuehl stated sediments continue to increase in these areas. She agreed that it does not preclude having a wetland behind it and stated it could go around but she is unsure that that is where it is headed.



Mr. Battalio asked if the project proponents know where the sand is coming from and if they expect to deposit it in other locations within the project.

Ms. Kuehl stated she did not know where the sand is coming from for certain. She stated deposits will be seen on south pieces of shoreline. She stated the Cove, which is part of Shoreline Park, has the same kind of accumulation and condition and the high-water line there has been making a more natural shape.

Mr. Battalio stated that is a great observation. It sounds like a design opportunity. Ms. Kuehl agreed but stated it is not part of new construction of this project.

Mr. Battalio referred to Exhibit Slide L14.0, the cross-section of South Park, and stated the toe or the bottom of the rock slope protection is cut into the slope so that it is perched up above the slope. It is fairly flat but there are soft soils in places. He stated he would typically look for some sort of minimum offset between the limit of excavation and the rock toe to form a bench to guard against a local slope instability. He asked about the new material that will be used for backfill. Ms. Kuehl stated she did not know.

Mr. Battalio asked if the elevation at 12.37 is two feet of sea level rise and one foot of freeboard. Ms. Kuehl stated it was, plus or minus.

Mr. Battalio asked if there was an adaptation plan for high sea levels. Ms. Kuehl stated there is some horizontal distance that is allowed where there is room and there is some thinking about how it would be done but there is not yet a specific plan for the 2100 level.

Mr. Battalio referred to Exhibit Slide L23.0, the cross-section of Channel Park, and stated it looks like there will be a copious amount of excavation at Section B, the section along the Oakland Estuary, and that, after the excavation, there is a steep slope that is armored. Ms. Kuehl stated that is correct.

Mr. Battalio asked if there is an alternative to using armor, such as a flatter slope with vegetation. Ms. Kuehl stated she has been unable to get that approved. It is worth a conversation.

Mr. Battalio suggested it may depend on where the design is in the plan formulation. He used the example of Crissy Field, in San Francisco, where there are places with armoring and places without. Ms. Kuehl stated a Wave Runup Report was completed for this area and the slide shows the minimum allowances for this location.

Ms. Alschuler stated the presentation indicated that the park was smaller than previously designed but the information the Board received was that South Park went from 1.97 acres to 2.3 acres and that Channel Park went from 4.36 areas to 5.97 acres. This is a significant amount of additional acreage in the park. She asked if this information is correct.

Ms. Gaffney stated there are acreages that are authorized within the BCDC's jurisdiction and there are overall acreages of the park. She stated her understanding that the overall acreage of the park has remained the same and that, perhaps, the areas within the BCDC jurisdiction have been slightly modified.

Ms. Kuehl stated the acreage of the park has to be above a certain elevation to count and the project proponents are making a more open-water design so the land mass is getting smaller. The total acreage of the park as currently designed has gone slightly up.

Mr. Pellegrini asked for clarification on the State Lands piece and that there are uses that are no longer considerable. He asked if there are other restrictions to public access that the Board should be aware of within the State Lands, such as time of day or activities that would restrict public access in those areas.

Ms. Kuehl stated State Lands have strict rules that say nothing is allowed that is of non-regional use. As defined by many years, regional uses are flat, green open-spaces, parking lots, and bathrooms. Anything other than that program goes beyond State Lands rules. There are examples where individuals have gone beyond the rules and succeeded but there are a number of examples where success was not attained.

Ms. Kuehl stated that is the biggest restriction other than the many conversations with the city of Oakland planning staff about how to maintain the park, how the park could succeed over time, and how it fits within the family of Oakland parks. There are no other significant restrictions.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about offsite connectivity and if considerations are being made as part of this project, such as the Fifth Street underpass or other principal connections at the edges that would allow for or enable increased access to the site.

Ms. Kuehl stated a proposal to add protected bicycle lanes on Fifth Street is currently in development as part of this project to increase connectivity. There is additional potential for a protected bicycle lane on the Embarcadero. She stated an effort is being made to ensure that the site feels public.

Ms. Gaffney stated Public Trust lands must have Trust-consistent water-oriented uses and cannot be seen or perceived to be a local-serving recreational amenity. This is why playgrounds, dog parks, and play courts are typically discouraged from Public Trust lands.

Mr. Pellegrini stated it is not known how the residential buildings are orienting to these parks. He asked if the State Land boundary goes up to the future development line or if there is a buffer zone in between the State Land and where there will be a building.

Mr. Van Ness stated each of the development parcels is a property boundary. The buildings will be built with required setbacks so there will be a buffer between those spaces and the adjacent public open space or right-of-way. The parcels that have been submitted for preliminary design review around Clinton Basin have active interactions between the adjacent spaces and the residential space.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the height of the buildings. Mr. Van Ness stated the overall massing of the site was a plan of approximately 85 feet. There are locations where the height could increase significantly up to 240 feet.

(1) Parcel A is a housing parcel that is nearly completed. There was no tower placed on that location.

(2) Parcels H and J have been submitted to the BCDC staff and to the city for review. There are no towers at those locations and the buildings are at the approximate 85-foot level.

Ms. Alschuler asked for verification that there are no towers in these locations. Mr. Van Ness stated there are no towers in Phases 1 or 2. He stated there are development rights to put towers in Phases 3 and 4, but those designs are yet to be determined.

Ms. Kuehl noted there are things on the front page that are out of date since the overview rendering was done during the planning phase.

d. **Public Hearing.** Six members of the public provided the following comments:

(1) Ms. Gaffney summarized the written comments submitted by Stewart Port as follows:

(a) Mr. Port was concerned about the inconsistency of South Park – the original 2007 plans and the permit authorizations that included all the permit requirements of having the 4- to 10-foot-wide sidewalks and 22-foot-wide Bay Trail connections. He pointed out the inconsistencies between the permit requirements and the proposed plan for South Park.

(b) Mr. Port also stated the project came before the Oakland Planning Commission on November 7, 2018, with changes for a revised Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and a proposed marina, including the Brooklyn Basin project. He included a link to the Oakland Planning Commission document that showed the proposed project.

Ms. Alschuler asked if that project is related to South Park and Channel Park. Ms. Gaffney stated it is adjacent to South Park.

(2) Daniel Franco stated the project proponents are a pack of liars. There are a lot of omissions. He stated the proposed marina is even larger than what is depicted on the front drawing that is suddenly being disclaimed by the project proponents when they were called out on it. He stated they are proposing a mega marina and big towers on Parcels K, L, and M, which is what Mr. Port referred to in his comment – the project proponents are now saying that it is just a drawing and it might not happen. Mr. Franco cautioned the Board not to take the project proponents at face value.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board was just handed a drawing dated November of 2014.

Mr. Franco stated it is probably the same plan,. He stated there have been meetings at the Oakland Planning Commission and that is the date being discussed where the proponents talked about a mega marina. He stated that is getting to be a bigger point – it spits in the face of any sane definition of wetlands to say that the tiny wetlands, which is less than one acre, will be able to survive as a wetlands when there is a mega marina built around it.

