

# 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

October 29, 2020

**TO:** Design Review Board Members

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

**SUBJECT: Approved Minutes of the July 13, 2020, BCDC Design Review Board Virtual Meeting**

1. **Call to Order and Meeting Procedure Review.** Design Review Board (Board) Chair Karen Alschuler called the teleconference meeting to order at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Andrea Gaffney, BCDC Senior Bay Development Design Analyst, called the roll and confirmed the presence of a quorum.

Other Board Members in attendance included Board Vice Chair Gary Strang and Board Members Cheryl Barton, Bob Battalio, Tom Leader, Jacinta McCann, and Stefan Pellegrini.

BCDC staff in attendance included Rebecca Coates-Maldoon, Andrea Gaffney, Yuriko Jewett, and Ashley Tomerlin.

The presenters were Denise Darrin (RMW Architecture and Interiors), Patrick Foster (Port of San Francisco), Keith Garner (Shepard Mullin), John Grubb (Bay Area Council), Ellen Johnck (Ellen Johnck Consulting) and Dominic Moreno (Port of San Francisco).

Also in attendance was Alec Bash (phonetic) (resident).

2. **Staff Update.** Ms. Gaffney updated the Board as follows:

a. The Commission received a staff briefing on June 18th on the upcoming Climate Change Policy Guidance document on which staff has been working for the past year. The meeting audio and presentation slides can be reviewed on the BCDC website. The guidance is meant to assist permit applicants and their consultants and is scheduled for a Commission vote in September.

b. The next Commission meeting will be held on Thursday, July 16th. The Commission will consider the permit application for the Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development Project in San Francisco.

c. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Board meetings will be held virtually through the end of the year. Future virtual meetings will begin at 5:00 p.m. and should include Facebook live streaming.



d. The next Board meeting will be held on Monday, September 14th. The tentative agenda includes a project review for a mixed-use development project at Point Molate in Richmond.

**3. Approval of Draft Minutes for June 8, 2020, Meeting.** Ms. Barton referred to her comment in the fourth paragraph on page 9 and asked to add “however” between the first and second sentences, add “Bay” to the third sentence, and strike the words “giant” and “naturally” so her comment in the fourth paragraph would read, “Ms. Barton stated the Design Advisory Committee’s suggestion to consider using more native plants throughout the design to promote biodiversity is important; however, plants shift with climate change. She stated the project proponents are creating a prototype for the Bay region - an environmental laboratory that will be enlightening and educational for the public.” She noted that adaptive plants should also be considered because they are more likely to survive.

Ms. Barton referred to her comment in the fifth paragraph on page 9 and asked to change the word “model” in the first sentence to “project” and “incredible” to “significant,” and to add “Bay edge projects and” so the first sentence in the fifth paragraph would read, “Ms. Barton stated the proposed project will be a significant model for many other Bay edge projects and places throughout the region and will provide a learning experience for visitors.”

Ms. Barton referred to the fifth paragraph on page 9 and asked to change the last sentence from “she asked about the plan for maintaining and curating the proposed site as it evolves and ages over time” to “she asked about the plan for maintaining, curating, and explaining the proposed site to the public as it evolves over time.”

Ms. McCann referred to the fifth paragraph on page 12 and asked for change “Ms. Alschuler asked” to “Ms. McCann asked.”

Ms. McCann referred to the second sentence in the third paragraph from the bottom on page 29 and asked to change the word “weeding” to “making.”

Ms. Battalio referred to Mr. Trivedi’s comment on page 11 just prior to the public hearing and asked to change the word “weight” to “wake.”

Mr. Strang referred to his comment in the third paragraph on page 21 and asked to add “and requested that the Master Plan be available for discussion in subsequent meetings” so it would read “Mr. Strang asked about the main principles of the Master Plan and how those principles have or have not been carried forward and requested that the Master Plan be available for discussion in subsequent meetings.”

Mr. Strang referred to the last paragraph on page 30 and asked to change the word “into” to “up to” so it would read “Mr. Strang asked if the riprap shoreline goes right up to the Promenade.”

Ms. Alschuler referred to pages 26 through 28 and asked to clarify that the staff responses were not BCDC staff but city staff.

