

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 510, San Francisco, California 94105 tel 415 352 3600 fax 888 348 5190

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

December 10, 2019

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: Draft Minutes of the November 18, 2019, BCDC Design Review Board Meeting with Port of San Francisco Design Advisory Committee

1. **Call to Order and Safety Announcement.** Design Review Board (Board) Acting Chair Jacinta McCann 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 Members Cheryl Barton, Bob Battalio, and Stefan Pellegrini. BCDC staff in attendance included Morgan Chow, Andrea Gaffney, and Ethan Lavine. Port of San Francisco Design Advisory Committee (DAC) Members in attendance included Laura Crescimano, Marsha Maytum, and Chris Wasney. Port of San Francisco Staff included Dan Hodapp and Ryan Wassum. The presenters were Will DiBernardo (Scape Landscape Architecture), John Donnelly (Scape Landscape Architecture), Roscoe Mapps (Mission Rock Partners), Julian Pancoast (Mission Rock Partners), Justin Semion (WRA Environmental Consultants), Heather Tazalla (Mission Rock Partners), and Dilip Trivedi (Moffat & Nichol). Public comment via email was submitted by Robert Hall (Resident), Laura Thompson (San Francisco Bay Trail), and Noreen Weeden (Golden Gate Audubon Society).

2. **Staff Update.** Andrea Gaffney, BCDC Bay Development Design Analyst, reviewed the safety protocols, meeting protocols, and meeting agenda. She provided the announcements as follows:

a. The Bimla Rhinehart Memorial Pier at Yerba Buena Island had a dedication ceremony on October 28th.

b. The next Commission meeting will be held on November 21st. The Commission will consider the Pier 70 Mixed-Use Development Project and the Foster City Levee Improvements Project.

c. The Commission will tentatively review the Terminal One Project at Point Richmond and the Mission Bay Ferry Landing Project at the December 5th meeting.



d. The next Board meeting will be held on February 10, 2020. The tentative agenda will be to review the Oyster Point Project, Phases 2 and 4, and the India Basin Shoreline Park and 900 Innes Park Project.

3. **Approval of Draft Minutes for October 7, 2019, Meeting.** Ms. McCann referred to the paragraph at the top of page 6 and asked to change “slumped” to “sloped” so it would read “to remediate a saddle area where the asphalt is sloped towards the wharf.”

Ms. Barton referred to her comment under Item 5 on page 20 and asked to change “is designed tight at the end” to “as designed is a very tight fit at the end of the promenade” so it would read “Ms. Barton stated the hotel, as designed, is a very tight fit at the end of the promenade.”

MOTION: Ms. Barton moved approval of the Minutes for the October 7, 2019, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as revised, seconded by Ms. McCann.

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 4 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain with Board Members Barton, Battalio, Leader, McCann, and Pellegrini voting approval.

4. **China Basin Park at Mission Rock Mixed-Use Development (First Post-Permit Issuance Review).** The Board and the Port of San Francisco Design Advisory Committee (DAC) jointly conducted the first post-permit issuance review of the revised design of China Basin Park by Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC, and the Port of San Francisco. The project is located approximately at Third Street, between Terry A. Francois Boulevard and Mission Rock Street, in the City and County of San Francisco. The joint review will evaluate the project in relation to the issued permit requirements including the Design Controls for China Basin Park.

The proposed project would include a mixed-use development, and a redeveloped and expanded China Basin Park. Public access improvements include a shoreline promenade, passive lawn, active recreation facilities, picnic facilities, seating, and a Bay overlook at the knuckle wharf. Additional authorized program elements include public plazas, a public dock, planted areas, a public restroom, permanent or temporary public art installations, and public programming and special events.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Morgan Chow, BCDC Coastal Program Analyst, reviewed the project and summarized the changes made to the design since incorporating the Board’s comments from the December 5, 2016, and November 6, 2017, meetings, which are referenced in the staff report. She summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the revised design:

(1) Provides adequate, usable, and attractive public access that maximizes public use and enjoyment of the area.

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

(b) Includes public access improvements that create diverse recreational opportunities for people of all races, cultures, ages, abilities, and income levels.

(2) Includes public access amenities sited and designed to maximize public use.

(a) Includes appropriate enhancements to the park that create an inviting space for the public to enjoy.

(b) Includes micro-climate considerations that are adequate for all users, such as access to shade.

(c) Includes elevated walkways through the Stormwater Gardens with adequate widths for the projected number and type of users of the space.

(3) Arranges the various facilities and amenities proposed within the park in the best possible configuration in terms of circulation, views, enjoyment, and safety.

(a) Designs and aligns the Bay Trail, Park Promenade, and secondary pathways through the park with adequate circulation through the park for a variety of users.

(b) Avoids or minimizes conflicts or congestion at points within the park.

(c) Preserves and enhances important views to the Bay.

(d) Provides a sense of arrival at the entry to the park at Terry A. Francois Boulevard and guides visitors to the Bay or other points of interest.

(e) Includes considerations for special event programming especially in the new program areas between the Bay Trail and the waterfront.

