

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

July 1, 2021

TO: Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Andrea Gaffney, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov)
Schuyler Olsson, Coastal Program Analyst (415/352-3668; schuyler.olsson@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: **Middle Harbor Shoreline Park Master Plan Update, Port of Oakland, Alameda County;
First Pre-Application Review**
(For Design Review Board consideration July 12, 2021)

Project Summary

Project Proponents

Port of Oakland (Port)

Project Representatives

Jan Novak, Ramona Dixon, Richard Sinkoff, Laura Arreola, Port of Oakland (Property Owner and Project Proponent); Laura Gates, Michael Freitag, Gates and Associates (Consultants).

Project Location (Exhibits 2, 5-6)

The approximately 40-acre project site, now known as Middle Harbor Shoreline Park (“the park”), is located within the Port of Oakland (“Port”) in a highly industrialized area in Alameda County. The park is encompassed by Port facilities along its inland borders, including the Oakland International Container Terminal to the east, the TraPac Terminal to the north, Middle Harbor Road and the BNSF Railroad to the northeast, and Port View Park and the Ben E. Nutter Terminal to the west. Along its bayward edges, the park encircles the Middle Harbor Enhancement Area (“MHEA”), an approximately 189-acre subtidal habitat restoration area, and is bordered by the Oakland Estuary to the south.

Project Site and Context

Site History (Exhibit 7)

The majority of the land at this site was once water, located on or near Huchiun, the traditional indigenous homeland of the Muwekma Ohlone. In 1820, the Spanish crown granted El Rancho de San Antonio to Luis Maria Peralta, including the project site. A port was created at the site in the late 1800s, and the area became controlled and used by the U.S. Navy beginning in World War II. In 1998, the Port acquired the 153-acre former United States Navy Fleet Industrial Supply Center, Oakland (FISCO) from the Navy, and planned the “Vision 2000 Maritime Development Program” (“Vision 2000”), to redevelop the area and modernize and expand the Port’s maritime facilities. Middle Harbor Shoreline Park was constructed at the site in 2004 as part of the Vision 2000 Program, which consisted of three main projects: 1) the Oakland Harbor Navigation Improvement Project, which deepened the



Oakland Harbor to -50 feet (“-50 Foot Project”); 2) construction of the Joint Intermodal Terminal to increase rail efficiency; and 3) the Berths 55-58 Project, which involved development of a new marine cargo terminal with five new container ship berths.

In 1999, BCDC issued Permit No. 1999.007 to the Port for the Berths 55-58 project. The project involved a significant reconfiguration of the shoreline in and around the former FISCO area, including removing large areas of fill and adding new fill for both the new terminal and the creation of Middle Harbor Shoreline Park, which became the BCDC-required public access component of the project.

Furthermore, in 1998 and 2001, BCDC issued two Letters of Agreement for Consistency Determination No. C1998.010.00 and C2000.014.00 to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for the -50 Foot Project and related sediment disposal and re-use at several areas around San Francisco Bay. Pursuant to these authorizations, approximately 5.8 million cubic yards of dredged sediment was used to create the approximately 189-acre MHEA, a shallow subtidal habitat restoration area that provides valuable marine wildlife and bird viewing opportunities to visitors of the adjacent Middle Harbor Shoreline Park.

The design of the park was the result of a more than two-year public engagement process, in which the Port and its partners gathered feedback from surrounding West Oakland communities for incorporation into the park Master Plan. The Master Plan, Management Plan, and current park status are described below.



Left: aerial image of Port and Navy Fleet Supply, dated 1993. Right: aerial image of the Port and park, dated 2021.

Existing Conditions (Exhibit 14)

The park is an existing approximately 40-acre public shoreline park. It opened in 2004, and has since seen its annual visitation grow from 20,000 to approximately 60,000 visitors. The entire park is a BCDC-required public access area and provides public access to approximately 8,966 linear feet of previously existing and newly created shoreline. The park’s existing design and current status are described in subsequent sections below.

Original Park Master Plan (Exhibit 8,9, 14, 16)

The original Master Plan describes the park's history and setting, community engagement process, goals, and design components. According to the Master Plan, the stated Community goals for the project were to:

- have direct access to the shoreline and the water for a range of activities;
- create a place for learning about the natural environment, local history, maritime activities, and stewardship of the environment;
- create an inviting place for a range of people with varying abilities, providing for both active and passive uses; and
- emphasize the unique aspects of the site—the shoreline, views, habitat, and maritime activity.