Mr. Franco stated the project proponents have lied about many things such as that the Shoreline Park will open soon with lovely amenities that are apparently now gone, such as restrooms. Instead, shipping containers were tossed into the water that the Coast Guard made the project proponents clean up. There is a long list of fibs.

Mr. Franco stated the top corner near Parcel A was also going to be a small wetlands area but is now a sidewalk and a storm drain. The project proponents claim that it has always been a sidewalk and a storm drain but they had pitched it as part of the park as a wetlands in that top corner. Again, it was too small to be useful as a wetlands, but that is how the plan was pitched and approved.

Mr. Franco stated it is the height of hypocrisy to have things in the drawings that the project proponents claim will protect the butterflies. He stated all 90 acres were going to be meaningful wetlands in the 1998 Estuary Plan, not a tiny postage stamp size. It is wrong for the project proponents to say that they are trying to protect butterflies when what they are actually doing is stealing land from the creatures that cannot be in attendance to speak for themselves.

(3) Naomi Schiff, Founding Member of the Coalition of Advocates for Lake Merritt (Coalition) and Board Member of the Oakland Heritage Alliance (Alliance), stated the Coalition and Alliance do not see the Fifth Avenue area as an impediment but as a cultural resource full of artists. She asked why the promised restrooms were removed from the proposed plan. She suggested that the project proponents provide a diagram of all 24-hour accessible public restrooms in this development.

Ms. Schiff stated not only was there discussion of a large marina at the Oakland Planning Commission meetings, but something that was never written in the Notice of Preparation for Environmental Impact Reports was the word "dredging." Dredging was requested presumably for sailboat keels. She asked how the marsh can be engineered to be deepened and shallowed simultaneously.

Ms. Schiff stated she has questioned the riprap and she stated the hope that the Board would help the landscape architect push on the engineer against the use of riprap if that is the way to do it.

Ms. Schiff stated fewer palm trees are better. The shore has not historically been ringed with palm trees. Architects like palm trees because they do not get in the way of buildings but palm trees serve no purpose for users of the parks. She suggested an appropriate landscape plan that minimizes palms and maximizes salt-tolerant native plants.

Ms. Schiff stated the Lake Merritt Channel is an important marker on the Pacific Flyway. She cautioned against designing it so much that the birds do not make it to their winter grounds.

(4) Sandra Threlfall, Executive Director, Waterfront Action, stated the mantra of Waterfront Action is, once people get to the water, they come back. She stated the high-rise buildings along the roadway make it so individuals cannot see that there is water on the other side. She stated it is almost irrelevant that there are public parks down there, especially for individuals with differing cultural backgrounds.

Ms. Threlfall stated one of the things that the project proponents are excited about is the acreage they have given for parks, but, in fact, all of those acres are because of the Public Trust – the parks are on Public Trust land where public housing is not permitted. She stated this should help the Board better see where the Public Trust is and where the housing is. The Public Trust is for everyone, not just for individuals who can afford the apartments or condominiums.

Ms. Threlfall distributed a handout to the Board and stated the existing mitigation area at the top of Clinton Basin has a marina around it with more slips for ships. This is not logical.

Ms. Threlfall stated Waterfront Action also negotiated for the grey area around Lake Merritt Channel on the right of the presentation slide.

Ms. Alschuler stated that area is the Channel Park area.

Ms. Threlfall stated the grey area was going to be as natural as possible to encourage the birds to come and wildlife that live there to stay. She spoke against the use of riprap.

Ms. Threlfall stated the concern that the needs and desires of the surrounding communities are continually being discounted. If a marina goes in and if the area is rippapped, it becomes what surrounding communities were afraid of – a private development.

(5) David Wofford, Member and Representative of East Lake Neighbors, stated East Lake Neighbors is a neighborhood not far from the proposed project. He stated he grew up in this area at the park, although he stated he never thought of it as a park. It was just a place where he played and grew up.

Ms. Alschuler asked Mr. Wofford to show the Board the area where he grew up on a presentation slide. Mr. Wofford stated it was at Park Boulevard and East 18th.

Mr. Wofford added that the Oakland Museum and the Henry J. Kaiser Convention Center will be remodeled. He stated he also participated in the reopening of the Rotary Nature Center, which sits at the start of the channel. Programming is being developed there that will be relative to the Channel Park and South Park development. He stated he also sits on the Measure DD Coalition.

(6) Lee Chien Huo, Bay Trail Planner, San Francisco Bay Trail Project, stated he was glad to see the two projects on the same agenda because it is difficult to comment about the Bay Trail without looking at things holistically because that is how the concept of the Bay Trail works.

Ms. Alschuler asked staff to show Slide 32, Bay Trail Diagram, to assist Mr. Huo in his discussion.

Mr. Huo stated the importance of the Bay Trail, not just in these two park areas but for the entire Brooklyn Basin project. He stated it is about capacity and consistency of type of trail. He stated capacity is cumulative width of what will be called the Bay Trail. He stated it is not shown on Slide 32, but it is in the Lake Merritt Connector Trail project – there is a good display map that shows the different projects and activities that are happening within that region.

Mr. Huo stated once this connection is made from Lake Merritt and the entire communities that it opens up to in Oakland, this will be a highly-used area for the Bay Trail. He stated it is possibly one of the more anticipated sections of connecting to the Bay Trail than most other projects. The Golden Gate Fields project is the only other project that is at this level of anticipation.

Mr. Huo asked the project proponents to look at the capacity of this, not just in terms of these two parks but in terms of the overall project. He asked what the width is and what the width needs to be for the future with higher populations when the Bay Trail is connected. He asked if the proposed width is adequate at this point and if it can be consistent enough so that it does not create pinch points.

Mr. Huo stated, in terms of the type of trail, he was unsure if he was reading the plans correctly. The circulation plan talks about the connection because the Fifth Avenue property cannot be crossed at this point. There are trails that go back towards the Embarcadero. He stated the circulation plan talks about a Class 3 facility as well as the Bay Trail. He asked if those are two separate facilities. He stated his desire that the facility can be used by everyone and that everyone would want to use it.

Mr. Huo stated the trail needs to be made a Class 1, a safe facility that children can be taken on and individuals who may have difficulty walking or bicycling can utilize.

Mr. Huo stated, although the Fifth Avenue site is not available along the shoreline at this point, they need to ensure that the trails being built in these two parks are built in such a way that it does not preclude that shoreline connection in the future.

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

Ms. Alschuler asked Board members if they felt more discussion was required on the connection with the bridge. She stated the importance of connecting the parks to the bridge.

Board members agreed that there was enough discussion about the connection to the bridge during the discussion on the parks.

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

Design of the Proposed Public Access:

(1) Do the proposed designs encourage diverse activities and create a “sense of place,” which is unique and enjoyable, and inviting to the public?

Suggestions to this question are incorporated in the responses to other questions.

(2) Do the proposed public access improvements for both parks create diverse recreational opportunities for all people, regardless of race, culture, age, ability, and income level?

Mr. Strang stated going to the site is instructive because it is a unique remnant of many aspects of Bay Area culture. He stated the need to figure out how this park can respond to the context and preserve some of what is there, and to understand that there are residents who are living in an unusual neighborhood who are likely to be there among mid- and high-rises for a long time. There are opportunities to bring in a layer of detail that would acknowledge that.