Ms. Alschuler referred to the sixth paragraph on page 29 and asked to add “the existing” and “on the site” to the first sentence so it would read “Ms. Alschuler asked about the existing Dolores Huerta Park on the site and if it represents an opportunity in terms of a mix of cultures in Vallejo to continue to use that history.”

Ms. Alschuler referred to the second sentence in the sixth paragraph on page 29 and asked to add in parenthesis “Promenade Park, Wetland Park” so it would read “She suggested naming the parks something other than their current descriptive names (Promenade Park, Wetland Park) to connect these parks to the rest of the city using the Dolores Huerta Park as a base.”

Ms. Alschuler referred to item 17 on page 36 and asked if the term “vertical capacity” is clear.

Ms. Alschuler asked for a motion and a second to adopt the minutes of June 8, 2020.

**MOTION:** Mr. Strang moved approval of the Minutes for the June 8, 2020, 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 6 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain with Board Members Barton, Battalio, Leader, and McCann, Board Vice Chair Strang, and Board Chair Alschuler voting approval with no abstentions.

**4. Klamath Historic Ferryboat at Pier 9, San Francisco (First Pre-Application Review).** The Board held their first pre-application review of a proposal by the Bay Area Council to redevelop the historic Klamath ferryboat and moor it along the south apron of Pier 9 in the city and county of San Francisco. The proposed project would include commercial office space, event space, and a museum. Public access improvements include the roof deck with panoramic views of the Bay, a multi-use room, self-directed interpretive elements, free event tours with maritime education, and other public amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Ms. Gaffney introduced the project, showed a series of street view photos of the site, and described points of interest. She summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including the seven public access objectives in the Shoreline Spaces Guidelines and whether the project:

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

(2) Includes considerations for the decks and apron that makes the waterfront an inviting space for the public to enjoy.

(3) Includes an approach to the ferryboat from the Embarcadero that feels inviting to the public.

(4) Includes adequate micro-climate considerations for all users, such as access to wind protection and shade.

(5) Includes appropriate considerations for tours that may occur at the ferryboat.

(6) Includes appropriate considerations for the museum displays.

(7) Includes a design that provides for adequate circulation throughout the ferryboat and at the waterfront for a variety of users.

b. **Project Presentation.** John Grubb, Chief Operating Officer, Bay Area Council, introduced the project team. He provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the background, context, existing site conditions, and a detailed description of the proposed project.

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

Ms. Alschuler stated her appreciation for the historical information of the ferryboats provided in the project presentation. She asked for further details on how the interpretation of the outside entry area was determined and about the outside wall connecting into the history walk currently on exhibit on the inside. She asked if the intent is to make that whole experience connected.

Mr. Grubb stated the intention is to include historical displays on the wall with input from the Port of San Francisco, BCDC, and others about appropriate additions. He noted that there are three displays on the wall at Pier 9.

Ms. Alschuler stated the agenda states that the project proponents are the Bay Area Council and the Port of San Francisco. She asked if the proposed project is a joint venture.

Keith Garner, Sheppard Mullin, stated the Bay Area Council is seeking a lease from the Port of San Francisco. Under the BCDC regulations, the owner must be an applicant, so the Bay Area Council and the Port of San Francisco are joint applicants for the permit.

Ms. Alschuler stated the site currently has a security gate. She asked if the proposed project design includes a similar heavyweight gate, if security must be provided, and if there are any conflicts between uses such as emergency vehicle access.

Mr. Grubb stated his understanding that a new fence will not be needed at this point. He stated the apron also serves as a fire exit for Pier 9.

Dominic Moreno, Marine Operations Specialist, Port of San Francisco, stated the maritime security fencing will be open during business hours for the Bay Area Council's use and for public access. He stated the Port of San Francisco will work closely with the Bar Pilots to ensure there is adequate security in place. He stated the security gate that is currently in place should suffice.

Mr. Moreno stated the apron is typically for pedestrian access. Emergency vehicles would go through the facility if they need to get down to the Bar Pilots or other tenants at that facility. He stated anything needing to be done on the apron can be accessed by the Fire Department's boat and/or at the Marginal Wharf.