(4) Includes public areas and amenities that are appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise.

b. **Project Presentation.** Ms. Chow welcomed Dan Hodapp and asked him to say a few words before the project proponents provide their presentation.

Dan Hodapp, Senior Waterfront Planner, Port of San Francisco (Port), reviewed the role of the San Francisco Design Advisory Committee. He stated Port staff has reviewed the Conformance Checklist provided by the development team and generally agrees with the development team's assessment that the design is consistent with the approved Schematic Design.

Mr. Hodapp noted that the Conformance Checklist identifies a few areas of nonconformance, which may be the result of unforeseen conflict, improved deficiencies, and increased public benefits. He stated the staff report identifies where Board guidance would be helpful.

Mr. Hodapp stated there is an unresolved issue in that the bicycle circulation through the park has changed and is still being evaluated by SFMTA, city planning, and the Port and so will not be included in today's presentation.

Mr. Hodapp asked the Board to consider Port staff as a resource.

Julian Pancoast, Director of Development, San Francisco Giants, part of Mission Rock Partners, the developers of the Mission Rock Project, introduced the project team and summarized the next steps for the project.

Heather Tazalla, Mission Rock Partners, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the concept design and public open space network for the project. She stated the first phase includes Buildings A, G, F, and B, which are two office and two residential buildings.

John Donnelly, Principal Landscape Architect, Scape Landscape Architecture, continued the slide presentation and discussed the overall vision of the Mission Rock development. He stated China Basin Park has a critical mass of open space, which is important and unique. The topography and wind factors are major design considerations. The Bay views and potential access to the water are signature opportunities. The design capitalizes on a number of ways to enhance these views and access to the water.

Mr. Donnelly provided a high-level walkthrough of the current design with an emphasis on programming, circulation, canopy planting, and resilience strategies. He noted, in terms of programming, that the Junior Giants Field, which was a feature of the previous permitted design, has been removed from the current plan. As the lawn areas were consolidated, project proponents felt the space could be much more flexible and yet still host that same activity without the fencing.

Mr. Donnelly stated the new design introduces a second access point into the water by way of a sloped walk for hand-powered boat access. The public dock off the Marginal Wharf at the east of the site would provide the other boat access point.

Mr. Donnelly stated a concentration of canopy planting on the west end of the site has been included in the design as windbreaks to increase pedestrian-level comfort. A consistent planting palette is proposed throughout the site to connect the paseos and characters of the Handshake and Central Plazas.

Will DiBernardo, Landscape Designer and Associate, Scape Landscape Architecture, continued the slide presentation and provided a detailed walkthrough of the park zones and the design components of the plazas, paseos, lawn, and coastal gardens.

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

Mr. Pellegrini asked who will ultimately own and manage the park.

Mr. Pancoast stated the whole project is on Port land; the Port of San Francisco will retain ownership of the land and is currently working on an agreement with a management entity to manage the park. He noted that maintenance costs will be funded through Master Association dues.

Mr. Pellegrini asked to what degree the heights of the buildings in Parcels A and G would impact the wind condition, particularly along the public frontage, and if that has been included in the wind study.

Mr. Pancoast stated the heights of the buildings are set by the Design Controls.

Mr. Donnelly added that there may be some wind impacts on the ground plane of Parcels A and G, but much of the funneling effect is a result of development that is offsite.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about shadow studies and if the impact of the shading of the buildings on the public open spaces has been utilized or if there has been work to explore and demonstrate that.

Mr. Pancoast stated he did not know but would provide the answer to the Board offline.

Ms. Barton asked if the water quality in McCovey Cove and the Bay have been a part of the study.

Mr. Pancoast stated preliminary testing has been done. Soil testing continues on the Phase One site.

Dilip Trivedi, Vice President and Coastal Engineer, Moffatt & Nichol, added that the original Environmental Impact Report (EIR) included a water quality analyzation and tidal flushing. He stated there are few flushing issues due to the water movement and the lack of sediment sources in the area.

Ms. Barton asked if the BCDC flood explorer model of sea level rise has been considered.

Ms. Gaffney stated it was taken out of the presentation because the proposed project site will be significantly elevated. The BCDC model of the current site showed flooding around the edges at the 100-year storm level at 24 and 36 inches of sea level rise.

Mr. Trivedi added that inundation maps prepared as part of the permitting process showed no flooding. This will change with the Tidal Shelves. As they move up, there will be a shift in the habitat types. He stated the beaches will require sand to be added over time as is normal for beaches. The Bay Trail is elevated and will not require adaptation until decades into the future.

Ms. Barton stated the project edge is different from what is normally seen around the Bay, which is terrific. She stated the need to ensure that the Bay Trail is well-paved for the engineering and inundation the project site will have to go through.

Mr. Trivedi agreed and stated he has had discussions with staff about this topic. He stated maintaining acreages of public access into the future needs to be thought of differently. He noted that the previous plan elevated everything and had no experience with the water.

Ms. Barton stated a seawall is great in certain areas but breaking with that is important.

Mr. Battalio referred to page 7 of the Exhibits, China Basin Park Sea Level Rise Resilience Plan, and stated the sea level rise criteria seem low. He asked where the sea level rise criteria were taken from.