The stated Port goals were to:

- provide a long-term positive connection between the Port and the local community;
- have a place for public science education programs, especially for students in elementary and middle school;
- generate public awareness of the Vision 2000 Program, - 50' dredging and habitat projects, and other maritime activities of the Port;
- have the park actively used by the local community, terminal employees, and regional public;
- and provide a park that supports and utilizes the adjacent habitat enhancement area.

The Master Plan also described the key design elements of the park, including the four main sub-areas of the park:

- **Point Arnold**, an “urban/active” area and the primary park entrance, including a preserved wharf and warehouse structure and a family-oriented setting for picnicking and playing;
- **Union Pacific (UP) Mole**, a “nature/passive” area which provides opportunities for walking, picnicking, fishing, and wildlife viewing. It includes the Chappelle Hayes Observation Tower, which provides views of the Oakland Estuary, East Bay hills, Downtown Oakland, the San Francisco skyline, and Port facilities;
- **The Promenade**, a transition corridor between Point Arnold and the UP Mole area, including an amphitheater, large lawns, and Oakland's first beach; and
- **The Port View Park Connection**, a Bayside walking and bicycle path connecting the park to the adjacent Port View Park.

The Master Plan also included proposed offsite improvements to facilitate better access to the park (including construction of a proposed bicycle path from West Oakland), a system of trails connecting to Port View Park, and historic elements throughout Port View and Middle Harbor Shoreline Parks (including FISCO artifacts). Outdoor educational programs for youth were also considered in the park plan.

The Master Plan also envisioned construction of several buildings. The initial planned park structures (design Phases I and II) included:

- a restroom and snack bar at Point Arnold (partially constructed);
- research vessel boat docking facilities at the notch on the south end of the UP Mole (not constructed);
- an Observation Tower at the UP Mole with restrooms and elevator access (constructed);
- a park maintenance building (not constructed); and
- Phase III buildings, including an interpretive center/educational building, a biological field station, a community/conference center, and an interpretive center expansion (all not constructed).

Original Park Management Plan

A Park Management Plan was developed in conjunction with the park Master Plan, and was executed as an agreement between the Port and the East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD). EBRPD was engaged to manage the park because the Port did not have experience in managing a regional park of this scale. In the agreement, EBRPD committed to the general management, operation, and maintenance of the park in accordance with EBRPD policies, standards, and procedures, while the Port committed to building the park, obtaining necessary permits, leading community engagement and educational programming, and maintenance and repair of certain park elements, including but not limited to structural maintenance and certain utility facilities. The management agreement was implemented from 2003 until 2009, when it was terminated due to disagreements between EBRPD and the Port over the cost of maintaining the park. The Port has since directly managed the park.

Current Park Status and Challenges (Exhibit 13)

In 2019, at the request of BCDC enforcement staff, Port staff began working to address several permit compliance issues that BCDC had identified in past site visits, including several of the issues described below. Pursuant to negotiations between staff of both agencies, the Port has committed to resolving identified issues at the Park, establishing a BCDC-approved process for managing special events, and to conducting a full public process to complete and implement updates to the Master Plan, Management Plan, and the Permit. The park was generally built as envisioned in the Master Plan, with several notable exceptions. It's important to note that the park is open to the public, and continues to be a valuable resource and gathering area for the surrounding communities and region. Below are the substantive issues on which BCDC and the Port are working to resolve:

- Inadequate maintenance over the years has left several of the park's key features in deteriorated condition, including:
 - poor condition of the large lawns (due to inappropriate soil substrate as well as non-maintained, malfunctioning irrigation);
 - an inoperable elevator at the UP Mole Observation Tower (at least 15 years out of service), making the tower inaccessible to those unable to climb the stairs;
 - eroded, non-ADA-accessible trails and paved areas, including an accessible route to the beach;
- The park is underutilized and public access to it is limited, due to its relatively difficult-to-reach location within an active Port, and the limited public transportation options and bicycle access;

- Strong winds and limited amenities negatively impact visitor dwell time in the park, while the wind and salty marine air make amenities and certain vegetation difficult to maintain;
- The created beach has failed to provide a shoreline for swimming, strolling, and sunbathing because the subtidal area consists of a semi-consolidated conglomeration of sand and mud.
- Several key amenities envisioned in the Master Plan and/or required in the BCDC Permit were never built as noted above. These improvements were envisioned as key elements for connecting the community to the park and programming the park;
- The Port does not currently have a BCDC-authorized process for handling special events at the park. For more than a decade, the Port held, large, limited-access special events (concerts) at the park without BCDC authorization, which closed some or all of the park to the public. These concerts brought thousands of people to the waterfront for paid concerts, but did not sufficiently contemplate the possible impacts to the public and wildlife who also use the park and basin.

