

# San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

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

**TO:** All Commissioners and Alternates

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

**SUBJECT: Approved Minutes of the June 10, 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, Tom Leader, Jacinta McCann, and Stefan Pellegrini. BCDC staff in attendance included Rebecca Coates-Maldoon, Andrea Gaffney, and Sam Stewart. The presenters were Andrew Davies (EKN Development Group, LLC), Andrew Dewitt (SWA Group), Ryan Doone (HKS Architects, Inc.), Ebbie Nakhjavani (EKN Development Group), Michael O'Hara (Tim Lewis Communities and North Waterfront Cove, LLC), and Andrew Sullivan (Page Southerland Page, Inc.). Public comment via email was submitted by Lee Chien Huo (San Francisco Bay Trail Project).

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

2. **Report of Chief of Permits.** Ms. Gaffney presented the report on behalf of Ethan Lavine, BCDC Coastal Program Manager, who was unable to be in attendance.

a. The San Francisco Estuary Institute has released the San Francisco Bay Shoreline Adaptation Atlas Report, which categorizes the shoreline into a variety of shoreline types and makes recommendations for how to adapt those types of shorelines for sea level rise and climate change. It is published on the website along with a book. Ms. Gaffney asked if the Board would like a briefing on the Shoreline Adaptation Atlas at a future meeting.

Ms. Alschuler agreed to have a briefing. It may be one of the tools the Board will refer to for each project it reviews.

[info@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:info@bcdc.ca.gov) | [www.bcdc.ca.gov](http://www.bcdc.ca.gov)  
State of California | Gavin Newsom – Governor



b. Staff continues the Board member recruitment effort. Ms. Gaffney asked Board members to send her names of possible candidates.

Mr. Strang asked about disciplines to focus on in terms of recruiting Board members.

Ms. Gaffney requested names for all disciplines discussed. She stated the current recruitment list consists of two names: an architect and a landscape architect.

Ms. Alschuler stated she sent an email to staff with several possible candidates and asked that all Board members do the same.

Ms. Gaffney asked Ms. Alschuler to resend her email.

c. The Commission meeting for the Fill for Habitat San Francisco Bay Plan Amendment, the beneficial reuse of sediment, that the Board received a briefing on is scheduled for June 20, 2019.

d. The Commission meeting for the Environmental Justice and Social Equity Bay Plan Amendment that the Board received a briefing on is scheduled for July 18, 2019.

e. The state conducted a programmatic audit for the Enforcement Division of the BCDC. Ms. Gaffney read a statement prepared by one of the enforcement attorneys as follows:

“On May 14, 2019, the state auditor released a final report on its audit of BCDC’s Enforcement Program. Fortunately, the report found that the Commission staff generally draft permit conditions that comply with applicable laws and that staff respond to information and approve permits within required timeframes.

“The report also found some issues with the Enforcement Program, including finding that a lack of formal policies and guidance create a risk of inconsistent actions as well as a risk that cases could be closed without properly resolving the underlying violation.

“In total, the report sets forth seventeen recommendations for actions that the Commission should take to improve the Enforcement Program. These include conducting a workforce study of both the permitting and regulatory activities at BCDC to determine additional staffing needs and hiring a compliance person to assist permittees in complying with permits.

“Going forward, BCDC’s Enforcement Committee will begin meeting regularly twice per month as they work to implement the recommendations.”

Ms. Gaffney deferred to staff counsel to answer Board questions.

Karen Donovan, BCDC Enforcement Attorney, introduced herself and stated she has been handling the response to the audit.

Ms. Alschuler asked if there are any findings from the audit that has to do with what the Board does.

Ms. Donovan stated there are not. She stated this is more about how staff will attack a backlog of enforcement cases and handle processing procedures for enforcement going forward.

Ms. Donovan stated there is only one recommendation in the report that applies to permitting and that was simply that perhaps staff could provide a few more case examples for things that would be appropriate for an administrative permit.

Mr. Strang asked what would be a good response to questions from the public and who members of the public should be referred to.

Ms. Donovan stated members of the public could be referred to the Enforcement Division. She stated the auditors had seventeen recommendations for the Commission. Almost all of them were related to enforcement. Others were recommended actions with regard to BCDC activities in Suisun Marsh, how the Bay Fill Cleanup and Abatement Fund is being used, and about updating permit fees.

Ms. Donovan stated the BCDC is working on process improvements and examining possible changes to the regulations including clarifying how minor violations are handled.

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

### 3. **Approval of Draft Minutes for April 8, 2019, Meeting**

**MOTION:** Mr. Strang moved approval of the Minutes for the April 8, 2019, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as presented, seconded by Mr. Leader.

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

4. **Encinal Terminals Mixed-Use Redevelopment, City of Alameda (Second Pre-Application Review).** The Board held their second pre-application review of a proposal by North Waterfront Cove, LLC, to redevelop an approximately 23-acre site at the waterfront of Alameda's north bank across the Alameda-Oakland Estuary from Coast Guard Island and Brooklyn Basin in Oakland, and adjacent to Fortman Marina. The proposed project would consist of a residential mixed-use development with 589 residential units, 50,000 square feet of commercial space, at least three acres for public open space use, and a commercial marina of up to 160 slips in Alaska Basin. Public access improvements include a waterfront plaza, an urban beach, playground areas, the Fortman Walk, a waterfront district, a kayak rental facility, a water transit docking facility, up to 180 parking spaces, and other public amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Sam Stewart, BCDC Coastal Program Analyst, introduced the project, showed a video from a recent site visit, and described points of interest as the video played. He summarized the changes made to the design since incorporating the Board's comments from the December 17, 2018, meeting, which are included in the staff report. He summarized the issues in the staff report including whether the revised project:

(1) Designs the public access areas in a manner that "feels public" and makes the shoreline enjoyable and inviting to the greatest number of people.

(a) Includes considerations in designing the public access so that it is inviting to the public, taking into account the Tidelands District is not included in the project.

(b) Creates clear delineations between public areas and private development and resolves areas of potential conflict between these uses.

(2) Maximizes physical and visual access to and along the waterfront.