Mr. Strang asked how the location of the ferryboat on the pier was established, such as nosing the ferryboat up to the Embarcadero versus setting it back 200 feet.

Mr. Grubb stated there is a lesser amount of berth dredging required closer to the Embarcadero, the existing jetty can be used as an access point to the ferryboat, and it is safer to be further away from the sea wall.

Mr. Strang asked if there are plans to improve the Embarcadero.

Mr. Grubb stated the project proponents are open to improvements on the Embarcadero but none are currently planned. Improvements that are planned will be on the apron at Pier 9, such as benches or bicycle racks as long as they do not interfere with circulation.

Mr. Strang asked about circulation and valet parking.

Mr. Grubb stated valet parking is part of the existing uses for the waterfront restaurant through 2025 and will not be used for this project. He stated visitors to the ferryboat will almost exclusively come by public transit.

Ms. Gaffney stated the promenade in front of the valet parking area is also part of the existing uses for the waterfront restaurant.

Ms. McCann asked about the length of the lease for the berth and the apron.

Mr. Grubb stated it is a 15-year lease with two five-year options to renew.

Ms. McCann asked if there is a requirement that the Klamath has to maintain and operate the engine, if it is a functioning engine.

Mr. Grubb stated there is not a requirement. The engine rusted out and stopped working many years ago. Pieces have been cut out that would have allowed it to operate. The engine and engine room can be visited and is fascinating. It would be nice to include the engine room as part of public access but it is not Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible.

Mr. Grubb stated the ferryboat is approximately 100 years old. As part of the maintenance program, it will be dry-docked every 15 years to be sandblasted, repainted, and recoated.

Ms. McCann referred to Presentation Slides 32 and 33 that show the before and after renderings and stated it is unclear whether there is any surface treatment being proposed to the ground surface of the apron. She asked if the existing concrete will be updated.

Denise Darrin, Studio Director of Workplace Strategy, RMW Architecture and Interiors, stated the project proponents are not intending to do any surface treatment in that location.

Mr. Grubb stated the engineering of the hardscape has been reviewed and the existing concrete is in relatively good condition.

Ellen Johnck, Ellen Johnck Consulting, stated Pier 9 is a contributing historic resource to the Embarcadero Historic District. Any proposed improvements to the surface treatment of the apron will be required to go through a rigorous review by the Port of San Francisco to determine if it is compatible with the Secretary of the Interior's standards to what has been achieved to date on that pier.

Ms. Alschuler stated new lighting and fencing is shown on Presentation Slide 33. She asked if those improvements are part of the proposed project.

Mr. Grubb stated they are a part of the project for safety and esthetic reasons.

Ms. Darrin added that the project site will continue with existing railing and lighting seen elsewhere on the Embarcadero.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the lighting and railing will also be seen on the apron.

Mr. Grubb stated there are no railing or light standards along the apron.

Ms. Barton asked for a greater description of the accessible path of travel along the Embarcadero. She stated her assumption that there is a ramp from Pier 9 in the front at the apron, which will rise and fall with the tides. She asked about ways to get to the roof deck other than by the elevator.

Mr. Grubb stated there is a staircase to the interpretive history space on the upper deck and an additional stair that comes up into the history museum on the roof level. He stated there is an elevator on the ground floor past the stairs, which is accessible from the front door.

Ms. Barton asked about the elevator's capacity.

Mr. Grubb stated it holds four to five standing passengers. The elevator can be taken to the upper and roof decks.

Ms. Barton asked about the number of individuals who will be working on the site on a daily basis, the estimated visitor population during various times of day, and if the site will be open on weekends.

Mr. Grubb stated, during the Landor years, there were 100 employees and, during the Duraflame years, there were 50 to 100 employees who worked on the ferryboat. The Bay Area Council has approximately 30 staff members and the subleased space would add approximately another 30 employees.

Mr. Grubb stated the Conference Center on the main deck has a capacity for 300 visitors and the Multi-Use Lounge on the roof deck is another space that can be used. He stated the numbers of individuals per day for the offices and events will be approximately 150 to 200 individuals and members of the public will be approximately another 200 per day.

Ms. Barton asked if employees have access to the ferryboat from the gangplank in the back.