Social and Environmental Context

The Commission has developed a Community Vulnerability Mapping Tool to help inform its analysis of how socioeconomic indicators and contamination burdens contribute to a community's vulnerability. The mapping tool collects information at the level of Census blocks, and is used by the Commission to help identify certain disadvantaged and vulnerable communities. These communities include those disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and hazards that may lead to negative public health effects or environmental degradation, and those with higher rates of socioeconomic characteristics indicative of social vulnerability.

There are no populated census blocks directly at or adjacent to the project site, as it is embedded deep within the Port. However, immediately east of the Port lies West Oakland, a neighborhood with a long history of environmental justice impacts from Port activities. The three West Oakland census blocks lying closest to the project site fall into the "highest contamination vulnerability" category, while two of the three blocks are classified as "moderate" or "highest" social vulnerability, due to high-percentile socioeconomic indicators including people with very low income, renters, single parents, and people with no vehicle. Further to the east, most of the census blocks are likewise classified as having moderate to very high social and/or contamination vulnerability.

During the week, there is heavy port-related truck traffic around the park, and park visitation is limited. School groups, company picnics, port-related workers, and the occasional birder comprise most of the weekday use. On the weekends, when truck traffic at the port is reduced or closed, the park visitation significantly increases. People from all over the region come to experience this unique park situated within a port industrial area that affords sweeping views of the Bay.

Proposed Project

Master Plan Update (Exhibits 18-38)

The proposed project involves updating both the Master Plan and Management Plan for the park. For the proposed Master Plan update, the physical structure of the park and its four sub-areas would stay mostly the same. Most of the proposed updates can be described as relatively minor, with the most

significant change occurring to the beach and lawn areas as described below. Based on initial community outreach, the Port has organized their proposed updates around five key thematic areas:

1. **Facilitate Connections with Nature (Exhibits 25, 26, 30, 31).** To address the poor condition of the extensive lawns on site, the Port proposes removing much of the lawn and replacing it with native vegetation more suited to local conditions (including both irrigated and non-irrigated portions). In addition, the area of upland beach would be approximately doubled in size, by converting the existing dune area to beach, and moving the dunes further inland to an area currently covered in lawn.¹ In addition, the dunes would be re-designed to include view corridors and protected wind pockets, thereby providing a better visual connection from inland areas to the water. An existing but deteriorated accessible mat to the beach would be improved, and would facilitate access to the beach for small watercraft such as kayaks and SUPs (no physical float launch is proposed in the water). According to the Port, these changes to the beach and lawn would both enhance habitat value and decrease maintenance costs.
2. **Nurture Physical Well Being (Exhibits 23, 24, 32-34).** The Port would pave many of the existing deteriorated stabilized sand paths to increase their durability and accessibility and reduce maintenance costs. New paved paths would be added in the amphitheater area, and “experiential paving” would replace the degraded paving on the Point Arnold Wharf, highlighting the site’s former rail track and related history. In addition, new amenities would be added to enhance trail user experience, including bicycle racks, mile markers, exercise stations, and other features.
3. **Support Socializing/Gathering Activities (Exhibits 26, 28, 29, 32).** The Port would add informal tree clusters to create “human scale” wind-protected spaces where visitors can linger comfortably for longer periods; several new small, wind-protected picnic areas; a nature-themed play area in the oval adjacent to the group picnic area at Point Arnold; and other amenities to enhance visitor experience and increase dwelling time, including Wi-Fi, seating, and signage.
4. **Share cultural heritage of site (Exhibit 27, 35, 36).** The Port would update and expand the existing interpretive signage system, adding themed areas describing the site’s cultural and environmental heritage, including the site’s unique maritime and military history and the adjacent shallow subtidal habitat restoration effort. For example, storyboards would be added related to sea level rise, World War II, the “Port’s world influence,” and other topics. In addition, a modular elevator would be installed at the UP Mole Observation Tower, replacing the broken elevator that has been out of service for at least 15 years.