(a) Provides clear connections for all users to the Bay from Clement Avenue, and otherwise maximizes the opportunities for the public to access and view the Bay.

(b) Includes considerations concerning visual access in relation to the public access and the proposed marina waterfront district in Alaska Basin.

(3) Includes public water access points and docks that are appropriately designed to avoid or reduce conflicts among the uses and considers other amenities or uses for water-oriented recreation.

(4) Takes advantage of the unique historical features in its design and considers whether there are additional opportunities to enhance the public's understanding of the site and its relationship to the Bay.

(5) Provides adequate public access areas with each phase of development.

(6) Appropriately designs the public areas and amenities to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise. Designs the wharf promenade and plazas to be adaptive to potential intermittent flooding by the end of the century.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the yellow area and the red area on a presentation slide, which indicates that area is the proposed Bay Trail.

Ms. Gaffney stated the yellow area on the slide is a cross-island trail. The city of Alameda and the San Francisco Bay Trail will come to an agreement on the alignment of the Bay Trail after the city of Alameda updates its Bicycle Master Plan. A possible location for the Bay Trail is indicated in red on the slide.

**b. Project Presentation.** Michael O'Hara, Managing Partner and Director of Forward Planning, Tim Lewis Communities and North Waterfront Cove, LLC, stated the project team has been working with the BCDC Engineering Criteria Review Board (ECRB) over the last few months. He provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the context; existing site conditions; prior plan versus current plan; seismic wharf improvement, retrofit, and demolition; consistency with the Bay Plan; and a detailed description of the proposed project.

Mr. O'Hara stated the ECRB asked the project proponents to evaluate the northern wharf area under multiple seismic scenarios. It was determined that there could be no guarantee of non-collapse. Since the safety of future occupants on that portion of the northern wharf could not be guaranteed, public access to the waterfront promenade in areas not retrofitted would not be permitted.

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

Ms. McCann asked how the marina access will operate adjacent to the public walkways.

Mr. O'Hara stated it is anticipated that the marina operators will come up with the plan of access for those locations. He stated, in general, the idea is to limit the points of access but to create areas of access that do not conflict with what is happening on the land side. He pointed out possible access points on the presentation slides.

Ms. McCann asked where yacht owners would park.

Mr. O'Hara stated they would park within the buildings. The idea is the numbers on the slides indicate the number of public parking spaces in those locations. The city of Alameda mandated that parking be set aside for the open space, commercial space, and marina within that area.

Mr. O'Hara stated they would enter either of the parking garages from the central boulevard. The entirety of the building will be parking with convenient drop-off points for loading and unloading outside. The other area is the roundabout, which would have temporary parking and loading areas.

Ms. Alschuler asked if individuals could use the emergency vehicle access road as a drop-off point.

Mr. O'Hara stated they could not. The access road is for emergency vehicles only.

Ms. McCann asked if there will be a harbormaster operation as well.

Mr. O'Hara stated there will be. He pointed out the harbormaster building on a presentation slide, which was relocated to the land side, and stated it also will contain public restroom facilities.

Ms. McCann asked how security will be handled for the marina and transit areas.

Mr. O'Hara stated the security for the marina would consist of a series of gates that could be opened with key cards. He pointed out other areas on the presentation slides with no limitations to public access. He stated there would be no added security for the transit location other than a gate at the ferry.

Mr. O'Hara stated one thing to remember is that, within the mixed-use buildings, the ground floors will be commercial but will also contain public amenity spaces. The project proponents are only mandated to put in 30,000 square feet of commercial space on the proposed site. That requirement can be met by including that space in the ground floors of the buildings with access to spare.

Ms. McCann asked for clarification at the cross-section with two levels of parking garage. She asked where along the length of the buildings that cross-section will be and if it is a solid wall versus an open wall.

Mr. O'Hara pointed out two locations on the presentation slides. He stated one of the locations is envisioned to only be one level of parking. He stated one of the things that is mandated in the Master Plan is creative things being done along those areas so there will not be a large blank wall. Including interesting things there is part of the General and Master Plans.

Mr. Battalio stated he is a member of the BCDC ECRB, as well. He asked Mr. O'Hara to explain the difference between the permanent access and other access on the wharf and the adaption measures for higher amounts of sea level rise.

Mr. O'Hara pointed out areas on the presentation slides. He stated the concept is that the proposed project is being pushed out as far as possible to get that 41 feet of minimum public access. That 41 feet is comprised of a 26-foot emergency vehicle access (EVA) road and a 15-foot setback to the building.

Mr. O'Hara stated, from the building front, there is eight feet of sideway, seven feet of plant material or bioretention, and then the 26 feet starts. He noted that this is something that the fire districts require. Anytime buildings are over 26 feet, a 26-foot-wide EVA is required but, with everything else added in, they require 41 feet.

Mr. O'Hara stated the 41 feet is essentially guaranteed all the way along the edge of that wharf. There is variability with a minimum of 26 feet in some areas that is wider in other areas. He stated the EVA route follows fire district guidelines for vehicular access for fire trucks and emergency vehicles.

Mr. Battalio stated the deck area elevation is 13.5. He stated, at some level, the 100-year flood would cover the deck.

Mr. O'Hara showed a slide of the site elevations and stated the 13.5 elevation would apply to the end of the century. If other criteria are used, it increases to 15.8. Adaptation measures will be implemented in either case and have been left to be determined.

Mr. O'Hara stated a geologic hazard abatement district is being implemented, which would be formed now. Assessments would be collected from the residents and, over time, it would create a fund that would allow adaptive measures to be implemented.

Ms. Alschuler asked what the development itself is to help the Board better understand the relationship between the development and the public space.

Mr. O'Hara stated the development areas have been broken down on the presentation slides. The blue line is the 100-foot shoreline off the existing wharf edge. He stated staff does not quite agree with the project proponents as far as where the jurisdictional limit line would begin and end. The purple line was taking the approach that the jurisdictional limit line is where the seawall is so it is 100 feet inland of the seawall.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the purple line would move as a result of the changing wharf. She stated there is a reason that the Board is interested in the 100-foot area. The Board welcomes buildings in the 100-foot area where they help support the use of the waterfront. She asked about the buildings because the edge of the water was moved in with the removal of the wharf while the footprint of the buildings remained the same in the new design.