Mr. Trivedi stated it was from the Mission Rock project when it was permitted, where there had been a change from the NRC studies to the OPC 2016 study. The highest numbers predicted to Mission Bay datum elevation 104 represents five and a half feet of sea level rise. With 66 inches of sea level rise, there would be little to no adaptation needed for the park. The beach and the areas shown below Mission Bay datum elevation 104 would be, at that point in time, 66 inches of sea level rise. There would be a need to relook at how those spaces are adapted.

Mr. Battalio referred to the Elevation Benchmarks table on page 7 of the Exhibits. He stated it does not seem to be clearly designed for 66 inches. Page 7 of the staff report states that Phase One is 8 inches and Phase Two is 36 inches of sea level rise.

A project proponent spoke off-mic. Mr. Trivedi agreed and stated those numbers are the triggers, not the criteria.

Mr. Battalio stated it is confusing because it is not stated anywhere but the table in the Exhibits. Also, the sea level rise is not clearly stated.

Mr. Battalio asked if the 100-year water surface elevation has been vetted. The numbers listed appear to be still water, not the total water level.

Mr. Trivedi stated it is still water; however, there are small waves in this area.

Mr. Battalio stated the need to take total water level into consideration.

Mr. Battalio asked for clarification on the waterfront access features, particularly the dock element. There are images that show the dock in different configurations. He asked if it is pile-supported or floating.

Mr. Pancoast stated the public dock is a floating dock with a gangway.

Mr. Battalio asked if there were any desirable ecological outputs other than a tidal pool throughout the Tidal Shelf spaces.

Mr. Pancoast stated target species and expected species that go along with the social aspects and activation were looked at.

Justin Semion, Technical Services Director, WRA Environmental Consultants, added that it is both because there are other opportunities around the Bay to incorporate this type of design into shoreline projects. This is the first project to do something on this scale. There are opportunities for ecological improvements Bay wide from that perspective.

Marsha Maytum, DAC Member, asked when the uppermost Tidal Shelf at Mission Bay datum elevation 92.6 will interact with the water. She stated she was curious about the experience in the near-term.

Mr. Trivedi stated elevation 95 is Mean Higher High Water. Anything below 95 will be inundated on a daily basis.

Ms. Maytum asked if the character and materials shown on the renderings are the conception or if that is still to be determined.

Mr. Pancoast stated it is to be determined. He stated the park structures are still being developed.

Chris Wasney, DAC Member, stated the Tidal Shelves are a potentially wonderful feature, but there is also a cautionary tale of some tidal steps much closer to the ferry building that have been barricaded for decades. He asked if the project proponents have had experience with the design details that will keep it safe and not barricaded in a few years.

Mr. Trivedi stated the ramp will not be composed of concrete but other materials have been chosen, which will hold up to algae formation. Also, given the wave environment there, the ramp at the beach is flat. Having a pea gravel/sand mixture will hold up to wave action and to movement of sediments.

Mr. Wasney asked if it would be constrained in some sort of matrix such as a gravel pave type of system.

Mr. Trivedi stated it will have curb edges, which have some sort of containment edge beams.

Mr. Wasney asked about tidal action scouring that out.

Mr. Trivedi stated the slope is flat, similar to beaches in the oceans with 8:1 or 10:1 slopes with medium to coarse sand, which holds up to wave action.

Mr. Wasney stated the importance that that feature be successful. He asked if riprap will be used as is typical in the Bay where the land meets the Bay.

Mr. Trivedi stated the plan is to use the riprap that currently exists.

Mr. Wasney stated the renderings of the edges of the building show an almost continuous swath of cafés along the entire Promenade. He asked if that is realistic to think that that will be the tenants along there.

Ms. Tazalla stated, per Design Controls, depending on the part of the building edge condition, it is anticipated that retail food and beverage will spill out into the park or the paseos, including the edge condition. The plan is to activate those areas through retail.

Mr. Wasney stated there may be skepticism about getting appropriate tenants. He stated there have been issues on past projects where the vision of the tenants in the renderings are not the ones that end up signing leases.

Laura Crescimano, DAC Member, asked about the expectation of conformance to the standards and if it is discretionary if some do not conform to the standards.

Mr. Hodapp stated there is some discretion.

Ms. Crescimano asked where the views through to the water will be when the site elevation is raised.

Mr. Pancoast pointed out areas on a presentation slide. He stated open views to the water occur all along the Bay Trail, the Great Lawn maximizes views along the edge, and the Central Plaza views are focused to the north to Oracle Park and McCovey Cove.

Mr. Pancoast stated the views are more constrained on the west end of the site due to the topography and meeting the existing grade, but the view analysis indicates that there is, if not a direct water view, a sense of it. Views to the water start to open up halfway through the Handshake Plaza and across the Lifted Grove. The Stormwater Gardens are relatively flat so the views start to open up, even though it is at a lower elevation than the center area of the park.

Ms. Crescimano asked about changes made to the bicycle circulation and why those changes were made.

Mr. Pancoast referred to a presentation slide showing a side-by-side comparison of the Design Controls in the previously-permitted plan, where there was accommodation for bicycle access from the end of the Bridgeview Paseo into the center of the site. The project proponents felt that it was in some ways redundant to the Bay Trail bicycle circulation that was already in existence on the outside.