Mr. Strang noted the interesting comment given by a member of the public on whether the area, especially South Park, is inviting and accessible. He stated the park is landlocked in its current location. He stated, although the Board is not reviewing Clinton Basin today, after hearing public comment he questioned why the Board is not looking more closely at Clinton Basin because there is a constricted access point along the edge. There is new housing pushed up against the basin, which would be nice for individuals to live in but would not necessarily be inviting, and the park would not be visible for people who want to visit.

Mr. Strang stated, in addition to that, the two parks do not connect, which is a circumstance that must be dealt with, and the Bay Trail may have to wind around the Fifth Street neighborhood. He stated it seems like it should be opened up more - that there should be more space between Parcel M and Parks K and L and a more predictable setback at Clinton Basin.

Mr. Pellegrini stated it would be helpful to better understand the sectional condition between Parcels M, K, and L and the private zone to capture how generous that space is and if there is an opportunity to think about that as a front door as opposed to what the current plan infers.

Ms. Alschuler asked what Mr. Pellegrini meant by "front door."

Mr. Pellegrini stated he meant the short- to medium-term pedestrian and bicycle access around the private portion. He stated it would be helpful to understand what that looks like and, as Mr. Huo mentioned, there is ambiguity between what is marked as Bay Trail and is happening in the cross-section. It would be helpful to see a drawing or diagram.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board was told yesterday during the site visit that some of the Bay Trail section has already been built. Ms. Gaffney stated there is an interim Bay Trail requirement that is currently under construction.

Ms. Alschuler stated Mr. Strang was talking about an area along Clinton Basin.

Mr. Strang clarified there are three parallel passages there that are potentially constricted. He stated there is also the question about the marinas. The Board has a diagram of one of them and has seen several renditions of what the marinas might do. He asked the project proponents to update the Board on the marinas.

Mr. Strang stated there is also a question about the marina that is opposite of the private parcel, which could be improved in the future or be removed altogether. There are important pieces of this project location that are hard to understand at this point.

Ms. Alschuler suggested beginning with what the Board was given to review - the two parks. She asked if the marina is major enough to come back to the Board for review and what the timing looks like in relation to building the parks. Mr. Van Ness stated BCDC and Board review will be required for any marina proposal.

Ms. Alschuler stated concern about the marina and stated the need for the Board to see more information as they are revised.

Mr. Van Ness stated there have been a couple of questions about development blocks, mostly in relation to the sense of arrival to the parks that are under review today. He stated the main thing the project proponents are looking for from the Board today is, since these designs have changed since the Commission approved the project originally, how these changes affect the public access areas and how these two street spaces, even though there is a context of the larger development, continue to provide the essential public access experience that the Commission approved several years ago.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board has a concern about the sense of arrival to both of these parks. The park along Clinton Basin is important because it is a fire truck route as well. Ms. Gaffney stated her assumption that the Promenade was always assumed to be an emergency vehicle access route.

Ms. Alschuler stated it has been changed since the prior drawing. Ms. Kuehl stated the change is that the fire trucks used to run around the edge of the water and then turn back in at the end. The current plan pulls the fire trucks in sooner.

Ms. Alschuler stated South Park is threatened in terms of individuals feeling that it is a public space. She stated this area is a wonderful idea with it being a hub for the Bay Trail and the future bridge, but it is hard to imagine how the people using the Bay Trail will feel.

Ms. Alschuler asked what will make individuals come back in once they have gone out to the Embarcadero. There needs to be enticements and things happening, and there will have to be things when the designs for those buildings go in that make that work and make individuals feel safe and comfortable day and night.

Ms. McCann stated the Board heard that the park should have its own sense of identity and the studies show different character. The Board also heard important comments today about the sense of public space versus private space and about the importance of habitat. She stated she was unsure whether creating a different, distinct character in these places is the right approach and whether they should be a more consistent approach that is clearly public and cues that are public so that individuals coming in are clear that this is public.

Ms. McCann stated the materials in the meeting packet are beautiful and the furnishings look good but they connote something which is not necessarily public. She stated individuals will just want to get to the water's edge. She questioned whether the character of the sense of place is really what should be the sense of place for these parks.



Mr. Pellegrini stated he shared Ms. McCann's concern about this. It is interesting that the previous design felt integral, even if it did not necessarily feel urban and open. It felt integrated in that the open spaces, parking areas, and the Bay Trail were seen as a similar family of forms. He stated his concern that the design is beginning to feel more segregated in many ways - that the individual park spaces are partitioned or broken up into areas that start to suggest less flexibility in how they might be used.

Mr. Pellegrini asked how it should be thought about now that it is over a decade old. This was designed when the idea of this waterfront being public was less possible than it is today. He suggested evolving the design in a direction where the amount of public access could be taken as a baseline.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested that the corner of the channel might have a significant piece of infrastructure touching down that indicates that the area is an anchor of the old estuary. He used the example of going across the Berkeley Marina pedestrian bridge and, upon descent, finding nothing there. There is an opportunity to think about some of these spaces more holistically that might become grander or more significant open spaces that could be thought of as being more public.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the short answer to staff's question is yes, it does not seem to be less public than what was previously proposed, but his question is if it should be more public. It does not yet feel that way and community concerns can be interpreted that there are similar worries that the land that is being offered and how it is designed and being presented is not quite public.

Mr. Strang stated the current design is consistent with what was previously proposed but maybe that is no longer appropriate.

Mr. Pellegrini stated there are quantitatively similar cross-sections in terms of access of the Bay Trail. Some areas are cut away while other areas are expanded but, generally, it is the amount of open space that is being offered. He stated he is not sure where to go with that.

Mr. Strang stated it is less programmed in some ways than it was before and more naturalistic is probably more highly valued now, given the amount of land currently being developed. He stated it sounded like Mr. Pellegrini was suggesting that it could be simplified, wilder, or more natural than what is shown.

Ms. Alschuler referred to Exhibit Slide L2.0 and suggested looking at the area as a whole and thinking about where it was before Shoreline Park was redone, which was more of a typical waterfront park. Brooklyn Basin is an unusual solution along the waterfront with a large amount of space and beautiful materials. She stated the need for large visual signals along the Embarcadero that something amazing is there that will be worth going to.

Ms. Alschuler stated Brooklyn Basin's large open space needs to be programmed. At the other end there is a flexible paved space that should not just sit there. The same is true of this end. She stated management and maintenance of the whole project will be critical to its use over time.

Ms. Alschuler stated the parks are both large spaces in their way with potential for events, but the outline of the buildings might not now be the best way for people to see their way through the blocks. She suggested modifying the buildings and used the example of Parcel M. Parcel M turns that angle towards the Embarcadero. She stated the need to rethink the Embarcadero in a way where individuals on the bridge coming east will see the park or see something happening in the festival area that will draw them in.

Ms. Alschuler stated her biggest worry is South Park, which is almost invisible. She stated it may need something to mark it that can be seen from Clinton Basin to encourage individuals to visit.

(3) Does the Bay Trail as proposed provide sufficient space for pedestrians and bicyclists to navigate the trail safely?

Ms. Alschuler stated the need for the Bay Trail to have a consistent path with special attention given to it as it curves around the Fifth Avenue neighborhood.