Ms. Alschuler asked what about the buildings will contribute to the character of this being a lively waterfront place that is welcoming. She stated she would like to see more social areas.

Mr. O'Hara stated the Master Plan is approved for 589 units, 30,000 to 50,000 square feet of commercial space, and up to 160 marina berths. He stated the buildings contribute to the design by funding it. It funds the open space; without the development there to that extent, density, and in that manner, none of this would happen. He stated it is borderline feasible as it is right now with that because of the extent of cost.

Mr. O'Hara stated, to put this in perspective, it essentially funds this great waterfront space. As far as how the buildings have been oriented on the site, the project proponents have been working around a tidelands district and have worked with the city for a long time trying to get an exchange agreement done to allow the development to be spread out over a greater footprint. The city was not interested in doing that; this is what prompted the change in the plan to begin with.

Mr. O'Hara stated the developable area has been greatly reduced and has, therefore, put pressures on the buildings.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the developable area was reduced since the last time the Board saw this project.

Mr. O'Hara stated the plan prior to the December presentation to the Board was greatly reduced. He reiterated that there has been continual pressure on this.

Mr. O'Hara discussed how the buildings are designed. The area in the northeast contains few portions that are within that area. He pointed out the two most impactful areas on a presentation slide as far as where they are within the jurisdictional shoreline band. He stated the idea is that much of these areas, particularly one corner and one side, are very well suited for ground floor retail and commercial areas.

Mr. O'Hara stated, as far as getting an interaction between the building and the open space, that is a very important part of it. And, essentially, just as outdoor rooms extend an interior, the commercial space is going to draw and give even more public space along that area.

Mr. O'Hara pointed out two primary areas on the presentation slides. All of the commercial and work/live units are located in the Del Monte Warehouse and Gateway Plaza areas. The idea is to create a hub of activity there so that location becomes very public. The only thing that is private is the part that is elevated two to three floors above.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the northwest corner.

Mr. O'Hara stated it is similarly situated in the area in the northwest corner but filling it with commercial units would far exceed the minimum. He stated the 30,000 to 50,000 square-foot range is about right for the market. To obligate more than that would be too much. There are portions of the building that would be private but would look public.

Ms. Alschuler stated she would like to see the pictures of the buildings.

Mr. O'Hara displayed slides depicting images of the buildings and pointed out interesting features.

Ms. Alschuler asked how the design will make individuals want to walk between the maritime and commercial areas and to feel comfortable throughout.

Mr. O'Hara stated it provides parking for the open space area, which is consistent with the Bay Plan.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he was interested in seeing more about the access to the water for vehicles coming with kayaks and how the loading and unloading would occur.

Mr. O'Hara stated he had two answers: one is there is a drop-off point on Clement Avenue. This will be the new thoroughfare. This will be built in conjunction with the Del Monte Warehouse. He pointed out a little drop-off point and a kayak rental kiosk; that area would be for individuals that live in Del Monte or along the Marina Shores Development. They could wander over there for a quick drop-off or individuals coming along Clement Avenue would have the ability to pull off the road, unload their kayak, and then possibly park on the street, where there are approximately 130 parking spaces that surround the Del Monte Warehouse building. There is adequate parking there. There are also some parking spaces along Central Boulevard.

Mr. O'Hara stated the other area would be at the end. He pointed out the roundabout drop-off area. He stated the idea is that, whether access is created in one location or another, there would be a way to utilize that. That would be secondary. The primary small watercraft and kayak launch area is at the south end of the basin.

Mr. Pellegrini stated his understanding from the text that the diameter of the roundabout is 120 feet and that the idea is that it is sized for vehicles to turn around but also to pull over to the sides.

Mr. O'Hara stated that is correct.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the areas where the building frontage would be defined by the two-story parking deck would exclude the building at the southern entry. He asked Mr. O'Hara to outline the edge of where that two-story parking deck would be on the other parcels.

Mr. O'Hara stated there would still be a two-story edge.

Ms. Alschuler stated the ground floor had commercial and other spaces.

Mr. O'Hara stated that is correct. He stated, if this area gets filled with commercial, which probably makes the most sense, and if there is some commercial up above, the parking edge would probably be here. He stated the city and the Master Plan mandates the use of something other than a long, blank wall. It must be something interesting such as green walls.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if it is safe to say that is yet to be determined but that the future design would determine the outcome of how much of that frontage is taken up by parking.



Mr. O'Hara stated that is correct. He stated he tried to address that in some of his responses to Board comments. This is a conceptual plan. It has all of the elements that are anticipated to be seen, but it may be configured differently. The idea is that visually there are intermittent breaks which not only provide private open space, but also provide a break visually from the taller building. Each of the buildings that comes forward to the city of Alameda will have to answer all of those questions.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if there is a control that would regulate whether or not those were at grade or above the parking podium in the related courtyard spaces that are illustrated on the buildings.

Mr. O'Hara stated they would. He stated, the way that this is configured and in order to create both the private and the public parking spaces, all of those areas are anticipated to be above grade.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if Mr. O'Hara could roughly outline where those would be on the presentation slides.

Mr. O'Hara pointed to one of the areas which are elevated two stories. He pointed to areas that would be elevated at least one to two stories above grade.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if that would include the big east-west one that was labeled number 26 on the plan.

Mr. O'Hara stated that is correct.

Ms. Alschuler asked if there was any place where the residential comes down to the edge of the water. She stated she assumed the rest of it is two levels of parking facing that way.

Mr. O'Hara stated it is but, because the areas are so large, most of that would only be one level of parking. But the other thing to think about is that, to put a blank wall against the edge loses a marketing opportunity. Incorporating town home units along that edge have been considered.

Mr. O'Hara stated, as far as the interplay, the northern and eastern edge is probably the closest to having residential at-grade, with a front door, patio, and then the Bay Trail or something along those lines. There will be ample opportunities to do that and to essentially line the parking spaces which would help alleviate the concern for the city.