Mr. Grubb stated employees enter the ferryboat from the front. The gangplank in the back is for the Conference Center. There are also stairs located on both sides but the primary entrance is from the front.

Ms. Alschuler asked to look at Presentation Slides 22 through 26, the public access slides for the main, upper, and roof decks, and asked Mr. Grubb to answer Ms. Barton's questions while pointing the locations out on the slides, particularly the Conference Center.

Mr. Grubb referred to Presentation Slide 22, Main Deck Plan - Public Access, and noted that the event entrance and Conference Center are on the right. He pointed to the path a member of the public may take to access the ferryboat.

Mr. Grubb stated there are passive and active experiences available for the public. He stated members of the public can sign up for tours, which will be directed by staff members.

Mr. Grubb referred to Presentation Slide 26, Roof Deck Plan/Multi-Use Lounge - Public Access, and pointed to the stairs and elevator leading up to the museum and roof deck. He stated attendees from the Conference Center or members of the public have full access to the roof deck.

Mr. Leader asked about the landscaping planned for the roof deck.

Mr. Grubb stated he would like to have an accessible roof deck on the entire structure but engineers concluded that is not possible. Two challenges can be caused by members of the public visiting the ferryboat: possible collapse of the roof deck and possible tipping of the boat.

Mr. Grubb stated the primary structure has steel framing inside to support the concentrated weight of individuals. Landscaping along the edges effectively keeps individuals concentrated down the middle of the roof deck for added balance. He noted that viewing centers have been included so individuals can access the edge, but only a few at a time. The second challenge is, if something draws individuals quickly to one side of the roof deck, it will create a lean to the boat, which is dangerous.

Mr. Strang asked about the issues around the maritime use regulations.

Ms. Gaffney stated there are San Francisco Special Area Plan issues about mooring an historic ship in an open water basin and trust consistency issues with the uses.

Mr. Garner stated there is a discussion with the State Lands Commission about the portion of the boat that is public access versus commercial. This is a question the project proponents have had since the beginning.

Mr. Garner stated the Port of San Francisco is acting as trustee with BCDC and the State Lands Commission. BCDC and the port have been active in recognizing historic preservation as a public trust use when paired with other public-trust-consistent uses, including public access.

Mr. Garner stated what is being done with this project is similar to what is being done at the Ferry Building, where a large portion of the Ferry Building is used for office space but there is also access both inside and outside the Ferry Building that is available for public access. It brings the public in and allows them to see maritime resources that otherwise would not be available.

Mr. Garner stated the project proponents are still in discussion with BCDC, the State Lands Commission, and the Port of San Francisco on all of these issues to design a proposal that is consistent with BCDC regulations that is also consistent with the public trust requirements and includes strong public access and other amenities.

Ms. Gaffney stated a Special Area Plan Amendment will be required in addition to getting a permit to moor the ferryboat at Pier 9 and the dredging that is associated with that.

Ms. Alschuler directed Board Members to page 7 of the staff report to help answer public trust questions and what is required. She stated the last sentence on page 7, which ends "... the revised balance of public and private benefits would be necessary to the health, safety, and welfare of the entire Bay Area" is a bold statement.

Shannon Fiala, BCDC Planning Manager, stated the Bay Area Council is proposing to locate this historic ferryboat on the north side of Pier 9, which is on the south side of what has been designated as the Broadway Open Water Basin.

Ms. Fiala stated the Special Area Plan Open Water Basin policies limit new fill in open water basins to certain uses, including historic ships permitted as of July 2000. Since the mooring of the Klamath ferryboat was not permitted as of July 2000, the proposed project would require an amendment to the Special Area Plan prior to the Commission's permitting process.

Ms. Fiala stated the intention of the open water basins is to preserve the connection of the public to the water, protect views, and promote recreational access to the Bay. Through the plan amendment process, staff will be evaluating to what extent this proposal could potentially detract from those original goals trying to be reached through the establishment of these open water basins.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the ferryboat is considered fill.

Ms. Fiala stated the way that BCDC would approve the fill that results from the historic ferryboat will be determined through the permitting process.