(4) Are the proposed parks designed to enhance the pleasure of the user and viewer of the Bay?

Mr. Battalio stated it is not clear that as much of the rock revetment is needed, especially behind the wetland in South Park and where the shore is being cut into in the Channel Park area. He suggested that those areas would provide an opportunity to do a flatter slope that is more vegetated and more dissipative for waves. He inferred that the waves in this area are not significant since the boat slips (at the 5th Street Marina) seemed fairly exposed.

Mr. Battalio stated the high area at Channel Park presents an opportunity for some sort of ecotone that goes into an oak meadow, which would resonate with the city of Oakland. That kind of meadow with oaks down into wetlands is something that is of interest.

Mr. Battalio spoke against the idea of having a trail along the shoreline with some sort of armoring along it. He asked why there has to be a Class 1 trail that close to the water. Ms. Gaffney stated one of the goals of the Bay Trail is to design access as close to the water as possible.

Mr. Battalio suggested that that access to the water be a more natural access. A lot of rock is not necessary unless it is a rocky intertidal habitat. The large hillside is a natural feature with rocks in it that would erode slowly.

Mr. Strang agreed and stated the Board has encouraged the Bay Trail to pull away from the shore many times to create edge variety.

(5) Are the proposed shoreline designs appropriate to recruit tidal marsh vegetation along Channel Park?

Mr. Pellegrini stated Crissy Field comes to mind where the experience is somewhat static and individuals can participate in the changing environment of time. He stated he liked the idea of (plant) recruitment. He asked how individuals would be able to interact with, view, or experience that on the land side that would be less static. He asked how the design of the park on the upland area is associated with what is happening at this lower level.

Ms. Alschuler asked if Mr. Pellegrini was referring to interpretation materials.

Mr. Pellegrini stated there are two possibilities in the Channel Park area - there is a viewing hill or the hill may not be there with only one path. It is an open area with an edge condition where individuals could view the area that would be recruited (by vegetation.) He asked for more guidance on what that could be like.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he liked that the parking areas in the previous proposal are shifting towards something much more conducive to flexible use.

Mr. Strang agreed. He asked, given the large deck at Shoreline Park, if another event space will be appropriately activated and if there is enough density in this location to make that into something. He asked, unless it was a festival area, if the Parcel M multiuse parking lot had to be so large. He asked about the number of cars that will park there.

Ms. McCann stated she understood the idea of the multiuse plaza coming down to the edge of the water but in this case, with the two pieces of the park on either side, there could be value in pulling it back and letting the softer spaces connect more by not bringing that all the way to the water's edge.

Ms. McCann stated the more the amount of paving can be reduced the better for the connectivity between each of these pockets, particularly connectivity of planting areas.

Mr. Pellegrini stated modifying the hill provides flexibility in thinking about the land and the tangential direction, which might help unify the open space along the shoreline with the parking behind.

Ms. McCann referred to Exhibit Slide L24.0, Sculptural and Iconic Tree Species, and stated there was public comment about including more native plants and Mr. Battalio mentioned oak trees. She suggested examining the plant palette further. She used the example of the Araucaria trees, which do not tolerate an understory and are not native to this area. She suggested simplifying the tree selection to make a strong relationship with the different habitat types that are being proposed.

Mr. Strang agreed. He stated the *Washingtonia filifera* is a California native but is not native to the Bay Area and does not do well in a coastal setting. He stated the *Washingtonia filibusta* is a hybrid that does better in coastal settings. The *Araucaria* is a beautiful iconic coastal tree around the world but it requires fast drainage, which is a limiting factor.

Mr. Battalio stated projects in the Bay have been able to get away with natural recruitment but because of the soil chemistry it sometimes takes a few years. This works in a depositional environment where there are rhizomes floating around nearby wetlands. He stated, for some of the mitigation projects, there is a tendency to plant to try to get the vegetation to establish rapidly.

Mr. Battalio stated it is acceptable to recruit tidal marsh vegetation as long as it is a low-energy area and there is reason to believe that it is an area where natural recruitment is probable. He cautioned that it may not happen quickly depending on the soil chemistry.

Mr. Battalio stated his concern is with the armoring and his earlier question about what the new material will be, both of which could affect the likelihood that the energy will be low enough for plants to establish in the right soil.

(6) Would the proposed design for Channel Park align with the future public access to be provided by the Lake Merritt Bridge Connector project?

Ms. Alschuler stated the assumption that, if this bridge has any chance of going ahead, this park needs to work the best it can with it. It is more likely to be the second option of the park than the first.

Ms. McCann stated it would be ideal to see a plan that builds off the bridge landing.

(7) Would the parks be enhanced by including other site amenities?

Ms. Alschuler stated there was public comment about the marina. The Board will ask to review the plan again if there is a marina added.

Ms. Alschuler stated there was public comment about the removal of restrooms. Ms. Kuehl stated there are two restrooms in Shoreline Park - one is in the 9th Avenue Terminal and the other is the Portland Loo, a public outdoor restroom. The Portland Loo facility will be evaluated and will potentially be added into future areas of the park.

Ms. Kuehl stated the plan currently consists of several cafés and other opportunities for restrooms. She stated Lake Merritt has one public restroom, which is not enough but public restrooms are difficult. She stated the hope that the Portland Loo works so those could be added into the Plaza in Channel Park and in Clinton Basin.

Ms. Alschuler stated restroom are a necessary requirement. Restrooms will be needed inside the buildings or outside in both parks because the two parks do not easily connect.

Ms. Alschuler stated there was public comment about the palm trees.

Mr. Strang stated he does not feel strongly either way but project proponents need to research varieties that will do well in this location. There are a number of options there.

Ms. McCann stated the cross-sections do not help because they show a line of palms but not the context of the other trees to them. She suggested a limited use of palm trees to specific reasons such as a marker to help individuals orient around a trail point. There needs to be a good balance with trees that will provide shade. The plans at this time are not developed. She suggested that the emphasis should be on trees for habitat and shade.

Ms. Alschuler stated what it looks like along those narrow paths of the Bay Trail to encourage individuals to go to the water will be important.

Ms. Kuehl stated the city of Oakland liked the palm trees because there are many public places in Oakland where there are palm trees at the waterfront. The project proponents have heard mixed reviews. She agreed with the need for more shade trees.

Ms. Alschuler suggested that the project proponents show the Board how individuals will get to these parks from the neighborhoods beyond this map. It is daunting when looking at the rail lines and highways.

Sea Level Rise:

(8) Are the public access areas appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to future flooding?

Ms. Alschuler stated she ran the application to review the future of the site with different levels of sea level rise. The project proponents will raise the whole site by three feet. She stated she was unsure about what is planned for the Bay Trail and paths behind the buildings as a result. It would be important to know that.

Ms. Alschuler stated the sections listed in the meeting materials suggest potential problems in the future and the application showed the edge completely vulnerable on the whole of the site. The notes state that long-term adaptation was for the future but did not comment on it. This project has to last longer than that.