Mr. Leader stated the Master Plan would commit the project proponents to having pedestrian ways between the different phases between the yellow lines on the presentation slide.

Mr. O'Hara pointed to public pedestrian paths running along the edge and stated they essentially run at the boundaries of the private space and the tidelands area.

Mr. Leader stated, when the Bay Trail coincides with the access to the marina and along the urban beach site, individuals will be accessing their boats with their equipment and supplies. He asked about foreseeable conflicts with individuals on bicycles using the Bay Trail.

Mr. O'Hara stated it is possible. He stated the access points could be limited there and managed with signage. Possible access points leading to the marina are being left to the marina developer/operator to answer these questions.

Mr. Strang asked who would maintain the beach and the public park.

Mr. O'Hara stated all of the public open space will be essentially privately owned but with public access easements to it. The master homeowners' association (HOA) will be tasked with maintaining those areas.

Mr. Strang asked if the level of the deck will be raised with fill.

Mr. O'Hara stated the level of the deck will not be raised but there are low points on the site, such as at the northern edge, which will require fill to bring them up to the level of the wharf. The total import of fill is anticipated at 11,000 yards.

Mr. Strang stated the reason for his question was that he is curious about the substrate that the trees will be planted in. He suggested testing the soil and considering the amount of soil that will be available to the trees for increased success.

Mr. O'Hara stated much of this site has historically been land unlike other waterfront areas that have been heavily filled. He pointed out the edge of the marsh on a presentation slide and stated the concept was to do soil testing and to come up with a soil amendment strategy that was satisfactory, given the site conditions and the material being used there.

Mr. O'Hara deferred to Andrew Sullivan to provide a more detailed response.

Andrew Sullivan, Associate Principal and Director of Landscape Architecture, Page Southerland Page, Inc., agreed that this is a challenge and stated a site-specific Soils Master Plan will be developed that relates to specific existing onsite conditions. He stated the current Concept Plan includes linear planters along the boulevard area that will be a minimum of four to five feet wide with an extended trench of soil, which will incorporate a solution for drainage and other issues.

Mr. Strang stated most of the changes are driven by the demolition of the wharf. He asked if there are other changes that are not driven by the demolition since the Board last saw the project.

Mr. O'Hara stated there were a number of items mentioned in the response to Board comments from the December meeting that were addressed, such as relocating the harbormaster's office on land, creating vistas, and adding a floating dock.

Ms. Alschuler asked about ways the story of the history of the site will be told.

Mr. O'Hara stated there is an awesome story to tell. The site was home to the largest fleet in the world at one time. The General and Master Plans require that the history of the waterfront and the industrial history of the site be incorporated in the design.

Mr. O'Hara stated a series of signage is planned within the garden and public areas and along the Bay Trail. He stated there is a sizeable public art component to this project and the idea is that some of the public art would also be historical. He noted that cleats, anchors, and other artifacts are planned to be displayed in the open space.

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

Ms. Gaffney read the written comments submitted by Lee Chien Huo, Bay Trail Planner, San Francisco Bay Trail Project, which were included in the meeting packet and will be attached to these minutes.

Mr. Huo wrote that he hoped that the city of Alameda will continue to work with the various property owners to ensure that a Bay Trail alignment consistent with the Goals of the Bay Trail will be constructed along the eastern shoreline edge of Encinal Terminals.

Mr. Huo wrote that the current proposed interim trail along the eastern edge on the Fortman side does not meet the Bay Trail goal of providing a shoreline trail and a blue water experience for both bicyclists and pedestrians.

Mr. Huo wrote that he appreciated that the Encinal Terminals project is providing a 26-foot path around most of the project's edge; however, the detail for the waterfront promenade northeast's 26-foot trail appears to stop short of the property line. He requested that the 26-foot-wide shoreline trail be designed to extend to the property line along the shoreline in anticipation that the shoreline trail will be consistent with the design along the eastern shoreline edge in the future. Ms. Gaffney stated the eastern edge is the Fortman Marina side.

Mr. Huo wrote, since the proposed eastern trail will essentially function as the primary trail connection, the city is able to work towards developing the final shoreline alignment at the Bay Trail. On the trail along the eastern edge of the boundary, the project should be designed to have a consistent width and capacity for trail users. The current cross-sections appear to propose an 18-foot-wide trail that will function as a multi-use path with a five-foot-wide pedestrian-only shoreline path on the eastern side of the project.

Ms. Gaffney stated that is an 18-foot-wide trail on the Encinal Terminals property and then a five-foot-wide trail that is part of the Fortman Marina public access requirement. Ms. Gaffney stated Mr. Huo asks that the trail be designed to match the capacity of the rest of the trail that is being proposed.

Ms. Gaffney continued to read Mr. Huo's written comment: Mr. Huo wrote that, for the details on the waterfront promenade north, there is an L-shaped bend next to the proposed floating dock. Ms. Gaffney stated the proposed floating dock is at 9 and 15, in the corner of a presentation slide.

Ms. Gaffney continued to read Mr. Huo's written comment: Mr. Huo wrote that this is the narrowest point on the promenade and he requested that the Board consider if the width at this location is enough not to create a bottleneck in the promenade.

Mr. Huo wrote that there are not enough details in the plan provided to see how the trail connections will be made with the adjacent properties. Mr. Huo requested that details for these connections be provided at a subsequent Board meeting or with staff to be directed to ensure that these connections are resolved prior to going to the Commission for consideration.

Mr. Huo wrote, based on phasing provided by the development, the majority of the project and shoreline access trails will be completed by Phase C, except for the trail connection along the eastern edge of the property at the Fortman side.

Mr. Huo wrote, by Phase C, the proposed project will mostly be implemented and functioning; however, trail users will be subject to an out-and-back trail. He requested that the entire trail system, including the eastern trail segment, be fully completed as part of Phase C to provide an amenity that will be needed and wanted by the people who will live or visit these facilities by the project through Phase C.

Ms. Gaffney stated Mr. Huo thanked the project proponents and the Board for allowing him to provide these comments.

e. **Board Discussion.** Ms. Alschuler stated there have been a lot of adjustments and changes to this plan since December, when the Board last saw it. She asked the Board to include those things when addressing the project as a whole.