¹ These changes to the beach would improve areas of beach above the mean high water line, but would not address the substandard subtidal condition of the beach. Instead, the subtidal area is being addressed jointly by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Port pursuant to a separate BCDC authorization (C2000.014.01) for the Middle Harbor Enhancement Area. The Port and USACE have stated they plan to conduct a separate public engagement process for the subtidal beach, starting around July of 2021.

5. **Enhance Outdoor Educational Opportunities (Exhibits 27-29).** The Port would emphasize outdoor educational opportunities, rather than indoor education facilities originally foreseen in the original Master Plan. The amphitheater would be re-purposed as an outdoor education hub, including interactive sculpture elements, imprinted paving, elements on seat walls, and additional paths and gathering areas to create a self-guided educational environment. Converted shipping containers and architectural wind breaks would be added to create a protected outdoor classroom and storage for educational programming.

Uncompleted amenities from original Master Plan. As described above, certain amenities from the original Master Plan were not built. In some cases, alternative amenities have been proposed as replacements, are described below:

1. **Maintenance building.** Rather than the planned maintenance building, the Port has been using a modular trailer, two ship containers, and overhang structure to serve as maintenance facilities. The Port has indicated that a more permanent solution may be implemented in the future, but has not yet provided details.
2. **Boat docking facilities at the UP Mole notch.** The Port has stated that, due to strong currents and the high volume of large vessel traffic in the Oakland Alameda estuary, the notch is not an appropriate location for small vessels to dock as originally foreseen in the Master Plan. As such, the Port is currently exploring design alternatives for utilizing the notch, including: 1) a pedestrian bridge crossing the notch, 2) filling the notch, and 3) leaving the notch as is.
3. **Biological research field station.** This amenity was not built and currently the Port has not proposed a replacement.
4. **Community/Conference Center.** This amenity was not built and currently the Port has not proposed a replacement.
5. **Interpretive Center / Educational Building and Interpretive Center Expansion.** As a replacement for these indoor educational facilities, the Port has proposed an outdoor education hub as described above.
6. **Class I bicycle path along Middle Harbor Road.** The Port has stated that the previously proposed location of the bicycle path along Middle Harbor Road is not appropriate due to high truck traffic along the route and associated safety risks. At the request of BCDC enforcement staff, the Port has been exploring alternative routes, but has not yet identified a solution. As such, this element is not incorporated into the currently proposed Master Plan update.

Management Plan

In addition to updating the Master Plan, the Port is also currently preparing an update to the Park's Management Plan, including a process for managing special events. The draft plan describes the Port's operating experience and lessons learned for park maintenance, security, and educational programs and outreach under the two past models of park management (i.e., a management agreement with EBRPD from 2003-2009, and direct Port management from 2009 to present).

It also describes the Port's revenue from use fees for special events and picnic reservations, and briefly addresses the proposed process for managing special events (See separate section on "Special Events" below). Finally, the draft management plan describes current programs and partnerships and



conceptually analyzes three separate possible park governance options: 1) Direct Port management; 2) New non-profit management entity; and 3) EBRPD management and operation. The draft describes the structure, cost, and advantages and disadvantages of each option, as well as the Port's previous experience with options 1 and 3. However, the Port has not yet proposed a preferred option.

Special Events (Exhibits 15, 21)

As described above, the Port has held numerous large special events without notice to BCDC or approval. This has created conflict between BCDC and Port staff, and in some cases has created adverse impacts on the park. As there is no authorization for special events in the Permit, the Port currently needs to seek BCDC plan approval for every large special event it wishes to hold where the park is partially or entirely closed to the public. Both agencies agree this is an inefficient process. In 2019, the Port voluntarily placed a moratorium on special events until BCDC and Port staff could agree to standard conditions for special events that could be incorporated into a permit amendment. However, this issue has not been prioritized in recent times due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

As the situation of the pandemic improves and the Port works to update the Master Plan and Management Plan, discussions around special events have renewed. The current draft of the proposed Management Plan discusses special event management but not yet in great detail. The Port has verbally signaled to BCDC that they would like authorization to host one small (defined as 1,000 to 4,000 attendees) one-day event and one large (defined as more than 4,000 attendees) weekend event per year. BCDC will continue to work with the Port to define the parameters for managing special events, which would then be incorporated into both the Permit and the Management Plan. These larger special events propose to close off portions or all of the park to the public, and are in addition to the picnic reservation events that occur at the park, which can host up to 1,500 people for company picnics, church celebrations, and other group gatherings that occur during the week and on the weekends.