Rebecca Coates-Maldoon, BCDC Principal Permit Analyst, stated there is a two-step process from BCDC's perspective. First, the project would need a Special Area Plan Amendment. That process is underway for the Commission to consider that action. Pending that, the permit amendment process would begin where staff would consider how the project is consistent with the Commission's policies regarding Bay fill, public access, scenic views, and others.

Ms. Coates-Maldoon stated there is dredging associated with this project so the Bay resources side will need to be reviewed. These things would happen during the permitting process after the Special Area Plan Amendment.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board's role is to answer the staff questions about public access.

d. **Public Hearing.** One member of the public provided the following comment: Alec Bash (phonetic), resident, stated it would add interest to the Broadway Open Water Basin to have the sister ship, the Santa Rosa, an historic ferryboat on the south side of the Open Water Basin join the Klamath on the north side.



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

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

Ms. Alschuler stated she was surprised to see a presentation that did not highlight where it was on the waterfront and how it would connect. The proposed project is next to one of the most attractive features on the waterfront - the Exploratorium, which attracts thousands of visitors every year.

Ms. Alschuler stated the new floating fireboat that is going in closer to the Bay Bridge includes a place for the public to gather, observe, and learn about what is happening on that floating fireboat. She suggested not only telling the story of the Klamath ferryboat but to also have a place from the boat to see what is happening with the service uses at the end. It will make it a more diverse experience.

(2) Are there any additional considerations for the decks and apron to make the waterfront an inviting space for the public to enjoy?

Mr. Leader suggested keeping the basic profile of the ferryboat as it is. The proposed project will be inviting, attractive, and will have many visitors.

Mr. Leader stated the private Multi-Use Lounge on the roof deck is a mistake. He asked if it has to be private or if it could have a public use at certain times. Curious visitors may try to look in and they will disturb someone who is trying to hold a meeting. He asked how that will work and if there could be more benefit to the public at least at certain times of the day.

Mr. Leader stated one of the great things about this project is bringing the public in contact with the Bay Area Council. This is a great historic move to make a symbol of the work that the Council is doing in relation to the environment, sea level rise, and things that the city faces right in the middle of the work happening on the Embarcadero. The Multi-Use Lounge would be a good place for the Bay Area Council and the public to meet each other.

Mr. Battalio suggested refinements to how the ferryboat will be moored and accessed. He stated the current design includes ramps at a one-on-twelve slope. He stated to his recollection that ramps can only go approximately thirty feet laterally and two and a half feet vertically at a one-on-twelve slope.

Mr. Battalio stated this means there is a landing, which means it can only go two and a half feet both up and down. This is not sufficient for the tide range in the Bay. He noted that other passenger ferries have complicated ramps and landings due to the large surface space. He stated access will be more complicated than a single thirty-foot-long one-on-twelve access ramp.

Mr. Battalio stated the other refinement he would suggest is about the motion of the vessel. He stated the large vessel is undoubtedly stable and not much affected by waves, but vessels do move in waves, currents, and winds, and, as they move, they interact with the piles, which create interesting motions. Those motions result in the vessel going up and down as well on the piles.

Mr. Battalio stated the allowance for the pile tops needs to not only include the 100-year water level and sea level rise, but is also needs to include an allowance for vessel motion so that the pile guides do not hit the top or go off the top of the piles. They need to be braced. He stated the write-up was specific about the pile elevation, which was premature. It first needs to include the vessel motions. The vessel motions go back to the access.

Mr. Battalio stated the Port of San Francisco has good examples of public access to commuter ferries. These are all doable things that can be addressed but the access ramps and whether they would meet ADA requirements at all tides are not adequately addressed from his perspective as an engineer.

Mr. Battalio stated the Port of San Francisco has plans to upgrade the sea wall. He suggested developing a plan to include a grander, more historically accurate connection to the ferryboat.

Mr. Strang stated his understanding that the soil depth on the roof deck will be four to six inches, which is a little thin to be easily maintainable. It will take a great deal of effort to keep the landscaping looking like the pictures in the presentation slides. He suggested the possibility of having deeper soil but less of it over a smaller area so that the weight is kept the same. He stated this would also address Mr. Leader's concerns and allow for larger gathering spaces at the railing.