Mr. Pancoast pointed out the pedestrian, family play, and food and beverage zones on a presentation slide and stated all those zones came together in certain locations, which created further potential for conflicts between pedestrians and bicycles. He stated the thinking was to take the loop and push it out to coincide with the Bay Trail so that bicycles, in particular, would have unfettered access along the Bay Trail. There is no need for cyclists to ride their bicycles through the core of the park. Cyclists could get off their bicycles at a number of locations to experience the park. The updated design discourages direct bicycle circulation through the park.

Mr. Pellegrini stated this is a high-intensity area in the city. He asked about the amount of foot traffic and public access the ecological area could sustain. He asked if the Tidal Shelves will be open through all seasons. He asked if the biological environment in the Tidal Shelves sustains unfettered public access or if it will require management or monitoring of the access.

Mr. Pancoast stated the high shelf will be accessible but it is not anticipated that all shelves will be fully accessible.

Mr. Semion added that the biological environment in the Tidal Shelves should be monitored over time.

Ms. McCann referred to a presentation slide and asked if the dashed line that is labeled "low" is the existing edge of the site.

Mr. Pancoast stated it is the limit of work.

Ms. McCann asked if there is any implication of Bay fill at this site.

Ms. Gaffney stated the project will predominately be excavation with possible minor fill on the edges to shore up the Tidal Shelves. There will be a general increase in Bay surface area.

Ms. McCann stated the need for an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) review of the boat access sloped walkway. She asked about parking for individuals who launch their watercraft.

Mr. Pancoast pointed to the lower right on a presentation slide of an early conceptual design where Terry A. Francois Boulevard had not been fully designed and stated that location will be a loading zone adjacent to the park. He stated there is also on-street loading along Third Street. All of the parking for the project is in a parking garage on the southwest corner of the site; there is no on-street parking. Individuals can unload their boat and then park in the garage.

Ms. McCann referred to the presentation slide titled "Sea Level Rise Resilience Plan" and stated there is a blue cross-hatched section on the left side, which states "further protection through other adaptation measures," and it is nearest the zone that is the primary access into the park from Third Street. She asked about the measures that could work there.

Mr. Pancoast stated a sea level rise adaptation plan was submitted with the initial permit, which included adaptations beginning with eight inches of sea level rise along Terry A. Francois Boulevard because that street will maintain its current grade, which means it will need adaptations relatively early. The adaptations that have been imagined are creating a wall along the aprons of the pier and creating a sea wall along the Channel Wharf, which is the open space between Piers 48 and 50. Adaptations would increase over time as sea level rise is monitored.

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

(1) Ms. Gaffney summarized the written comments submitted by Maureen Gaffney, Bay Trail Planner, and Laura Thompson, Project Manager, San Francisco Bay Trail, as follows:

(a) Further clarification is required on how cyclists travel around the park and how they will connect back at Third Street and at Terry A. Francois Boulevard.

(2) Ms. Gaffney summarized the written comments submitted by Robert Hall, a member of the California Native Plant Society, Golden Gate Audubon Society, and Nature In The City, as follows:

(a) Incorporate biodiversity in the planting as opposed to the Great Lawn for singular use.

(3) Ms. Gaffney summarized the written comments submitted by Noreen Weeden, Golden Gate Audubon Society, as follows:

(a) Implement measures in the structures featuring glass to reduce collisions with birds, such as the use of special glass, treatments for more conventional glass, screens, and other alternatives.

(b) Encourage biodiversity in the planting palette for increased urban habitat.

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

(1) Does the revised design provide adequate, usable, and attractive public access that maximizes public use and enjoyment of the area?

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

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

Ms. Barton stated the new design is a bolder statement of place, which is a necessary statement for everyone living around the edge of the Bay.

Ms. Barton stated the new design encourages diverse activities, which will be successful well into the future. She agreed with the removal of the little baseball diamond. Being near the water and celebrating water, tides, and the changing relationship to the Bay should be done full throttle. The new design accomplishes that.

Mr. Battalio stated he really liked the new design and seeing the slope cut into the shore is refreshing. He stated his answers to staff questions 1(a) and 1(b) are yes. In response to 1(b) about creating diverse recreational opportunities, he stated he liked the waterfront access. It is something many individuals will enjoy.

Mr. Battalio stated the creation of the Tidal Shelves presents challenges, but that does not mean it is not worth doing. He congratulated the project proponents for that addition.

Mr. Battalio asked if the idea of the Tidal Shelves was a natural ecotone that looks neat or an idea that was more like an eco-slope. As the sea rises, the whole thing would naturally shift. He asked if the Tidal Shelves will be lost as the sea rises or if they will be allowed to shift.

Ms. Barton stated the Tidal Shelves are an experiment that everyone can participate in watching sea level rise.

Mr. Pellegrini commended the effort to unify the public space. He stated it was skillfully done and is an improvement to the design. He stated he had concerns about wind and comfort at the site and the shadows that the buildings would provide, which will also affect the comfort level. He stated attention to that would help the Board better understand the usefulness of this intensely-used space.