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

(1) **Physical and Visual Access**

(a) Are the public access areas designed in a manner that “feels public” and makes the shoreline enjoyable and inviting to the greatest number of people?

(b) What considerations should be given to designing the public access so that it is inviting to the public, taking into account the Tidelands District is not included in the project?

Does the design create clear delineations between public areas and private development? Are there areas of potential conflict between these uses, and if so, how could they be resolved?

Mr. Strang stated the buildings were laid out assuming a certain amount of wharf. Much of the wharf will be removed due to the seismic condition but the buildings have not responded to the new wharf configuration. He stated this may be causing some constrictions at key points. He suggested revisiting the buildings to open up some of those constrictions that are mentioned in the agreement.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board is not against the density of this development. Having people out there is great. It is not about trying to get it to be lower, except if residential could face on these spaces as long as it would not control those spaces. There would be eyes on the street and there would be something happening, which would be a benefit. It is not that the Board would like to reduce the amount of development; it is just trying to make that edge encourage visitors. Individuals should not be afraid to walk that last hundred feet to get to the edge.

Mr. Strang stated there is a positive change where the marina layout has been changed and opened up to provide greater views to the Bay in those two areas, and there are accents or moments along that long walkway. At the same time, the public park is sandwiched between the marina and the two-story garage in some areas, and also where the beach is. He stated he does not have a specific fix for that but it should be noted.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the Board would see when a project is proposed on the Tidelands Trust area in the future, such as a hotel or recreational center. It will have to prove itself to have regional attraction and use and there will be a lot of issues about what will go there.

Ms. Gaffney stated her understanding that the Tidelands District will be a part of the Master Plan permit. It will be considered just like the other phases of development. When it comes for development, it has the potential to come back for Board review.

Ms. Alschuler stated she specifically asked to see that because it is currently conceptual.

Mr. Battalio stated the Tidelands District is included in the proposed project. He noted that the questions in the Staff Report erroneously state that it is not.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board will be looking for the character of the buildings, the landscaping, what will be done to make it interesting and inviting, wind protection issues, and sense of invitation. She stated the need to delineate that there are certain sections of the places with the two stories of parking that are critical to take a look at. She noted it is not that the Board is requiring retail to be there because it would not support retail.

Ms. Alschuler suggested pulling it back and including a landscape buffer.

Ms. McCann stated the pinch points, particularly at the northern end, are significant, especially because there is a marina there. She suggested further review of the Master Plan and solid analysis of exactly how the access to the marina will operate - what sort of landside support areas are needed - because the Board has reviewed enough marinas to know that it would be very likely that there would be adjustments to the design because of what will be required. That needs to be clear.

Ms. Alschuler asked Ms. McCann to list her concerns so staff could work with the project proponents on them.

Ms. McCann stated she was concerned about the access for individuals who have to trolley their materials to the boats. There must be landside utility backup and enough landside access for parking and other things. She stated this is the first time she has seen a marina where individuals park inside a parking garage. It would be helpful to see samples of successful models.

Ms. Gaffney suggested that perhaps Jack London Square may have good examples of how this might work.

Ms. McCann stated the operational aspects need to be more clearly defined. She referred to page 9 and stated the red dividing line is such an arbitrary line between Maritime, Commercial, and Residential. One side has a lot of greenspace and open parking areas, and on the other side development is maxed out, which is good. The Board wants density and feasibility, but it seems that, if that line could be manipulated a bit while still accomplishing what is optimal for both uses, it might free up space.

Ms. Alschuler agreed and suggested giving some breathing space along there with variety and pulling it back a bit with the shaping of that edge.

Mr. Pellegrini agreed with the idea of expanding the public space in certain areas where some of those pinch points could be alleviated. That could, in many ways, help with the access issues to the marina but also provide more of a destination at the waterfront which, currently, still feels more like a through-space than a gathering space.

Ms. Alschuler stated the pinch points are the turn at the northwestern corner and where the parking garage is right up against the 41 feet and, if that is the case, when it comes to design in the northeast portion as well, it could be interesting.

Mr. Pellegrini stated, if the space to move along the water is tight, the development blocks along the edge are the largest that are being proposed. He stated it can be inferred that the amount of connectivity available at the water's edge is less than what is available in other parts of the site.

Mr. Pellegrini stated it is important to open up the parking structures at the northern end, which would have parking spaces usable for marina and shoreline activities. There is a large area that was conceptually outlined as parking podium. Airport parking garages make it clear how to navigate to the exits and the access points.

Mr. Pellegrini stated, short of having a stronger pedestrian framework at grade, maybe there needs to be something that moves through the garages. He stated he had concerns about the blocking on the eastern side that is very big when the spaces along the water's edge are tight. There is no space for that additional circulation to go.

Ms. Alschuler stated there are diagrams that show flooding that was extensive in the grey area of the Fortman Marina. She asked if that is set up to exist during flooding because it has to be able to operate.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the development that will occur within whatever interpretation of the shoreline band that will be used is unknown. It could be residential liner, parking garages, or commercial space. The Board has concerns about the nature of that frontage and what it will be like. He suggested that the Board see this later once that development has been determined.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he would be concerned if the majority of the ground floor of what will be built, particularly at the perimeter, ends up just being parking garage. It would be a missed opportunity. To the degree that that can be projected, predicted, or cut off, it is important to understand the mechanism available.

Mr. Pellegrini stated, looking at this in the long-term, there are fewer and fewer projects being defined by very large parking decks. If this is a phased project that will be happening for many years, it would be important to have a better use of the frontage along the public access.

Mr. Leader stated there is an area of the plan that is compacted by the movement, which makes a restricted zone against the face of the building. The building did not change its form from the last iteration. It will be difficult to cram everything in there; there will be circulation conflicts. More permeability is required, especially at the corner, such as breaking off that hook or finding other ways through. Added permeability will allow it become an inviting, active place to circulate around some pavilions rather than a big wall.

Ms. Alschuler suggested rethinking the floating public dock. It is fun to think about it being there for public use and at the same time being connected to the marina, but it may be contributing to the creation of this cut due to the shape.