Ms. McCann cautioned the project proponents to be thoughtful on the design for the roof deck to ensure it is inviting. She stated the project might not be perceived as public all the way through to the roof deck. She provided the example that the public is unaware of the upper level at the end of the pier at the Exploratorium, next door. She encouraged finding good ways in addition to signage to motivate the public to explore the roof deck such as tying it to walking tours in the city.

Ms. McCann referred to the Presentation Slides 19 and 20, which show the railing on the apron. She stated the Exploratorium is an example of railings on aprons and there are other examples of aprons on the waterfront which are publicly accessible where there is not a rail. She stated it is more authentic to not have a rail but there are also safety issues to consider.

Ms. Barton asked if the piles stabilize the ferryboat from the danger of tipping.

Mr. Battalio stated piles are typically flexible because the ferry is too big. What happens is, when the ferry moves against the piles, the piles have a restoring force and it works together like a dynamic structure.

Mr. Battalio stated as far as rolling or pitching because of a weight change, the piles could not be relied upon because they would most likely bind at that point. If they bind, then they may break. He suggested ballasting the ferryboat to limit the motion or change the response to waves.

Ms. Barton agreed that the plants will require more than six inches of soil on the top deck. She noted that plants have weight and wet soil adds to that weight.

Ms. Barton suggested keeping the true authenticity of maritime in the design and appurtenances and not trying to do too much to mesh other things that have been done along the waterfront. She suggested keeping it ship-like, simple, and clean.

Ms. Alschuler stated the project proponents indicated that they had hoped to make the Multi-Use Lounge on the roof deck public but did not mention the limiting factors. She stated there are two other ways onto the ferryboat. It is important to do everything possible to make that a place that the public can experience, including the types of conferences that the Bay Area Council holds to ensure a diverse audience and a lively place.

Ms. Alschuler stated the need to figure out the crowd handling and make the big waterfront decision outlined by Ms. McCann, which is to keep it with bollards or open it up. She stated the railing does not seem like it is for an apron type of use. She suggested that the project proponents reconsider that and do something more open.

(3) Will the approach to the ferryboat from the Embarcadero feel inviting to the public?

Mr. Battalio stated the Sausalito Ferry has interesting timber fenders that cradle the vessel and a large, open ramp, and the end of Pier 45 has a notch where the ferryboat used to come in. He stated having a connection onto the Embarcadero with this kind of mating setup and more generous space to embark and disembark would feel more interesting.

Mr. Strang stated some renderings include planting pots along the Embarcadero. He stated he liked the gesture of improving the Embarcadero, but the residential pots can be at odds with the historic industrial feeling and scale of the waterfront. He suggested keeping it open and, if there are plantings, include them at a scale that can stand up to the scale of the space. He stated seating would be important.

Mr. Strang stated the project site is in a part of the Embarcadero that is not welcoming, includes a gate, which is a clear ownership threshold, and includes a 220-foot walk from the curb. He stated it will take work to provide milestones to invite individuals in and make them feel welcome. He stated something specific should be done on the Embarcadero to lead individuals to the entrance.

Ms. McCann stated the Bayside History Walk on Pier 9, the Autodesk, and that corner of the pier does not have much displayed there. She suggested adding interpretive panels on the exterior walls of the building that talk about the history of ferries. She stated it would be a great opportunity to tie the Bayside History Walk and that space into the entire concept to better reach the potential of what could be achieved there.

Ms. Barton stated her concern about the privatization impression because much of the ferryboat will be for private offices. She suggested making it as clear as possible that it also contains public space.

Ms. Barton stated the need to consider features on the apron such as an inviting antechamber or overhead structure in the queueing or waiting area to make it clear that it is accessible to the public.

Ms. Barton stated ferries have protective canopies in most instances. Something akin to that would be a clue to individuals walking along the Embarcadero that this is a public entrance.

Mr. Pellegrini agreed with Ms. Barton's concerns about the perception of the balance between public versus private areas.

Ms. Alschuler stated her assumption that the area along the promenade is the responsibility of the waterfront restaurant. She suggested that the project proponents could partner with the waterfront restaurant so there would a more multistep approach to the ferryboat, including adding seating or a viewing area that lets individuals better understand what they will be experiencing inside.