Mr. Pellegrini echoed Ms. Barton's comments about the Tidal Shelves. He stated his skepticism and uncertainty are outweighed by his excitement about the Tidal Shelves and the opportunity to try for success. He stated he is struggling with balancing the ecological value with the unfettered public access. Other projects have been successful at restoring habitat but public access has been controlled. He asked if this issue can be handled by management or maintenance.

Ms. McCann agreed that the question of maintenance is important. It was great to hear that the Tidal Shelves might be maintained by a private entity. This has been effective in other parts of Mission Bay, but, in this case, the adaptation or experimentation in maintenance will need to be monitored. She stated it would be great to see the maintenance program have room for shifting away from the original plant selections, maintenance techniques, frequency of replenishing the beach, or other unanticipated issues so that, if something had to be retrofitted, it would still be done in a way that is consistent with the design.

Ms. Barton stated it would be an amazing public demonstration that can be tracked so individuals can see what is going on. It is a place to exhibit not unlike the Exploratorium in its upper room.

Ms. Crescimano agreed that it is refreshing to see breaking the water's edge and pushing those boundaries. She stated, even though there are concerns about things seen before, those concerns should not keep projects from trying to do things. She suggested thinking more through processes to manage inevitable concerns.

Ms. Crescimano stated she liked the attention to thinking about the programming across the site, the sub-zoning, and playing the more active retail edge versus more family and play areas. She stated there is little detail around those play areas, which makes it difficult to comment on the programming in and rearrangement of those spaces. She asked about the structures in those locations and what makes them play areas.

(2) Are the proposed public access amenities sited and designed to maximize public use?

(a) Are the Beach, Cove Access Walkway, and Tidal Shelves an appropriate enhancement to the park? Are there any additional considerations to making this an inviting space for the public to enjoy?

(b) Are there adequate micro-climate considerations for all users, such as access to shade?

(c) Is the proposed width of the elevated walkways through the Stormwater Gardens adequate for the projected number and type of users of the space?

Mr. Battalio asked how the Tidal Shelves function hydraulically or hydrologically - when the tides move up and down, the water cascades over the barriers, and then drains back out. Unlike a natural system, it will need to be controlled. These types of

systems historically have taken more maintenance than anticipated. He also suggested thinking about the sediment deposition rate, even though it was reported that the suspended sediment in that part of the Bay is fairly low.

Mr. Battalio suggested a custom, coarser sediment such as one millimeter higher so that the wind does not blow the sand around. This was a lesson learned at Ocean Beach.

Ms. Maytum stated the elevated walkways through the Stormwater Gardens are exciting and wonderful but are hard to comment on without the relationships to the drop-offs, the width, or the edge condition.

Ms. Maytum asked about the uses for the kiosks that are adjacent to the Stormwater Gardens area.

Mr. Pancoast stated one is for kayak rental and the other is for food and beverage. He stated there is a third kiosk proposed near the Coastal Garden, which will be used to serve families with play-type or family-type concessions.

Ms. McCann asked Ms. Maytum if she had comments about the positioning of the Stormwater Gardens.

Ms. Maytum stated the location seems to be the preference for the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), the experts in this area. She stated it makes sense that it is set back so it will not interrupt the interaction of the Bay edge and view, but there is clearly a problem in that corner that will need to be dealt with over time.

Mr. Wasney stated the Stormwater Gardens are in the shadiest part of the site. He stated, regarding the concerns for shade and shadow, the Stormwater Gardens are possibly the least active of the programmatic zones.

Mr. Battalio stated the access to the Tidal Shelves makes him nervous, which prompted his earlier questions about the ecology and the priority of the function of the Tidal Shelves, but he acknowledged that treating it as a tidal pool and serving the public is also an important consideration since the project is a public park, if the resource agencies determine that priority. Either way, he stated his concern about public safety since the area may be slippery.

Mr. Battalio stated the floating dock is a design opportunity.

(3) Does the arrangement of the various facilities proposed within the park, including trails, stormwater plantings, proposed public art, and other amenities, result in the best possible configuration in terms of circulation, views, enjoyment, and safety?

(a) Does the design and alignment of the Bay Trail, Park Promenade, and the secondary pathways through the park provide for adequate circulation through the park for a variety of users?

(b) Does the Board anticipate conflicts or congestion at points within the park, and what measures could be taken to avoid or minimize such conflicts?

(c) Does the proposed design preserve and enhance important views to the Bay? Does the Board have concerns related to the proposed siting of structures such as the waterfront café and kiosks, trees, or other project elements in terms of their effect on views?

(d) Does the entry to the park at Terry Francois Boulevard provide a sense of arrival and guide visitors to the Bay or other points of interest?

(e) What considerations should be made for special event programming considering the addition of program areas between the Bay Trail and the waterfront?

Ms. Crescimano stated comments on the repositioning of the Bay Trail cannot be concluded yet. It makes sense as far as tracking along the Bay, but how the reconnection and phasing will work is unclear. She asked how the Bay Trail would work at a location on the eastern side that she pointed out on the phasing presentation slide.

