

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**  
**Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level**  
**450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804**  
February 13, 2013  
6:00 p.m.

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Ray Welter, Chair	Brenda Munoz, Vice Chair
Robin Welter	Eileen Whitty
Mike Woldemar	Don Woodrow
Brant Fetter	

Chair Ray Welter called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Ray Welter, Vice Chair Brenda Munoz, Boardmembers Brant Fetter, Robin Welter, Eileen Whitty, Mike Woldemar and Don Woodrow

**Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Carlos Privat, Jonelyn Whales and Lina Velasco

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

December 12, 2012:

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> from the last paragraph; regarding art and landscaping in front of the Kaiser lot".

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Woodrow) to approve the December 12, 2012 minutes, as amended; unanimously approved.**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Whitty) to approve the Agenda; unanimously approved.**

**Public Forum - Brown Act - None**

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

Chair Ray Welter noted the agenda consists of one item which is a hold over item to February 27, 2013.

**STUDY SESSION(S)**

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| <b>2. PLN13-028</b> | <b>ATLAS ROAD BRIDGE</b>  |
| Description         | STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE COMMENTS TO EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT STAFF REGARDING THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED ATLAS ROAD BRIDGE NEAR POINT PINOLE REGIONAL SHORELINE PARK |
| Location            | ATLAS ROAD, WEST OF GIANT ROAD.   |

APN	PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY	
Zoning	C-3 (REGIONAL COMMERCIAL)	
Owner	CITY OF RICHMOND	
Applicant	EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT	
Staff Contact	LINA VELASCO	Recommendation: <b>COMMENTS ONLY – NO ACTION</b>

Lina Velasco gave the staff report, stating the study session serves to present the close to final design of the Atlas Road Bridge. Prior to the EBRPD bidding the project for construction, staff would like final input on design. By way of background, this is a cooperative effort between the City and EBRPD. Many years ago when the area near Atlas Road was being developed, this section was connection was envisioned and evaluated as part of several environmental documents. The City also created an assessment district where \$1.4 million was collected toward development of the bridge. There was a point in time when the City transferred the project through a cooperative agreement with the EBRPD, who is now leading the work to get the project constructed. In that effort as well, construction costs have increased more than double of what was originally estimated. They are also making an enormous effort to fund the completion of the bridge. Representatives from the EBRPD are in attendance to present the design, and feedback from tonight will be used to develop a final design.

Diana Althoff, Chief of Design and Construction, EBRPD, introduced Francisco Mariscal, their Civil Engineer and Project Manager for EBRPD and Sean O'Keefe, the consultant team lead for Mark Thompson Company, their consulting firm. She presented an aerial map of the open space park district lands, the Atlas Road Bridge location, and future public access and improvements area. She said this is a new regional access to the northeast end of Pt. Pinole which has been envisioned for some time. EBRPD purchased a parcel and added it to Pt. Pinole, which is a commercial/industrial property.

Ms. Althoff stated the idea was established sometime in the early 1990's, and the EIR was completed which included a bridge connector. EBRPD acquired the land in 1996 at 150 acres and entered into a cooperative funding agreement in 2006/07 and contracted with Mark Thomas to do a detailed design. She noted that the City had done a design but the codes changed and therefore, they had to re-calculate and redesign up to the current codes. However, they stayed with a simple Caltrans highway and bridge design for cost saving measures.

Since the time they had a detailed grading plan they removed the eucalyptus trees necessary to build the west side approach up to the calibration of the bridge. They have also built the fill necessary through that and in the spring will start the build of the bridge.

She presented a preliminary concept of how they envision developing the new regional access. The Atlas Road Bridge will make the new connector and quicker way to access Pt. Pinole, and they plan to have public access improvements, with staging, picnicking, a service yard, and hopefully a new visitor center in the future. As a part of the bridge, they will be building the initial public access.