Mr. Leader suggested breaking more pieces off so that it will have a scale that is not monolithic, or opening up ways through. He stated, moved in that much, it needs to give a little. There needs to be a response in the architecture, whether indoor or out or covered space that is open to the air.

Mr. Leader suggested including marina-oriented uses all the way along; otherwise, individuals may not be able to get out of that where it would not need marina-oriented use. A parking garage facing the edge is the worst. He suggested one bay dedicated to boaters' needs to solve the problem of parking in the garage. He stated this would be better than just a garage at the edge with a green fence.

Ms. Alschuler stated there were questions last time about broadening the approach as it goes towards the water and about the water taxi and how that would work in the drop-off. She stated it will be very important to look at that circle for the next round and whether it is really possible for individuals to stop out there and for multiple cars to be there.

Ms. McCann cautioned the Board that, even if it signs off on this as a Master Plan and comes back in five years for the review of the final phase, it will be open to multiple interpretations, even though interpretive notes will have been written that go with the plan.

Ms. McCann stated the southern end has buildings and an active edge, but, tracing along the plan, going through the maritime commercial, the edge has at-grade parking and a building without clear delineation, and continuing along the plan, there are parking garages. It seems like the activated edge, something that will make the benefit for reducing the 100-foot offset, is not there.

Ms. McCann stated she would feel more comfortable if the Master Plan had some type of delineation of the level of activation and the types of uses along the edge. Some percentage of the edge must have uses that could activate the public realm. The current design is the opposite.

Mr. Leader stated the argument is that the project will not pencil without parking along the edge. He suggested the possibility that it will not pencil. He stated the need for marine-oriented uses.

Ms. McCann stated the need to blend the marine/commercial with the parking garage and somehow have some interplay between the two areas.

Ms. Alschuler stated perhaps it should pull back unless it is something that supports the public use.

Ms. Alschuler stated Board comments were good and they describe how serious this issue is. She suggested solving the north edge issues by putting townhouses there. The very important gathering place destination of the site will feel uncomfortable if it is only parking garages.

(c) Mr. Leader stated the residential and commercial designs are great; the parking edge is bad.

(d) Does the revised public access maximize physical and visual access to and along the waterfront?

(e) Does the revised waterfront promenade design provide clear connections for all users to the Bay from Clement Avenue, and otherwise maximize the opportunities for the public to access and view the Bay?

(f) What recommendations or advice do you have concerning visual access in relation to the public access and the proposed marina waterfront district in Alaska Basin?

Mr. Strang stated he liked the beach, but the question is if the homeowners' association can maintain it long-term.

Ms. Alschuler asked if there are examples of homeowners' associations that run public parks.

Ms. Gaffney stated Heron Court Village near San Quinton is an HOA that owns the beach in front of it. It is not without its challenges but is a popular beach destination.

Mr. Strang stated the proposed beach would be even more difficult than a beach on the ground.

Ms. Gaffney stated Oyster Point project has a beach that will be turned over to the city.

Ms. Alschuler stated it will be a big responsibility to maintain all of the edge and the marina.

Ms. McCann stated the Mission Bay project turns the public parks back to the city to maintain after a certain length of time.

Ms. Alschuler stated the HOA for the current project will be required to fund and do the adaptation in a timely manner.



(g) Are the public water access points and docks appropriately designed to avoid or reduce conflicts among the uses? Are there other amenities or uses that should be considered for water-oriented recreation?

Mr. Strang stated it is heavily programmed, which is great, but it raises the same question about who will run and manage the programs.

Mr. Battalio stated it is nice that there is a hand-launch area for small boats. Having the public out on the float at the northwest corner is an interesting element. He asked about the pump-out, sanitary, and bilging water-separator components for the marina and the things that need to go along with that and where those will be. The water taxi is a great amenity.

(h) Does the design take advantage of the unique historical features in its design, or are there additional opportunities to enhance the public's understanding of the site and its relationship to the Bay?

Ms. Alschuler stated the need to look carefully at the way the story is told. It is a big story about scale, change, and history and should be told in a large-scale way.

(i) Will adequate public access areas be provided with each phase of development?

Ms. Alschuler asked about B-1 and B-2 on pages 12 and 13. It will be tough living there if the old part has not been taken down. She encouraged having that removed by the time people are living there.

Ms. McCann stated the public comment concerns about phasing were important.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he understands the desire to have a loop where individuals can go out in one direction and come back without having to do a 180-degree turn to return on the same trail. The nature of the roadway and how appealing the roadway might be for bicyclists and pedestrians would be key to that because the right-of-way of that road has been determined and is fixed, but it can provide that return route if well-designed without needing to build an additional trail on the eastern side.

Mr. Strang stated that seems less of an issue than the wharf. There can be big gaps between phases.

## (2) **Sea Level Rise Resiliency and Adaptation**

(a) Are the public areas and amenities appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise? Have the wharf promenade and plazas been designed to be adaptive to potential intermittent flooding by the end of the century?

Mr. Battalio stated this was reviewed twice by the ECRB. The sea level rise criteria have been accepted. There are three feet of sea level rise planned in an adaptive capacity to extend that to approximately five to six feet, perhaps up to seven, if necessary, which gets the project through the sea level rise performance that the ECRB looks for.

Mr. Battalio stated one thing that came up in the ECRB meetings was, when the wharf is overtopped, at some point, even though that will be relatively infrequent, there was a question about how that space will be used because the public access will be reduced to that 41-foot corridor. He stated he brought this up because it seems to have an implication to access towards the later part of the project life.

Mr. Battalio stated the other thing that occurred to him is that the adaptive measures include walls to inhibit or block surface water overflowing from the Bay to the trail. He stated, in a situation where the walking surface is below the water for any time period, it raises questions about ground water levels and how the drainage is working. He stated the importance of attention to how the internal drainage and seepage will be handled in the adaptation framework.

Mr. Battalio stated the proposed project meets ECRB criteria, although the ECRB could not comment on the other side since it is not in the project. It will come down to the Board's decision on if public access will be impacted in the future.