Mr. Battalio stated he commented on this earlier. It would be interesting to see the adaptation plan. He stated locating the Bay Trail close to the shore is not directly aligned with the objective of adaptation.

f. **Applicant Response.** Ms. Kuehl thanked the Board for their useful comments. She stated she wanted the Board to know that there is a CFD (community facilities district) for all of Brooklyn Basin. In terms of maintenance and programming for all of Brooklyn Basin, there is an entity in place that will be doing that and funding that in perpetuity, which changes the opportunity. Many Oakland public spaces suffer from lack of maintenance. This project will not because it has a mechanism to take care of it.

Ms. Kuehl stated the Board comments are things the project proponents have been thinking about. This project has been designed at the level of a master plan as it was before in that there are parcels and important relationships for setting programming, but it is not yet at the level of a refined design.

Ms. Kuehl stated the project proponents were looking for direction from the Board for where to go with this to get it back to the level of approval there was before with the changes in design. She stated there is an opportunity to keep refining the design. She welcomed comments that will help with the framework and stated big goals are great. The design will continue to be refined as detailed changes are made as part of the design process.

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

(1) There were big-picture questions about visibility, access, and programming.

(2) There was general comfort with the changes made to the plan and understanding the State Lands requirement, but there were many qualifying statements and questions.

Mr. Strang stated what is unusual about the site is that it is a little unregulated right now and there is a happenstance wildness to it that is important to both the residents and the environment that is rapidly disappearing.

Ms. Gaffney asked under what conditions the Board will want to see this project again.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board may need to see this project again if the design evolves in a dramatic way. The Board would especially be interested in the resolution of the marina.

**6. Lake Merritt to Bay Trail Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge, City of Oakland, Alameda County (First Pre-Application Review).** The Board held their first review of a proposal by the city of Oakland to construct an elevated pedestrian and bicycle bridge along the Lake Merritt Channel, in the City of Oakland. The proposed bridge is intended to create a continuous pedestrian and bicycle trail from Lake Merritt to the Bay Trail at the Oakland Estuary, and would touch down and connect to existing or planned trail segments at four locations. The project would also include removal of a deteriorated railroad bridge. The proposed project would include an overlook on the bridge, a resting/overlook spot at the top of each set of stairs, and integrated seating.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Rebecca Coates-Maldoon, BCDC Principal Permit Analyst, introduced the project, showed a video from a recent site visit, and described points of interest as the video played.

Ms. Coates-Maldoon made three corrections to the staff report: (1) Page 1, Existing Conditions: The Western Pacific Railroad is not in active use. The Union Pacific Railroad is still in active use; (2) Page 2: The text before "Proposed Project" is errant text. Please disregard; and (3) Pages 3-4: The sea level rise assessments discuss incorrect elevations for Victory Court and Channel Park. The updated elevations raise the Victory Court and Channel Park elevations.

Ms. Coates-Maldoon summarized the issues in the staff report including whether the project:

(1) Provides ample, diverse, and adequate opportunities for public use, including for both pedestrians and bicyclists.

(2) Adequately allows for recreational use of Lake Merritt Channel, including for kayaks and other low-clearance navigational vessels passing beneath the bridge.

(3) Includes public amenities that are adequate, distributed, and designed to balance the needs of visitors and natural resources in the project vicinity.

(4) Designs the bridge in a manner that is universally accessible for the public.

(5) Designs the bridge to take advantage of Bay views.

(6) Provides an appropriate landmark to identify the location of the Bay in areas where it's not immediately visible.

(7) Includes a bridge design that minimizes view impacts of the shoreline and Bay from other high points such as the I-880 overpass and the Embarcadero.

(8) Includes bridge railing and fencing that maximizes Bay viewing opportunities for all users.

(9) Includes appropriate connections at the bridge touchdown points (Peralta, Victory Court, Channel Park, and Embarcadero Bridge) to connect people to and along the shoreline, and designs the lower accessway to adequately provide connections to and invitations to use the bicycle and pedestrian bridge.

(10) Adequately integrates the bridge with existing or planned public access at the touchdown sites (e.g., Channel Park).

(11) Appropriately designs the proposed bicycle and pedestrian bridge to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise.

(12) Includes a bridge design that facilitates future adaptation of the shoreline, e.g. at its touchdown locations.

b. **Project Presentation.** Diane Tannenwald, Project Manager, City of Oakland, introduced the project team. She provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the project goals, context, and existing site conditions.

Steven Grover, Steven Grover and Associates, the architects of the proposed project, continued the slide presentation and provided a detailed description of the proposed project.

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

Ms. McCann asked for clarification about the extent of the project that is under review today.

Mr. Grover displayed a presentation slide and stated what is shown in yellow on the slide is the extent of the project – the four touchdowns but not the white paths, which are possible future paths, or upgrades to the Channel Park path or other paths shown in green or white.

Ms. McCann asked staff if there are current discussions to upgrade the paths to connect with a higher-quality park connection.

Ms. Gaffney stated she is not aware of any plans to upgrade the paths. There are projects being considered for some of the sites and likely there will be upgrades made due to elevation differences, and that some of these areas are flooding with king tides and storm events.

Mr. Strang asked how the proposed project ties in with the future improvements on the channel, how sea level rise affects the channel, and what kinds of long-term plans are in place to deal with the channel.

Ms. Tannenwald stated it is controlled at Seventh Street. In the 1800s, it was an uncontrolled swampy area. The challenge is that, if it is not controlled, there will be flooding around Lake Merritt. It is currently controlled to keep Lake Merritt at an appropriate level.

Mr. Pellegrini asked for clarification that this portion of the channel is subject to tides because it is south of the Seventh Street Flood Control Station point. Ms. Tannenwald stated that is correct.

Ms. Alschuler stated it currently floods. Ms. Tannenwald stated the Oakland Fire Training Facility floods. She stated that area is at a lower elevation and is subject to flooding.

Mr. Battalio asked if there is a strategy to adapt the landings, to perhaps raise them up if, in the future, sea level is higher or if it can be built into the structural scheme.

Mr. Grover responded as follows:

(1) Elevation 12, at Point A, the Peralta touchdown, is floodproof for a long period of time.

(2) Elevation 15, at Point C, the Channel Park touchdown, is not expected to flood in the foreseeable future.

(3) The elevation at Point B, the Victory Court touchdown, is approximately one-half foot lower than Point A.

Mr. Grover stated the location at Point B could be easily adapted by raising the touchdown in the future. It would mean that a step or two would be lost on one side, the ramp would be shorter on the other side, and the clearance would be slightly less under the structure. The project proponents are trying to balance these considerations. The goal is to maintain a clearance with a comfortable, open feeling with the understanding that it could be reduced and still have more than ten feet clearance in the future, if the landing needed to be adapted. These adaptations at Points A and B would not be a large challenge.

Mr. Strang asked for additional detail on the materials that will be used for the bridge and stairway. Mr. Grover stated the primary structural material is steel. The foundations are concrete and the use of wood accents is foreseen at the railings and benches to help soften the feel.

Mr. Strang asked about the materials used for the large flaring structural piece that rises above the walkway.

Mr. Grover stated the presentation slides showed two different versions of the structure – an open truss-work and a girder wall. The girder wall has the opportunity to be lower in profile and more compact. The open truss-work theoretically has the possibility of being more open. He stated, in the current analyses, the project proponents are finding that the member sizes for the open truss-work are rather large. The goal is to make this as visually low-profile as possible.