She pointed to grading, stating they had to build an approach up to the level of the new bridge that clears the railroad, and she displayed various views of the approach, stating it is approximately 60 cubic yards to build this and the pads for the future development area. A detail of the park entrance is found in the packet, location of the railroad track, a ramp up to the bridge to meet ADA requirements, and the future Bay Trail Connector northerly with the Bay Trail splitting away from the approach. She noted that the bridge is a simple and clean design.

Regarding the critical path of the project, they hope to complete the fill in the spring, complete agency reviews by mid-March and go out to bid by the end of March, go to their Board of Directors to authorize it in May and then start construction in June, with full completion by 2014.

Ms. Althoff said she wanted to review comments that have come in thus far from TRAC and from staff. There was some concern about vertical clearance where the protective fencing is installed which is a requirement by the railroad, and they will accommodate that clearance. There was also some concern about the clear width of the trail on the bridge and they have worked with the engineers who believe they can accommodate a 10 foot clear width. There was some concern about the width of the trail and shoulders off of the bridge, and their intent is to use EVR PV standard. There are a couple of pinch points they will not be able to achieve, but for all intents and purposes, this is what they hope to do. There was a request to install the Bay Trail way finding signs and this typically is done at the end of the project by staff on contract. There was also a request to make the chain mesh a little finer and color it. They have a one-inch opening which will be coated in black.

Ms. Althoff completed her presentation and said they were available for comments.

Boardmember Woodrow supported what he said is a great idea. He said he is amazed that they were able to get a bridge built over railroad tracks. He asked how the bridge will be built and asked if they would come in with 150 long beams and place with a crane, or would concrete forms be used. Ms. Althoff suggested Francisco or Sean discuss the details.

Sean O'Keefe stated they will pick super girders and pick those from the eastern segment, swing out over the tracks and go into place once the embankment is formed. They have a steep incline to get in and over the tracks based on the way the original Atlas Road was set, so they will have to bring it further back to get a smoother slope. There will be no false work on the bridge, the deck will be poured on the bridge, but the substructure will not because they could not meet railroad clearances.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned the number of truckloads of fill would have to be used to get the job done. Ms. Althoff stated it was about 12 yards per truck at 60,000 yards coming from Berkeley I-580 to Pt. Pinole, Richmond Parkway, Giant Avenue, and then Atlas Road. Boardmember Woodrow questioned how they intend to get 150 foot concrete beams in there, and Civil Engineer Francisco Mariscal stated they will come from pre-cast plans in the North Bay from Vallejo or Fairfield along I-80. At that point they will exit the Richmond Parkway, to Giant and then to Atlas Road.

Boardmember Fetter asked if there is a reason they would not be delivered by rail considering the weight and size. Mr. Mariscal said this may be a possibility and this can be left to the bidders and contractors. Mr. O'Keefe added that this is one of the most highly trafficked rail corridor so the idea that a train could be parked there and picked off, in reality while it is not impossible, he met with the bridge contractor and crane operator, and given their timeframe the manufacturer recommended bringing it by truck to the site.

Boardmember Woodrow asked if both the fill and beams will be coming in on Giant. Mr. O'Keefe stated they would mostly come down Richmond Parkway and get on Atlas Road. Boardmember Woodrow questioned whether concrete trucks will be traveling to the site over Giant Road. Mr. O'Keefe said he was not sure. Boardmember Woodrow said when they began with the fill, they did not inform people who live in Parchester that they would have between 600 and 900 truckloads of fill coming through there. Once the word was provided, residents came to EBRPD. If they will bring materials over Giant Road, he asked to contact the Parchester Neighborhood Council so those citizens are informed and not burdened beyond what they ought to be. He confirmed with Ms. Althoff that they are planning to go to their Board for a May 21<sup>st</sup>

bid award date and start construction a minimum of three weeks after that, or late June/early July. They will probably only start to order things at that time and not be on the site immediately.

Boardmember Woodrow asked and confirmed the fill would be completed in the spring. Ms. Althoff replied affirmatively and said they have between 6,000 and 10,000 yards left. Boardmember Woodrow questioned what will happen with the currently used bridge and Ms. Althoff stated this remains. In their land use plan they had an option to keep it as a staging area and secondary access once the primary regional access is built. Boardmember Woodrow asked if the gate and parking would be left and Ms. Althoff stated yes, and for local residents, they would want to retain that access.