Ms. Alschuler stated area will be lost in the future, either in 2050 or soon after.

Mr. Strang stated there is a berm and a wall included as part of the adaptive measures, but there is not a plan along with that to show how they close at the ends. He asked why those are even considered as adaptive measures.

Mr. Battalio stated the ECRB looked at it from the standpoint of if there would be enough space for someone to walk or drive an emergency vehicle, but the ECRB does not look at the project from a design perspective.

Mr. Alschuler stated the need for the Commission to be ensured that there is a reasonable plan in place.

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

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** Ms. Alschuler stated there is a lot for staff to be working with. She asked that the Board have the opportunity to review each of the phases, when there is a design, and when a proposal is suggested for the Tidelands parcels.

Mr. Leader stated there was a strong feeling that the whole zone should have a certain percentage, such as 50 percent, required to be marine-oriented uses.

Ms. Alschuler stated requiring that every edge facing the public walkway needs to be marine-oriented use is not realistic. She stated she does not feel comfortable saying that every bit of it has to be marine/commercial.

Mr. Leader stated the residential zone is out of the 100-foot zone.

Ms. Alschuler stated there are options: the buildings can be moved back or the landscape moved forward or some artistic piece.

Ms. Gaffney stated this is something that staff works with project proponents on a fair amount. She stated, if a way cannot be found to modify some of the building edges so that it is inviting to the public and it is contributing to the activation of the public access areas, the project could then be brought back to the Board for further review.

Ms. Alschuler asked staff to work with the project proponents to find that balance.

Mr. Strang stated more details are required on the marina. The future marina operator's input may further alter the plan.

Ms. Gaffney stated, in the special conditions section of the permit, the project proponents can be required to come back for review at each phase. The same thing would apply to the marina because the marina will not be permitted at this time.

Ms. Gaffney stated findings can be written into the permit that talk about a future marina, view corridors could be imposed, and criteria could be set up for how the marina could interact with the public access areas and impose view corridors in the special conditions section of the permit. These would all be criteria for Board review.

Board Members agreed to add those items in the special conditions section of the permit.

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

**5. Hotel Development at 1499 Old Bayshore Highway, Burlingame, San Mateo County (Second Pre-Application Review).** The Board held their second pre-application review of a proposal by the EKN Development Group LLC to redevelop a 2.19-acre site bounded by Old Bayshore Highway to the east, Mahler Road to the north, existing industrial buildings to the west, and the tidally-influenced Mills Creek to the south. The City of Burlingame Shorebird Sanctuary and the San Francisco Bay Trail are located across Old Bayshore Highway from the project site. The proposed project would include a 12-story dual-flag hotel with 404 rooms, a 4-story parking structure, a restaurant, and public access improvements. Public access improvements include an open space and public seating area, and other public amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Rebecca Coates-Maloon, BCDC Coastal Program Analyst, introduced the project, showed a video from a recent site visit, and described points of interest as the video played. She stated the changes made to the design since incorporating the Board's comments from the May 7, 2018, meeting are included in the staff report. She summarized the issues in the staff report including whether the revised project:

(1) Provides sufficient opportunities for public access on the site.

(2) Provides waterfront activities for a wide variety of users and creates a "sense of place" that "feels public," which would be unique and enjoyable to the greatest number of people.

(3) Designs the Mills Creek open space and public seating area to be compatible with a creek side public access corridor should one be developed in the future.

(4) Includes connections between the various public areas (Mills Creek open space, public seating area, sidewalks and crosswalk to Bay Trail, etc.) that are designed appropriately to connect people to and along the shoreline.

(5) Sites and designs the hotel and parking structure to minimize potential view impacts from the shoreline, and designs the revised drive aisles, public seating area, and landscape features to maximize views to and along the Bay and Mills Creek.

(6) Appropriately designs the public areas to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise.

b. **Project Presentation.** Andrew Davies, EKN Development Group LLC, stated the revised project is a much better project as a result of the Board's review and recommendations. He introduced the project team.

Ryan Doone, Senior Designer, HKS Architects, Inc., provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the revised design since incorporating the Board's comments from the May 7, 2018, meeting.

Alfred Dewitt, Landscape Designer, SWA Group, continued the slide presentation and discussed the open spaces, traffic flows, and circulation.

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

Mr. Leader asked about concern over the steep earth bank going down to the creek. Although it is off the property, if it were to collapse in a flood, the whole zone would be undermined. He asked if there is a geotechnical solution to help the client feel reassured about the stability there.

Mr. Doone stated he has not looked closely at stability. He stated there has been a geotechnical study. He noted that the photo on the presentation slide does not quite depict the existing condition of the earth bank at the creek. The bank has not been surveyed.

Mr. Doone stated the existing condition is almost a build-out of parking all the way to the property line. This was one of the Board's concerns last time. The project proponents' response was to pull it back and move the emergency vehicle access lane off of that area, which allowed creative things to be designed adjacent to the creek. It has been studied; the geotechnical engineer is satisfied that it is stable for the improvements that will be made.

Mr. Battalio stated his understanding that the built floor grade of 11 is one foot above the 100-year flood elevation.

Mr. Doone stated it is 11.2, which is a little over one foot above the base flood elevation, which is 10.

Mr. Battalio asked about sea level rise design criteria being proposed because, being only one foot above the 100-year flood, if sea level rise is one foot, the location would be flooded.

Mr. Doone stated this did not come up during the last meeting; he plans to meet with staff to go over this in more detail. He stated this section is a little off in the sense that the intent is to continue the 11-foot elevation out to the property line and then have a dive as opposed to having this at 9.5 so the areas of the public elements are raised higher than what is currently shown.

Mr. Doone stated the berms act to protect the building as well as the public elements. The site is a challenge because of the existing conditions that need to be matched on three sides while maintaining Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) access. The building has been raised in order to accommodate sea level rise.

Mr. Battalio asked about routing the valet parking into the parking lot in a different way. It makes sense to keep turning right, but it is tight there between the creek, trail, and the valet area. He suggested pulling in through the building.

Mr. Doone agreed that it is a pinch point but stated it would be difficult to bring the cars through the building.