Community Engagement (Exhibits 4, 10, 11)

Extensive community outreach was conducted during initial master plan of the Park in the early 2000s. The Port is also currently conducting community outreach related to the Master Plan and Management Plan update. A public engagement plan was developed in January of 2021, and six stakeholder meetings were held starting in February of 2021 with a range of groups, including West Oakland community and neighbors group representatives, the park education program representatives, Golden Gate Audubon Society, EBRPD, the City of Oakland, Port staff, and other stakeholders. The Port launched an online microsite in April of 2021, and completed a public online survey in May of 2021. According to Port staff, the public outreach effort has informed the current design presented to the DRB, and a summary of stakeholder feedback is shown on Exhibit 11. The Port will continue engaging the community on the final design with a community-wide forum in Summer of 2021.

Sea Level Rise (Exhibit 17)

The project includes updates to an existing park that was constructed before relevant Bay Plan policies for sea level rise were implemented. Sea level rise resilience of any newly proposed features has not yet been analyzed and will be considered in the future as the design of the site progresses. A

conceptual figure adapted from the Commission's Bay Area Flood Explorer (Exhibit 17) shows the expected effects of two feet of sea level rise and a 100-year storm tide.

Approval Timeline & Next Steps (Exhibit 4)

The Port is currently seeking feedback from the DRB and relevant stakeholders on the Master Plan and Management Plan Update. The Port intends to submit an updated draft Master Plan and Management Plan to BCDC staff in late 2021. The proposed changes to the Park will necessitate an amendment to the Permit, which is likely to occur in 2022.

Commission Bay Plan Findings, Policies, and Guidelines

San Francisco Bay Plan Policies

It is important to note that the Commission, with input from the DRB, previously determined that Middle Harbor Shoreline Park, as permitted and required in the Permit and its amendments, represents maximum feasible public access associated with the Berths 55-58 project. The park was a key component of the set of public benefits that allowed the Commission to authorize the Port's fill project, including significant fills to create the park.

The proposed Master Plan and Management Plan update does not propose new fill or development that would trigger additional public access requirements. However, as described above, BCDC staff has determined that the Port is not in compliance with several key public access requirements of the Permit, and as such is not currently providing maximum feasible public access as required. The Port has proposed updates to the public access area, as a means of both remedying past violations and providing the public with an improved, modern park experience, and these improvements must comply with relevant policies as summarized below. Relevant San Francisco Bay Plan (Bay Plan) policies are summarized below.

Public Access Policy No. 2 states, in part, that "...maximum feasible access to and along the waterfront and on any permitted fills should be provided in and through every new development in the Bay or on the shoreline..."

Public Access Policy No. 4 states, in part, that "public access should be sited, designed and managed to prevent significant adverse effects on wildlife" while **Policy No. 5** states, in part, that "public access that substantially changes the use or character of the site should be sited, designed, and managed based on meaningful community involvement to create public access that is inclusive and welcoming to all and embraces local multicultural and indigenous history and presence..."

Regarding sea level rise, the Policies state, in part, that "public access should be sited, designed, managed and maintained to avoid significant adverse impacts from sea level rise and shoreline flooding" (**Policy No. 6**) and that "any public access provided as a condition of development should either be required to remain viable in the event of future sea level rise or flooding, or equivalent access consistent with the project should be provided nearby" (**Policy No. 7**).

Further, these policies state, in part: "access to and along the waterfront should be provided by walkways, trails, or other appropriate means and connect to the nearest public thoroughfare" (**Policy No. 10**) and that "...improvements should be designed and built to encourage diverse Bay-related

activities and movement to and along the shoreline, should provide barrier free access for persons with disabilities, for people of all income levels, and for people of all cultures to the maximum feasible extent, should include an ongoing maintenance program, and should be identified with appropriate signs – including using appropriate languages or culturally-relevant icon-based signage” (Policy No. 8).

Bay Plan Map No. 5 includes the shoreline at the project site as a Waterfront Park, Beach Priority Use Area. Map Policy No. 3 states: “Middle Harbor Shoreline Park - Preserve industrial character of park. Preserve fishing access, picnic facilities, beach, historic features and community gathering and entertainment venues. Provide interpretation of port operations, historic and cultural factors. Provide non-motorized small boat access. Protect eelgrass beds. Provide signage regarding fish consumption advisories for anglers.”