Mr. Strang asked if the material is steel in the areas that appear to be solid. Mr. Grover stated it is. He noted that, if it were a girder wall, it could be lower than shown on the presentation slide – more like eight feet high.



Ms. Alschuler asked if the illustration that looks like a solid wall is the taller version. Mr. Grover stated it is and it is important factor to key in on. He stated the massing here is approximately what can be expected with a truss structure. The height can be slightly lower with a solid girder wall.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the purpose of this structure. Mr. Grover stated it is what is holding up the bridge. It is similar to a beam.

Mr. Pellegrini asked Mr. Grover to quantify the height of the truss at its tallest point from grade. Mr. Grover stated his comment about it being rather large was in reference to the member size. He stated it would be approximately 25 feet over the deck in the open version.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the maximum height of the bridge level from grade, for example, where it is clearing the tracks. He asked if that is the highest point.

Mr. Grover stated it is 41 feet. The clearance requirement above the tracks is 23.4 feet with 30 inches of structure depth being allowed for at the points where it crosses into the right-of-way. He pointed out the edge of the right-of-way on a presentation slide and stated it is 23.4 feet above the tracks and a straight horizontal line across to the other side where it is at 23.4 feet above the Embarcadero so it is symmetrical.

Mr. Pellegrini asked what the path of travel would be for someone who is disabled to utilize this bridge structure to get from the channel to the new Channel Park.

Mr. Grover stated someone in a wheelchair, for example, would come along the pathway trying to get to Point D and would rise at an approximately 4.9 percent grade, have the opportunity to rest at points along the way, and would descend at an approximately 4.9 percent grade to the landing.

Mr. Grover stated, if someone in a wheelchair was coming along a different pathway that he pointed out on the presentation slide, they would go up to halfway across, make a U-turn midway, and come back.

Mr. Grover stated if the individual in the wheelchair wanted to go to Channel Park, they would have an approximately 4.9 percent grade to get from Point D to Point C down into Channel Park.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) believes that the freeway, which was a Loma Prieta earthquake reconstruction, will be in its present location in the near-, medium-, and long-term future. The Union Pacific Railroad (UP) in this location is also utilizable by Amtrak. He asked if the UP is in its long-term location.

Ms. Tannenwald stated the project proponents do not see them being relocated anytime in the near future for two reasons. It is not just Amtrak - this is the primary feeder that goes to the Port of Oakland, and the Port of Oakland is the fifth busiest port in the United States and feeds not just California but the Western United States.

Ms. Alschuler asked if there are precedents for this bicycle bridge and if there are things learned about bridges from the connection of the Bay Bridge or others in this area. Mr. Grover stated many precedents were reviewed but the current design is not a copy of any kind.

Ms. Alschuler asked about goals. Mr. Grover stated, in terms of accessibility for bicycle and pedestrian access, the goals are to use the current best practices and stretch the envelope to make this as accessible as possible for all non-vehicular mode types well into the future.

Mr. Grover stated another key goal is to recognize that, as a place for people with disabilities and pedestrians in particular, it is important to think of the project not just as a path-making project but also as a place-making project. Points A, B, C, and D and also at the tops of the two towers are considered places to pause for temporary respite, places to view, and places to be a human being and not just pass through. Those kinds of places are what make a project like this successful as an invitation for individuals to step out of their vehicles and explore.

Mr. Grover stated, formally, the goal is to try to create something that is coherent from Point A to Point D and not a patchwork of separate structure types that are pieced together.

Mr. Grover stated another goal is to recognize the complexity of the program that will be fulfilled and try to address it elegantly. Making a bridge from Point A to Point B is one thing, but making a bridge that connects Points A, B, C, and D is quite another thing. Project proponents have worked hard to create an elegant form that makes those connections.

Ms. Alschuler asked if any other locations were considered for this bicycle and pedestrian bridge. Mr. Grover stated the project proponents studied 38 different alignments in detail.

Ms. Alschuler asked if this project is funded. Ms. Tannenwald stated the design is currently funded but the construction is not. The project proponents will be looking to that in the future. She stated the hope that, with the transportation dollars that are out there now, there will be a good opportunity.

Ms. Gaffney asked about the dimension for the lower path. Mr. Grover stated there is a ten-foot clearance.

Ms. Gaffney asked if that will be at the same level that will match up with the pedestrian side. Mr. Grover stated that is correct. He stated the lower path is always on the pedestrian side so that when individuals using the lower path merge with the upper path, they do not cross into faster bicycle traffic. He stated individuals in wheelchairs would transition to the six-foot sidewalk. He stated the blue area on a presentation slide is the six-foot sidewalk.

Ms. Gaffney asked about the width at the points where they meet. Mr. Grover stated it is 16 feet plus 10 feet for a total of 26 feet that is merging into the belvedere.

Ms. Gaffney asked about the location midway between Points A and B. Mr. Grover stated it is the full width of 10 feet plus 16 feet and, in the middle, individuals can cross over. He noted that the two paths have the same slope from the midpoint to Point A.

Ms. Alschuler asked about making the U-turn to get to the Bay. Mr. Grover stated there is a structure in between the two. That is necessary because there was not an opportunity to put the structure underneath the deck since flood clearance and navigation must be provided for. He stated, even though the navigation is not required by the Coast Guard, it is a city of Oakland design guideline and the rowing club lobbied for it.

Ms. McCann asked about the color of the bridge. Mr. Grover stated the project proponents have explored color schemes but have not yet decided on a color. He stated he would like to work with natural materials that do not require maintenance and recoating, if possible. The general palette area that the project proponents are looking into are hot-dip galvanizing, Corten steel, wood, and concrete.

Ms. Alschuler asked if any other low-clearance vessels besides kayaks could be used with the clearance underneath the structure. Mr. Grover stated, under current mean high-water conditions, there will be an approximate 9-foot clearance over the center of the channel.

Ms. Tannenwald stated currently even the kayaks have challenges and must go in at a lower water level because of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks as well as the utilities that run across the Channel.

Mr. Battalio asked to see the slide of the area over the railway. He asked about the elevation of the railway. Mr. Grover stated it is 41 minus 2.5 minus 23.5.

Mr. Battalio stated that is also high enough so it is unlikely that the tracks will be raised much.

d. **Public Hearing.** Three members of the public provided the following comments:

(1) Ms. Schiff stated her concern about the birds. She stated the existing conditions photographs show birds and a pathetic public shore sign. She stated the old railroad bridge should not be dismissed so easily. It may not be heavy enough for a railroad train anymore, but it could be a short highline. She noted that people fish from that bridge.

Ms. Schiff stated, when the Brooklyn Basin project first began, the old railroad trussle was going to be demolished but is now being reused. It is worth asking that question. She suggested that, if not used permanently, it might be used as an interim phase between now and 2022. At least individuals could walk on it, make the U-turn, and use the paths along the channel. Using the railroad bridge would help individuals begin to think about accessibility and supporting the project.

Ms. Schiff suggested soft banks. Although they need work, she stated the hope that the installation of the bridge would not mean the loss of the soft edges.