Boardmember Woldemar said he also likes the idea of the bridge and access, stating it is one of the most important parks in the North Bay. At the same time, the bridge is a Caltrans standard bridge and it is too bad that as a government they cannot do something more gracious and better without spending a lot of money. He said the concrete color is not stated, but he assumes it is gray and asked if it could be painted tan to better fit the bridge into the park, as colored concrete does not cost much. He referred to Sheet #47 which shows a typical section of the bridge. On each edge looks like a deck slab poured on top of the pre-cast beams and it looks like there is a lift there. Above that are the railing and barrier, and he thinks there should be some rhythm along the panel and more articulation. He suggested using similar ideas of the Marina Way Underpass which is very well done.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Sheet #47 and said there are markings indicating "to paint Atlas Road Overhead and paint the year completed." He asked if the graphic was a Caltrans stencil on the side of the railing, which he felt would be terrible. He suggested instead a brass plaque at each location and asked to recess it into the concrete.

He referred to Items 11 and 12 which talk about the pedestrian handrail which looks like what is on Sheet 23 or Item C-12. He was trying to understand the differential between the bridge and the bridge's walkway as it relates to the ramp going to the Bay Trail. There are no cross sections to show what the handrail looks like. He said he was glad to hear that all of the chain link work was in vinyl, but was surprised it was black and not green. He suggested the same color be used on the handrails on the trail, as well.

Lastly, Boardmember Woldemar referred to page 18 which is the detail of the trail itself and he wished it could be more gracious and softer. On Sheet 23, the detail of the pedestrian hand rail would be better if another horizontal pipe would be added to the bottom side of the radius so there are two pipes. It would be much better for children and add a lot of aesthetic quality to it. He noted that none of his comments would cost a great deal of money and he suggested possibly waiting a little longer and spending a little more money on it to do it right.

Boardmember Fetter agreed with comments on details of the design. Included in the submission is the agreement with the City of Richmond. He noted that the money has been in the bank so long that the amount of money has increased from interest and they should see where they are because it dictates so much of the budget. He felt the bridge would be there for a while. It meets a function and he asked if the design is for bicycles on the pedestrian end, and Ms. Althoff responded yes, it is designed for both. He referred to the ADA path, noting that meeting requirements can be difficult when dealing with steep grades. He questioned the logic of taking the trail downward and the way the path was developed. He asked if the east approach from the parking area of the path across to the park was all ADA compliant. Mr. Mariscal responded that the area is dictated by the height of the bridge and clearance. This motivated them to look for another way to get to the bridge and the solution was to make the ADA path to get to the proper

slope. The route comes across the crosswalk around the drainage pond heads up to the bridge which is part of the ADA path.

Boardmember Woldemar said from an access point of view heading northeast from Atlas Road in a wheelchair, one must go down the Bay Trail to turn around and come back up onto the bridge. He confirmed they were not able to make the grades work at an earlier point of access by using a retaining wall. Mr. Mariscal said he said they cannot lower the bridge and the other alternative could have been by modifying the road. Boardmember Fetter noted that the resulting effect would be some kind of disruption of the Bay Trail heading to the north, and the bigger question is whether there is an accessibility requirement on the Bay Trail.

Mr. O'Keefe said they looked at various alternatives to run this path and he agreed they do not like it either. The connector cannot be done because the landing needs to be every 30 feet and the grades do not work out well to do this. Unfortunately, the geometry does not work out to do shorter runs. They looked at 10 alternatives to do this and they had to design it in two parallel paths to be compliant with ADA regulations. He also noted that the retention basin is at a 2:1 slope and is private property, and Mr. O'Keefe reviewed their overall design of slopes, ADA access, and constraints with Boardmembers.

Boardmember Fetter noted there are landings going across the bridge just for ADA reasons and he can imagine that was not a great choice, and Mr. O'Keefe agreed and said it really steep and it comes down to the height that must be reached at the top of the railroad.