The Bay Plan **Recreation Policy** No. 1 states, in part: “Diverse and accessible water-oriented recreational facilities, such as marinas, launch ramps, beaches, and fishing piers, should be provided to meet the needs of a growing and diversifying population... and improved to accommodate a broad range of water-oriented recreational activities for people of all races, cultures, ages and income levels...” The following facilities should be encouraged in waterfront parks:

1. To capitalize on the attractiveness of their bayfront location, parks should emphasize hiking, bicycling, riding trails, picnic facilities, swimming, environmental, historical and cultural education and interpretation, viewpoints, beaches, and fishing facilities.
2. Public launching facilities for a variety of boats and other water-oriented recreational craft, such as kayaks, canoes and sailboards, should be provided in waterfront parks where feasible.
3. Limited commercial recreation facilities, such as small restaurants, should be permitted within waterfront parks provided they are clearly incidental to the park use, are in keeping with the basic character of the park, and do not obstruct public access to and enjoyment of the Bay. Limited commercial development may be appropriate (at the option of the park agency responsible) in all parks shown on the Plan maps except where there is a specific note to the contrary.
4. Trails that can be used as components of the San Francisco Bay Trail, or links between them should be developed in waterfront parks. San Francisco Bay Trail segments should be located near the shoreline unless that alignment would have significant adverse effects on Bay resources; in this case, an alignment as near to the shore as possible, consistent with Bay resource protection, should be provided.
5. Bus stops, kiosks and other facilities to accommodate public transit should be provided in waterfront parks to the maximum extent feasible. Public parking should be provided in a manner that does not diminish the park-like character of the site. Traffic demand management strategies and alternative transportation systems should be developed where appropriate to minimize the need for large parking lots and to ensure parking for recreation uses is sufficient.

The Bay Plan **Appearance, Design and Scenic Views** policies state, in part, that “all bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay” and that

“maximum efforts should be made to provide, enhance, or preserve views of the Bay and shoreline, especially from public areas...”

The **Public Access Design Guidelines** state that public access should feel public, be designed so that the user is not intimidated nor is the user’s appreciation diminished by structures or incompatible uses, and that there should be visual cues that public access is available for the public’s use by using site furnishings, such as benches, trash containers, lighting and signage. The guidelines further state that public access areas should be designed for a wide range of users, should maximize user comfort by designing for weather and day and night use, and that each site’s historical, cultural and natural attributes provide opportunities for creating projects with a “sense of place” and a unique identity. The Bay Plan Public Access policies on these Design Guidelines state that “the Design Review Board should encourage diverse public access to meet the needs of a growing and diversifying population. Public access should be well distributed around the Bay and designed or improved to accommodate a broad range of activities for people of all races, cultures, ages, income levels, and abilities.”

Board Questions

The Board’s advice and recommendations are sought on the following issues regarding the updated Master Plan and Management Plan proposal. Staff recommends the Board frame its remarks around the public access objectives found in the Commission’s Public Access Design Guidelines. The seven objectives for public access are:

1. Make public access **PUBLIC**;
2. Make public access **USABLE**;
3. Provide, maintain and enhance **VISUAL ACCESS** to the Bay and shoreline;
4. Maintain and enhance the **VISUAL QUALITY** of the Bay, shoreline and adjacent developments;
5. Provide **CONNECTIONS** to and **CONTINUITY** along the shoreline;
6. Take advantage of the **BAY SETTING**; and
7. Ensure that public access is **COMPATIBLE WITH WILDLIFE** [and, at this site, with adjacent Port uses] through siting, design and management strategies.

In addition, Staff has the following specific questions for the Board’s consideration:

1. What additional improvements does the Board advise to improve the water-based recreation at the park and beach?
2. What kind of transition between the lawn and beach does the Board advise to make the two spaces better connected and inviting to the shoreline?
3. What is the appropriate balance of planting and landscape changes needed to meet the goals of park visitors, enhance native habitat value, and reduce maintenance costs?
4. What advice does the Board have on improving the notch area at the UP mole for the public’s use and enjoyment?
5. What advice does the Board have concerning the facilities that were not built and the proposed outdoor programming that would substitute the indoor facilities?

6. What advice and considerations does the Board have on holding special events (larger concerts) at the park?
7. What advice does the Board have for designing the public access areas and amenities to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise, including provisions for the management plan?