Ms. Schiff discussed Channel Park and the connecting factor of the two projects. She stated she felt that Channel Park is being inundated by added infrastructure. She stated there was concern, when the Brooklyn Basin project was first discussed, that there would be a tall building on that piece of land, which is not only in an inundation zone but in a liquefaction zone and is ill-served by roads and transit. There apparently will now be a double bicycle path through there. The belvedere connection looks elegant but in the meantime Channel Park is disappearing. It is approximately half the size that it was when this project was first considered many years ago.

Ms. Schiff stated the Board was confused about how good the connection is between the sea and Lake Merritt. She stated the channel area is where the city of Oakland began. She stated the importance of retaining that identity. The landing places on each side of it at Estuary Park and Channel Park ought to be treated with the same respect that the individuals of Oakland had when they put \$100 million into Lake Merritt. She stated the need for the project at the estuary to be well-designed and to ensure that by dividing it up between jurisdictions and projects it does not end up being covered with concrete. For the people of Oakland to have access to their own waterfront is important. She spoke in support of the proposed project but encouraged soft edges, water, and dirt.

(2) Ms. Threlfall stated the \$100 million that Ms. Schiff mentioned was part of Measure DD, which passed in 2002. It is now in the third round of selling bonds.

Ms. Threlfall agreed with Ms. Schiff's point about Channel Park and stated, while she is not a birder, she has noticed the amount of wildlife in the area. She asked what is being done to the chance to keep that alive every time humans encroach with one more thing.

Ms. Threlfall stated the bridge has been a dream of the people of Oakland for 15 to 20 years but it is important to make it as easy as possible on all the creatures that rely on the area. She stated she counts herself as one of those creatures.

(3) Mr. Huo stated the Bay Trail is in support of this project. He stated this bridge is probably the most important connection to the Bay Trail and the city of Oakland.

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

Ms. Alschuler asked if the bridge will be open 24 hours per day. Ms. Tannenwald stated, although it will be open from dawn to dusk, which is similar to most city parks, it will most likely be used more than just dawn to dusk.

Ms. Alschuler stated this is an important project that is an exciting and attractive investment in bicycle and pedestrian access that will not be impacted by vehicles.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the percent of the design that has been completed. Mr. Grover stated approximately 25 to 30 percent of the design has been completed.

Ms. McCann congratulated the design team on the beautiful design that will solve a raft of complicated challenges in an elegant way.

Mr. Pellegrini agreed with Ms. McCann that the bridge design is an elegant, sensitive response to complicated challenges.

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

Physical and Visual Design of the Proposed Public Access:

(1) Would the proposed pedestrian and bicycle bridge provide ample, diverse, and adequate opportunities for public use, including for both pedestrians and bicyclists?

Suggestions to this question are incorporated in the responses to other questions.

(2) Does the project adequately allow for recreational use of Lake Merritt Channel, including for kayaks and other low-clearance navigational vessels passing beneath the bridge?

Suggestions to this question are incorporated in the responses to other questions.

(3) Are the proposed public amenities adequate, distributed, and designed to balance the needs of visitors and natural resources in the project vicinity?

(a) Are the proposed bridge overlooks appropriately sized and located?

(b) Is the proposed lighting appropriate?

(c) Would the project be enhanced by including other site amenities such as interpretive elements, bird viewing opportunities, bike racks, waste receptacles, signage, and/or additional seating opportunities?

Ms. Alschuler stated in terms of the balance with nature and whether it has a negative effect, if the natural character and materials are emphasized at either end, it can balance and can provide a variety of habitats.

Ms. Alschuler stated the lighting is important for safety because of the time it will take to walk or bicycle and understanding the distances so people will feel safe. She stated she was unsure if the lighting was enough.

(4) Is the proposed bridge designed in a manner that is universally accessible for the public?

Ms. McCann asked if there is an opportunity at this critical and historically significant point to help individuals know how to get to the waterfront.

Mr. Strang stated conceptualizing the bridge as part of the channel all the way up to the lake would do a lot to sell the bridge.

(5) Does the bridge design take advantage of bay views?

Ms. McCann stated she liked the fact that as individuals move along the bridge in either direction there are constantly changing vistas. Some individuals may see the Bay while others do not but, as an experience, it is interesting that the bridge does not produce one vista point.

(6) Does the bridge provide an appropriate landmark to identify the location of the Bay in areas where it's not immediately visible?

Ms. McCann stated she liked the fact that the geometry of the bridge and the way in which the design works is that it will operate as a landmark at this point. Something this strong and beautiful will effectively orient individuals amongst the mess of infrastructure that is currently in place.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the bridge will be seen from both directions of the freeway. He suggested a greater visual marker or visual indication that demonstrates and communicates the pedestrian access down into Channel Park.

(7) Does the bridge design minimize view impacts of the shoreline and Bay from other high points such as the I-880 overpass and the Embarcadero?

Mr. Strang agreed that the bridge is a brilliant response to difficult contextual situations. He stated it would be helpful to see graphics or a three-dimensional representation of the bridge to give a better sense of what the experience will be.

Mr. Strang stated the bridge is a big deal and it is only at 25 percent design. He asked, by the time the design gets to 75 percent, if it will be larger with more steel members and lots of concrete so that it competes with the freeway or loses its delicate sense. He suggested keeping the bridge light, spindly, and transparent. If it begins to feel like another overpass or if it gets value-engineered and it becomes bulky, then he would ask the question if there is not a simpler way to do this. He stated the need to ensure the bridge is not over-designed.

Ms. Alschuler stated the two high walls that curve up make an interesting view on paper but she was worried about how it would look life-size. She stated the view will be important in all directions. Keeping them lighter and more open is better than having a high, solid wall.

(8) Does the design of the proposed bridge railing and fencing maximize Bay viewing opportunities for all users? How can view impacts be further minimized or reduced?

Suggestions to this question are incorporated in the response to other questions.

Design of the Proposed Physical Connections:

(9) Are the connections at the bridge touchdown points (Peralta, Victory Court, Channel Park, and Embarcadero Bridge) designed appropriately to connect people to and along the shoreline? Does the design of the lower accessway provide adequate connections to and invitations to use the bicycle and pedestrian bridge?

Ms. McCann stated, even though the connection paths going up the channel cross different jurisdictions, she would love to see funding to ensure that the paths that go to Lake Merritt are of good quality and flood-free. When something like this is built, it is important that individuals have access to it in a safe and comfortable way. She suggested putting the bridge and its connecting paths together in one package.

Mr. Pellegrini stated this area is being unified with Lake Merritt and connecting 14th Street down to the water. He stated the need to consider the vocabulary of the public materials around Lake Merritt and how that soft vocabulary of Spanish Revival/Tuscan architecture will transition into the urban hardscape of Channel Park. He asked how the two will be connected aesthetically.

Ms. McCann stated that is a very interesting question. The immediate context is so overwhelmingly different that it is something to think about.

Mr. Pellegrini stated this project and the Howard Terminal proposal open the Oakland waterfront to the public. He stated a larger concern that is beyond the scope of this project is that this big, major, impassible infrastructure of freeways and rail lines is being considered a mere afterthought. He stated a good deal of attention and funding are being devoted to transforming the waterfront and figuring out ways to connect to it while assuming that the freeways and rail lines will remain the same.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested that the city of Oakland consider opportunities to think about a waterfront access plan or something that can start to look at these things more holistically. It would help in understanding how civic connections could be linked to the larger infrastructure. He stated the importance of ensuring that this elegant structure will be usable and maintainable in 2100.