Mr. Strang asked why the street trees are not in back of the curb instead of in back of the sidewalk. It forces the pedestrians to walk along the highway as opposed to behind the trees.

Mr. Doone stated there currently is no parkway along both Mahler Road and Old Bayshore Highway. It is a monolithic walk right up the curb. Those conditions could not be undone because there are issues of conforming back to a condition he pointed to on a presentation slide. He stated the project proponents recognize that walking along Old Bayshore Highway right up against the curb is not as pleasant an experience as it could be, so both Mahler Road and Old Bayshore Highway have been widened from 4 and 5 feet to 7 and 8 feet.

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

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

(1) **Design of the Proposed Public Access:**

(a) Given the proposed intensity of use of the site and anticipated increase in demand for public access, does the revised project design provide sufficient opportunities for public access on the site?

Mr. Battalio suggested laying the slope of the creek bank back to get some emergent wetland vegetation growing on the other side of the bank. On the other side of the creek, there is a little emergent marsh flood plane with pickleweed. On the project side of the creek, it is fairly steep with a little berm on the top with bushes on it. He suggested, although there is not much space and the design has been moved around, on the western part where the mounds are is also an opportunity to lay it back a little bit to get some transitional marsh and still have space.

Mr. Doone stated that came up last time and, as a team, there were many conversations about that and the very unique habitat that would create. He pointed out the property line and stated it would be compelling on an ecological level to do that with the slope, but it is not part of the proposed project.

Mr. Battalio asked if the city owns that property. If so, the city might be interested in helping with this.

Mr. Doone stated he does not know about the ownership of the creek.

Mr. Strang stated the point of the suggestion to set the building back was to use some of that property to lay back the slope and add stability. It would be difficult to revegetate in its current slick, steep condition.

Mr. Leader stated the future creek project would provide an opportunity to improve the engineering of the whole bank.

Ms. Alschuler agreed that would be one of the ways it would work with the future creek trail.

Mr. Strang stated there is also the pedestrian path that is alongside the valet road. He stated, if it were offset a little, the pedestrian path could be dropped down and include an 18-inch retaining wall, which would begin to lessen the steepness of the slope and would allow a separation between pedestrians and vehicles.

(b) Would the revised design for the Mills Creek open space and public seating area provide waterfront activities for a wide variety of users, and create a “sense of place” that “feels public,” which would be unique and enjoyable to the greatest number of people?

Comments and recommendations to this question are incorporated in the responses to other questions.

(c) Is the revised design of the Mills Creek open space and public seating area compatible with a creek side public access corridor should one be developed in the future?

Mr. Pellegrini asked staff what is meant by “future creek side public access corridor.”

Ms. Coates-Maloon stated Mills Creek currently does not have public access along it. The theory would be, at some point in the future, there could be the opportunity to develop a public access corridor that essentially extends from the project site farther up Mills Creek. She stated there would be a trail system along the adjacent property that would follow the line of Mills Creek so the public could get much farther up Mills Creek, and that would be connected back to the Bay Trail.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board needs to look at the whole series of creeks.

Ms. Gaffney stated including public access along the creeks is part of the city’s plan for this area.

(d) Are the connections between the various public areas (Mills Creek open space, public seating area, sidewalks and crosswalk to Bay Trail, etc.) designed appropriately to connect people to and along the shoreline?

Ms. Alschuler stated the presentation slide that showed the 50-year flood potential is something to think about in this area. She stated the need to create a model for other areas on how to survive and even flourish in those conditions.

(e) Have the hotel and parking structure been sited and designed to minimize potential view impacts from the shoreline? Are the revised drive aisles, public seating area, and landscape features designed to maximize views to and along the Bay and Mills Creek?

Mr. Battalio stated it is nice that the design includes the open space adjacent to the creek. He stated a lot of things would have to happen across the creek and elsewhere to clean the Bayside of Old Bayshore Highway looking inland with the idea of having some open view landward up the corridor, but it could be nice, especially if grades and a wider flood plane could be provided - even if it is only 10 to 20 feet along the side of the creek channel - so there will not only be a view but some ecological connectivity up into the city. There is an opportunity there.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested considering how the southern wall of the hotel can become an edge to the public space. He asked if the parking deck is an opportunity for a big mural or green wall. It is south-facing and how the building is interacted with from that space is an important consideration.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he would love to think about how the parking deck interacts as a viewing platform for the creek space. It is a different experience from looking across the highway so it may be appealing. He asked how that could work; for example, the pool and amenity spaces are essentially at the level of the top deck where pedestrians can meander along that edge. He asked if that would work with the parking configuration and if there are certain spots that might be along that southern edge where hotel guests would have visual access to the space at the creek.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the best way to handle it, if the Board wants this project to be a model and many of these other sites as they redevelop, if they are going to be orienting parking to the creek border, which is supposed to be publicly accessible and open. He asked if there are things this project could do so other projects down the road could look at this as an example.

Mr. Strang asked if there was a technical reason for not pushing the trees out to the curb. It is a weak pedestrian link between the creek and the bird sanctuary. Walking along the busy street is not pleasant.

Mr. Battalio agreed and stated it was uncomfortable when a large food truck drove past only two feet from him. He noted that the sidewalk is narrow in that section.

Ms. Gaffney stated staff will follow up with the city on zoning and utilities issues.

(2) **Sea Level Rise**

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

Mr. Strang stated pushing the terrace out to the edge does not do much to prevent the building from flooding at 11 inches. The water would go inside the building in short order with the finished floor at 11 inches.

Mr. Battalio stated this is something that the ECRB could consider. It seems a little short-ranged to invest this much money just to have the hotel flood within 20 years at the 100-year level. It is not what would be expected for a development like this. The floor being one foot above the 100-year water level is not consistent with the planning for sea level rise.

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

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board did not summarize their conclusions. The Board would not like to see this project again.

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

**MOTION:** Mr. Strang moved to adjourn the June 10, 2019, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Leader.

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREA GAFFNEY  
Bay Design Analyst

Approved, with no corrections at the  
Design Review Board Meeting of August 5, 2019.