Mr. Pancoast stated the Bay Trail is considering a citywide bicycle circulation corridor. He pointed out how the bicycle path will connect to the park on the presentation slide.

Ms. Crescimano asked if the connection on Terry A. Francois Boulevard will be put in place during the phasing.

Ms. Tazalla stated it would be.

Ms. Crescimano asked about the connection across Exposition Street and if there is enough capacity to have separated facilities.

Mr. Pancoast stated the 26-foot curb-to-curb on Exposition Street is narrow. Discussions are currently underway as to whether it should be more of a shared street since all the streets in this development are anticipated to be slow streets, which could be further slowed through design.

Ms. Crescimano stated she is not optimistic about nonstandard approaches to the streets.

Mr. Pancoast stated the Port is doing this to Jefferson Street at Fireman's Wharf.

Ms. Crescimano stated, if they are shared, they need to build in slowing mechanisms.

Ms. McCann asked for comments on subsection (b), the circulation component.

Ms. Maytum stated her appreciation about how the circulation is pedestrian-focused. She stated the need for not only a drop-off zone for a kayak launch but clear drop-off zones with ADA access.

Ms. Barton agreed and stated the drop-off location for kayak, family, and ADA access in the corner is busy and it is unclear whether that is a park entrance or a cul-de-sac. It needs clarification.

Mr. Battalio asked how the Great Lawn area will be programmed.

Ms. Crescimano agreed that the programming will help draw individuals to the location so the Great Lawn area will be used, unlike the large area at Chrissy Field that is unused.

Ms. Maytum stated the dog run will help support the use of the Great Lawn area. Also, the Great Lawn area has gradual sloping to create different vantages, shade, and sun, which is promising.

Ms. Crescimano stated the fact that this is the prow of Mission Bay will encourage its use, along with the activity of the adjacent ballpark. She stated it is a natural point to draw individuals into the area but, at the same time, it is a large lawn. Programming will be important.

Ms. Maytum asked about the public art component.

Mr. Pancoast stated there is an exhibit in the Schematic Design package that shows general public art locations, but the art has yet to be selected.

Mr. Battalio suggested including lockers or places to store things such as kayaks and gear, a place to rinse off equipment, and an outdoor shower and rinse station.

Ms. Crescimano stated she responded positively to how the space is laid out. She cautioned against overdesigning for the largest crowd, which would create a large, vacuous hardscape. She stated the current design has achieved a balance.

Ms. McCann asked about restrooms.

Ms. Gaffney stated a restroom is required in the park. It will be located in the Food and Beverage Pavilion.

Ms. McCann suggested that the Food and Beverage Pavilion could be an area in which to include an outdoor shower and rinse station for individuals to wash off the sand.

Ms. McCann asked for comments on subsection (c), about the siting of structures and views to the Bay. She noted that there was a significant refinement in the design around elevation, the build-up of the site, and potential implications for views.

Ms. McCann stated the Great Lawn and the Lifted Grove will create more interesting views. The views will unfold and there will be points of greater elevation, which is positive. The tree planting is not dense enough to block views but will frame them.

Ms. McCann stated she has reservations about some of the environmental factors and whether the trees will provide protection from wind, but they will provide some shade.

Ms. McCann stated the views are enhanced through this design - the little overlook enhances the view, the access ramp and points where individuals can get a little further out are terrific, as well as the public dock. There is a good balance in views and they have been significantly enhanced in this new design.

Ms. Maytum stated the need for additional detail in the approach from the street and the Family Play area, the height of the canopy of the trees, and the face of the pavilion, which could make a large impact on the first impression of the park, depending on how it is sited. She suggested ensuring that the unfolding is choreographed with the long views to the Bay and the amazing interaction with it.

Mr. Wasney stated having a compression and release of views is good. It would not be a bad thing to have a reveal at the Central Plaza. The landform of the Great Lawn is probably more of an impediment because it is quite high at that end. The relationship of the Food and Beverage Pavilion to this artificially-created landform of the Great Lawn is somewhat ambiguous. He asked if the building is embedded in it or retaining it. It feels wedged in there in its relationship, especially sectionally. It needs more consideration.

Mr. Wasney agreed and asked how the building serves individuals on the upper level.

Ms. Gaffney asked if there were concerns about the views down Bridgeview Street.

Mr. Pancoast pointed to a location on a presentation slide and stated that area is roughly four feet higher than Bridgeview Street.

Ms. McCann stated a greater amount of green will clearly be seen at the end. This can be viewed positively as a draw into the park. An extra four feet in height will not impact distant views to the bridge.

Ms. Barton stated it is wonderful because it reveals itself as individuals walk in different directions. She agreed with considering where the restaurant/snack bar/café is.

Ms. McCann asked if Ms. Barton's concern is that it is working well for the plaza but not for the area behind it.

Ms. Barton stated possibly but the designers may have had good reasons for choosing to put it there.

Ms. McCann asked for comments on subsection (d), about the sense of arrival at the entry to the park.

Ms. Barton stated she brought that up out of sequence earlier. It is a challenge and there is a lot going on there. She stated she is not sure there is a sense of arrival to the park; it seems like a back door, especially since Pier 48 will not yet be developed. How that edge is treated will be important.