(4) Are there adequate micro-climate considerations for all users, such as access to wind protection and shade?

Mr. Leader stated, when on a ship, it is not as important to include protection from the wind because individuals will expect to experience the elements.

Mr. Strang agreed that exposure to the wind is not a crucial issue. The pier would probably provide some wind shelter for the ferryboat because the pier is on the windward side.

Ms. McCann agreed with Mr. Strang about the microclimate. She stated the building will also provide a bit of protection on the north side.

(5) What advice do you have for tours that may occur at the ferryboat?

Ms. McCann stated having tours of the ferryboat is a great concept. She stated the curation of it will be important.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the tours are free to the public. She suggested providing an introduction to what is happening and the history of the basin as part of the experience of walking along the waterfront.

Ms. Alschuler suggested that some of this might be part of the museum programming. She suggested helping visitors get a sense of what it was like to be on the Bay when 120 ferries were in operation and the waterfront was in constant use.

Ms. Alschuler suggested not only including pictures on a wall. She stated it needs to be experiential and in concert with the Santa Rosa Ferryboat, Pier 7, and the Exploratorium.

Ms. Alschuler stated there is a lot of rich territory that could be embraced and the Bay Area Council would be the perfect organization to do that. The proposed project could be a big addition to the waterfront.

(7) What advice do you have for the museum displays?

Ms. McCann stated the museum display is fantastic. She stated the curation of it will be important.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he is particularly interested in the potential for historic interpretation and being able to understand the history of public access and the sheer amount of water transit that occurred prior to the construction of the bridges in the Bay Area. He stated allowing that history to be revealed to the public goes hand in hand with ensuring that this is an important public amenity.

(8) Does the design of the project provide for adequate circulation throughout the ferryboat and at the waterfront for a variety of users?

Mr. Leader stated it is appropriately located relative to the Embarcadero. The ferryboat does not need a sign for individuals to be aware of it because the ferryboat is a sign in itself. He stated visitors will be waiting on the side pier waiting to board. He suggested including seating on the side pier and other ways to organize the queue.

Mr. Leader stated the biggest concern he wanted to mention is that the roof deck is limited to the public. Part of this is because of the landscaping, which is quite wide, and the viewing center are small. He stated his concern about the width of the circulation next to the museum. He suggested pushing the envelope as much as is structurally feasible to make a larger space for individuals to walk around on the roof deck. One of the attractions is to get up to the roof deck. The space is too confined.

Ms. Alschuler stated it is important to ensure that there is no conflict with the service users in the area.

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Grubb 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 made the following summary and conclusions:

(1) Circulation seems to be clear. There were few suggestions about that except to understand the landscape of the experience and the steps as individuals approach.

(2) Focus on the roof deck. Once individuals discover this space, there needs to be a way to get up there and see the view. At least ten individuals should be able to get to the edge - something that makes it feel that there is access there.

(3) Expanded uses for the Multi-Use Lounge.

(4) Ramps

(5) Museum pieces on the engineering of the ferries and how they worked. Include pictures of the engine room since it is too small to accommodate the public.

(6) Microclimate does not seem to be a big problem, but there were good suggestions on how to make the project more inviting.

(7) Operations during conferences and daily use. Test it to ensure the access works and how the spaces will be used.

(8) Work against a sense of privatization even though there will be private sections. Work to make it a space that invites the public in.

(9) Collaborate closely with the Exploratorium to see how that can start to drive public knowledge across a diverse range of individuals to come to the Klamath Ferryboat.

(10) Look at the current Bayshore History Walk to see if there can be a synergy between the two projects to strengthen both as a result of the interpretive materials being considered for this project.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board would like to review this project again if it changes significantly; otherwise, the project proponents can work with staff to address the key issues.

5. **Adjournment.** Ms. Alschuler asked for a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting.

**MOTION:** Ms. McCann moved to adjourn the July 13, 2020, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Strang.

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 7 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain with Board Members Barton, Battalio, Leader, McCann, and Pellegrini, Board Vice Chair Strang and Board Chair Alschuler voting approval.

Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREA GAFFNEY  
Senior Landscape Architect

Approved, with minor corrections, at the  
Design Review Board Meeting  
of November 9, 2020