Ms. Alschuler agreed. She stated this bridge is iconic in itself. The freeways and rail lines will be there but, when this is constructed and is connected to these several places, it will bring individuals in from all sides. The city of Oakland should think about the bridge as a destination place.

Ms. Alschuler stated the critical piece is the bridge. It is the sculptural piece. It does not cost anything like the bridge to make good pathways and connect them. She suggested that Lake Merritt make an amazing pathway to the bridge, Channel Park be its own different place at the other end with something dramatic letting individuals know they are now in a park, and the bridge be itself. Seeing the bridge as a 50-year project is a short view. She suggested doing more sea level adaptation now rather than waiting to make small incremental adaptations later.

Ms. Alschuler stated parking lots may not be the best neighbor to this amazing new path. There may suddenly be other uses or things that start to align in this location that are stimulated by this change.

Ms. McCann stated she liked that the bridge touches down at four points and that there is a way to get on and off. It will help increase a personal sense of safety on the bridge. She stated there has been a challenge with other projects the Board has reviewed where individuals cannot get off until the other end, which is often some distance away.

Mr. Battalio asked if there was a way to connect the bridge to the east assuming that the Bay Trail runs away from the Embarcadero and towards the shore for a reason other than being close to the water. He asked if that land is available. He stated it seems like the design tries to connect the bridge to the Bay Trail, which is in Channel Park.

Ms. Tannenwald stated there is not enough clearance underneath the structure of the bridge. There used to be a lower trail in Channel Park but it is not shown in the meeting materials because there is not enough head height clearance there anymore.

Mr. Battalio asked why the Bay Trail has to be in this location and does not come across a different location that he pointed out on a presentation slide and connect parallel to the Embarcadero and connect to the other park. He stated he was reacting to the fact that everything seems to be related to having this concrete trail next to the water. He asked why the trail alignment has to be designed in its current location and all the landing has to be as shown on the slide. He suggested that the design could be more linear and follow the Embarcadero and then there could be other trails. Then the bridge would not have an S-curve but would have more of an arch shape.

Ms. Alschuler stated the public trails should invite individuals down into the park. Once they get past the park, there are tall buildings.

Mr. Pellegrini agreed that this is the best opportunity to get down to this location.

Ms. Tannenwald stated, during the original public outreach, a big debate was whether the bridge would land in Estuary Park or Channel Park. That was not shown as part of the presentation. It was a 50/50 split. The designers were creative in designing the new Embarcadero Bridge, which satisfied both groups. That is how the bridge ended up landing in the middle of the Embarcadero Bridge. It also is a benefit because the bridge length does not need to be as long since it is at a much higher elevation at the peak of the Embarcadero Bridge.

(10) Does the bridge adequately integrate with existing or planned public access at the touchdown sites (e.g., Channel Park)?

Mr. Pellegrini suggested thinking about a better way to integrate the design of the arrival into Channel Park with the overcrossing structure and ways that vehicles and other individuals would be entering into Channel Park. He asked if there was an opportunity to unify those design elements because they do not feel like they are being integrated currently.

Ms. Gaffney stated she was unclear on the interface between Channel Park and the bridge.

Ms. Alschuler agreed and stated the slides illustrate it differently from the meeting materials. The meeting materials seem to make the interface further into the park and, to get to Channel Park, individuals would have to go all the way to the belvedere, make a U-turn, and come back down.

Ms. Tannenwald stated drawings in the meeting packet are actually the same as the presentation slides.

Ms. Gaffney stated it is the same as the alternate of the back of Brooklyn Basin exhibits.

Ms. Alschuler stated it looks like it goes further into Channel Park. Ms. Gaffney stated the last page of the Brooklyn Basin package is basically the same drawing as page 8 of the bridge package.



Mr. Pellegrini asked if project proponents would defer to the Embarcadero geometry and do more of a switchback to get down to the Embarcadero and Channel Park. The belvedere would end up being closer to the Embarcadero location. He asked if this would free up opportunities for thinking about the grading of the park.

Mr. Strang stated the length of the bridge is required to get down. The park is probably more flexible than the bridge. It seems like the park could respond as a way to riff off that geometry to make them look like they are working together. There is a good start there with the wetland. Bioretention could be solved in a very nice way.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested that the designers of the two parks get together to figure out a way to unify the geometry of the sites more clearly. He asked, instead of having the bridge swing out over Channel Park and then needing to figure out how to resolve the grade of Channel Park and not create a wall on the back side, if that could be accomplished with a simple switchback that goes from the Embarcadero side. He asked if the geometry could be changed to go linearly from the Embarcadero point west to Point 6 and then come straight from Point 6 down into the Channel Park. He asked if the curve is necessary to make the geometry work. (Refers to Exhibit page 8, Channel Park drawing.)

Mr. Grover stated every bit of length is needed to get from the high point to run straight down into Channel Park.

Mr. Strang stated Points 2 and 6 would have to move further apart to be more parallel to the Embarcadero. (Refers to Exhibit page 8, Channel Park drawing.)

Mr. Pellegrini agreed and stated it would be longer.

Ms. Gaffney stated the bridge would bend up to the high point and then track parallel to the Embarcadero to get down to the Embarcadero and Channel Park grade.

Mr. Pellegrini stated another way to think about this is that, if the throughput is the Embarcadero instead of the bridge, it is letting that movement be more direct down to Channel Park. He asked if that was worth exploring.

Mr. Grover stated the design cannot go from Point 2 to Point 6 unless Point 2 was in a different location that he pointed out on a presentation slide.

Mr. Pellegrini added that it would also work if Point 6 was further to the west. More space is needed to do that. (Refers to Exhibit page 8, Channel Park drawing.)

Mr. Grover agreed and stated the bridge would then be cantilevering out over the channel even further.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested taking the opportunity for the design of the park and the design of the bridge to be more integrated. That is not seen in the current design.

Ms. McCann agreed that there are opportunities to refine that. She suggested reviewing the circulation in the park in the context of the bridge.

**Sea Level Rise:**

(11) Is the proposed bicycle and pedestrian bridge appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise?

Suggestions to this question are incorporated in the responses to other questions.

(12) How can the bridge design facilitate future adaptation of the shoreline, e.g. at its touchdown

Suggestions to this question are incorporated in the responses to other questions.

f. **Applicant Response.** The applicant offered clarifying points to questions raised by the Board during the Board discussion.

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board did not summarize their conclusions. (Please refer to the Board Questions and Discussion.)

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board would like to review this project again.

7. **Adjournment.** Ms. Alschuler asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**MOTION:** Ms. McCann moved to adjourn the April 8, 2019, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Strang.

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 5-0-0 with Board Chair Alschuler, Vice Chair Gary Strang, and Board Members Battalio, McCann, and Pellegrini voting approval.

There being no further business, Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREA GAFFNEY  
Bay Design Analyst

Approved, with no corrections at the  
Design Review Board Meeting of June 10, 2019.