Mr. Pellegrini stated that would be a good place to see additional detail to better understand that transition. The elevations of the Stormwater Gardens appear to be above the Promenade in that location, so the public way across the buildings connecting the east to the west between the pier is where it is most constrained. It is unclear how those spaces transition, how the site is entered, and how individuals will find their way around.

Mr. Pellegrini stated this is potentially one of the darker areas of the site. He stated the importance of being wary of the ground floor space at Block A never renting. The north facing area is challenging, particularly for the outdoor environment.

Mr. Battalio asked about the immersive walk in the vicinity of the Stormwater Gardens and Dog Run.

Mr. Pancoast stated those are the elevated walkways that were discussed earlier. The immersive planting and biodiversity are less than 30 inches above the freeboard of the Stormwater Treatment Gardens, so no guardrail is necessary except a curb.

Ms. McCann stated Pier 48 has its entrance there as well. Depending on what that becomes in the future, there is a lot going on in terms of potential conflict points.

Ms. McCann asked for comments on subsection (e), about special event programming.

Mr. Wagney stated service access has not yet been brought up. He asked where the emergency vehicle access would be for big events, where the sound truck comes in and if it has to block the Bay Trail while setting up equipment, where the ambulance will sit at most of these events, and how the trash truck comes in and picks up. He stated, although these are not the glamorous parts of a project, if they are not done right, it creates problems. He suggested an overlay study of how service vehicles, emergency vehicles, and set-up and take-down can occur without impeding access.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested more information in this area. He asked about the Exhibit on page 26, which shows that there could be times where 30 percent of the park's total area outside of the purple areas would not be publicly accessible. More understanding about what that might mean would be helpful.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the environmental conditions of the park may help drive this decision. If the sunniest and most environmentally friendly places are not accessible to the public during special events, it could be a consideration for thinking about how to balance public access, particularly in light of the Commission's new direction on social equity.

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

Mr. Battalio stated the sea level rise criteria used seems to be the prior criteria and not the existing criteria. The amount of sea level rise selected for year 2100 is 66 inches. It is not clear how the park adapts to that higher amount of sea level rise. It seems that some of the land is high enough that it will not be underwater with that still water level, but those are

some of the most interesting features such as the Tidal Shelves and the beach, which would be more inundated than they are now. He stated he was interested in how the design adapts to sea level rise rather than designing for more sea level rise.

Ms. McCann stated this part of McCovey Cove has quite a lot of power boat activity. She stated her observation around Mission Bay is that the wash from the larger motorboats can be quite significant.

Mr. Battalio agreed and stated the commuter ferries can produce waves that have surprised individuals so they slip off the step on the Embarcadero. The waves are important, especially with public access. This is where a beach is more resilient in terms of access in the range of environments than concrete, stone, or grading.

Ms. Maytum stated the interface between the city streets and this condition at the entrance to the project clearly needs to be worked out with the city in the future. If Terry A. Francois Boulevard and Third Street are major access points, that will be a big problem. The timeline or commitment should be documented.

Ms. McCann asked for comments on the Design Controls.

Mr. Pancoast stated it seems that most of the non-conforming aspects to the design controls have to do with the relocation of the Stormwater Gardens. He stated the design team felt this was a reasonable design move.

Ms. Crescimano stated there are quite a few things that are categorized as “will conform” or “detail pending.” There are several places that cannot be called “schematic.” It is difficult for the DAC to give approval without more detail. She stated it is great to see what has happened with the revised design. It is promising and she is excited about the direction it is going in.

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Pancoast 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.

The project proponents offered clarifying points to questions raised by the Board during the Board discussion.

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** Ms. McCann provided two high-level conclusions, as follows:

(1) There was great appreciation for the refined design concept reviewed tonight. There is a general level of support for it and for the enhanced diversity in the program and the general direction.

(2) A general feeling from both the DAC and DRB is that there is a level of detail that would be nice to see in order to feel more confident to give a clear sign-off at this schematic phase.

Ms. McCann made the following summary and conclusions to the questions in the staff report, as follows:

Staff Question #1:

- (1) Good support of diversity and of the spaces.
- (2) Bolder shoreline statement than previous design.
- (3) General support for the cut-in to the shoreline edge. This is something that is showing the way for moving away from the traditional way that the shoreline has been treated. The Tidal Shelves and the beach are very much supported.
- (4) Access into the water is a great move.
- (5) Questions about safety at the Tidal Shelves and the beach.
- (6) Questions about the balance between creating an ecotone there - ecology, biology - that can thrive with a level of potentially high access into the Tidal Shelves. More attention to that area is recommended.
- (7) A greater level of detail about how the sea level rise over time is going to impact accessibility and how the adaptations will work. A timeline showing how that will work over the next 50-plus years would be appreciated.
- (8) Evaluate the shadowing from buildings, particularly the area at the southeast edge of the park. Recommend attention to comfort and wind conditions.
- (9) Further study the wind conditions and the design responses to those.
- (10) The need for the access to sun from an equity standpoint is important.
- (11) The intensity of use and the durability of the spaces had reasonable Board/Committee support but there were questions about how the real success of these will be in the detail in how the designs were advanced.
- (12) There was a general feeling of excitement about the Tidal Shelves, the ecological value, and the unfettered access.
- (13) Strongly recommend an adaptable maintenance approach to the park to ensure that the admirable design objectives are accomplished over time.
- (14) Positive support for the retail edge, but desire to see more detail around the play areas in particular.

Staff Question #2:

- (1) Recommend some type of hydrologic review of the Tidal Shelves.
- (2) Question about potentially coarser sediment on the beach.
- (3) The elevated walkway is great in the Stormwater Gardens.
- (4) The Stormwater Gardens could be wonderful. Provide additional detail.

- (5) Concern about safety in the access to the Tidal Shelves. Investigate further.
- (6) The floating docks are great. Provide additional detail.
- (7) Recommend understanding how individuals can make their way down to the water and how they can tie into the edge of the park.
- (8) Question about bicycles on the Bay Trail—Clarify division for pedestrians and cyclists.
- (9) General support of the Bay Trail positioning. It is clear and a better configuration than the previous scheme.
- (10) Recommend increased clarity on the phasing and how Phase One will engage with the park.

Staff Question #3:

- (1) Recommend more effort be put into the detailing and design of the shared access, particularly in the southeast corner and some streets.
- (2) General support of the secondary paths, but the southeast corner is a complex, busy place. More study at a detailed level is required.
- (3) The art program is great. There is not a lot of detail as yet.
- (4) General support of the views. Ensure, as the design develops, that choreographing the unfolding views to the Bay are kept in mind.
- (5) Avoid clutter - too many things are going on in the foreground, particularly at the entrance from Third Street.
- (6) A sense of compression and opening to views is a good thing to develop and appears to be in the design.
- (7) Question if the Great Lawn is an advantage or an impediment to views.
- (8) Question about the placement of Food and Beverage Pavilion and whether it is really serving individuals in a successful way on the Great Lawn. Provide additional information.
- (9) Recommend increased detail at the Terry A. Francois Boulevard entrance.
- (10) Recommend overlay study of service and emergency vehicle access and special events programming. Potential conflicts need to be considered. The overlay study of services at set-up and take-down, security, et cetera, needs to be considered, as well as management.
- (11) Ensure that when events are on, sunny places in the park and other places that are important for equitable public access are preserved.

Staff Question #4:

- (1) Unclear how the design will adapt. More detail is required in perhaps a timeline or some type of diagramming that will illustrate that.

(2) Need for better understanding how the inundation of popular features such as the Tidal Shelves and the beach could influence the design in the long-term because, as they adapt and change, the overall program of the park will change as well.

(3) Be cognizant of the wave impact as details develop.

(4) Ensure that the beach is resilient from a safety standpoint.

(5) Ensure that the interface between the city streets and the park remain as successful connections.

(6) DAC recommends documentation in writing with the city to protect access to the park from Third Street and Terry A. Francois Boulevard over the long-term.

(7) Concern about the bicycle circulation and that it will not compromise other aspects of the park design. Recommend staff continue to monitor this issue going forward.

(8) Recommend supervision or oversight of the amenities for the water uses, such as the boat access - someone who could take action in emergency situations.

(9) Recommend increased safety and adequate supervision during major events because of the access to the water.

Ms. Gaffney then stated the DRB has a slightly different process than the DAC in that the next steps are plan review at a staff level for portions of the park that are already authorized in the permit, unless the Board feels they need to see it again. Staff will take this summary and continue to work with the project proponents to ensure that the project continues to develop in a way that is consistent with the advice given.

Ms. Gaffney stated the portions of the park that were not previously authorized such as the Tidal Shelves will require a permit amendment. That has a slightly different timeline and process to it.

Ms. Gaffney stated those two things could come back for Board review together or separately depending on how things progress. She asked if the Board has a desire to see this project again.

Ms. Gaffney asked Mr. Hodapp to explain the Port process and next steps.

Mr. Hodapp stated DAC Members requested more information to evaluate whether it meets the Design Controls for China Basin Park on park entrances, particularly the Terry A. Francois Boulevard entrance; the play area; the restaurant area; general materials; locations of public art; and circulation, particularly bicycle circulation.

Ms. McCann stated the plan enlargements included in the meeting packet are helpful, but areas such as the entrance and play area do not show up in as much detail. She noted that more detail may be included in the Schematic Design Package. She suggested it may help to shift the plan enlargement focus and add greater detail.

Mr. Pancoast stated there is confusion as to what is in the Schematic Design Package.

Ms. Gaffney stated the exhibits that were assembled for the Board were partial excerpts from the Schematic Design Package, but a link to the full Schematic Design Package was provided, which is hosted on the Port's website along with the Design Controls.

Ms. Gaffney asked if the Board would like to see the proposed project again.

The Board Members agreed that they would like to review this project again.

Mr. Hodapp stated the DAC would also like to review this project again.

5. **Adjournment.** Ms. McCann asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION: Ms. Barton moved to adjourn the November 18, 2019, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting.

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 4 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain with Board Members Barton, Battalio, McCann, and Pellegrini voting approval.

There being no further business, Ms. McCann adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:30 p.m.