Boardmember Fetter asked where the Bay Trail officially ends on Atlas Road as far as a bicycle lane is concerned, and Mr. Mariscal pointed this out. Boardmember Fetter stated he very much likes bicycling and to build the access is a prime opportunity to connect to two major resources. He said path widening improvements being made under BART in Berkeley and Albany are such that bicyclists do not take a 90 degree turn to get to a ramp, which is proposed here. Mr. O'Keefe agreed with Boardmember Fetter but said because there is private property in that area, there is no way to make ADA access to the trail. Boardmember Fetter suggested making other minor accommodations as far as curb access and smoothing it out, especially down by the corner where there is very low grade change.

Boardmember Woldemar pointed to curb returns on the plans and asked that if he drew a line in two areas, took striping in a cross hatch pattern which will slow down drivers, could they consider doing this and be more creative with the crosswalks. Boardmember Fetter supported this idea. Mr. O'Keefe noted that an issue to be considered here is the ADA standard and explained alternative designs they had previous considered. He said the City could add decorative elements, and Boardmember Fetter felt this would solve multiple issues for bicyclists, access and pedestrians.

Boardmember Fetter asked why was the project held up so long, and Ms. Althoff stated they did not receive the project until 2007 and they have been working on it through the many complications, agreements with the railroad, utility purveyors, adjacent property owners, and the PUC and the EBRPD. It was noted that it was a City project and the City could not execute. Boardmember Fetter said he was very appreciative of the Park District taking this on and accomplishing it and thanked them for their patience and work.

Boardmember Robin Welter referred to the width of the trail on the other side of the bridge and Mr. O'Keefe stated it is the Caltrans standard. She suggested flexibility for landscaping in the approach and on the other side of the bridge which would pull one's eye more towards the bridge. Mr. O'Keefe said trees were removed to create the embankment and natural native grasses will be used similar to what Point Pinole looks like. He noted the slope is 3:1 on that side and it will be engineered and hydro-seeded for erosion control. The Parks District can also

review the landscape plan, and Ms. Althoff agreed to take and consider all comments made tonight.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that Boardmember Robin Welter's comments were a flip flop as an entry statement and to also give an anchor or bookends to the other end of the bridge. He likes the Manzanita proposed but also likes other plant materials in a cluster at each end which would make sense from a design standpoint. Mr. Mariscal spoke about future maintenance of landscaping, riparian easements, property lines, and potential CCTA funding for which EBRPD has applied.

Chair Ray Welter said many of his questions have been answered. He would really like to see more thought on the pin points. He pointed out the abruptness of them and asked for something more elegant and timed together. There are three things all tied together and to him, it would be an opportunity for a circle or landing as a hinge point. He encouraged EBRPD to look at those four areas as far as functionality in a wheelchair and going around sharp turns. It would be a lot easier for bicycles, someone in a wheelchair, and while he understands the slope condition, it seems like more work needs to be done to tie the links together and smooth out corners.

Boardmember Fetter concurred and said even having a little more curvature to it would help. He referred to the landing at the bottom of the ADA ramp, said he knows there are rules about how they terminate and how the railing is around them, and he encouraged that this be explored. Ms. Althoff clarified that the area is compacted earth and they do not have all of their right-of-way points yet. Chair Welter suggested paying more attention to the areas where there are transitions and make them more elegant.

Boardmember Woldemar amended his request for painting the rail from green to brown, as the fence at the end is a standard EBRPD brown color.

Boardmember Woodrow asked to expand on the bridge abutments, questioning whether they were square boxed or curved surfaces. Mr. O'Keefe stated they are squared off. Boardmember Woodrow stated all he has to say is based on what he sees happening at Ferry Point. This is an end of a road, it is dark, with easy access in and out, and people will be there with spray cans, and he asked to put surface on the concrete that will enhance the chances of keeping the spraying off. Mr. O'Keefe said this would be something the Park District would have to consider. If someone decides to tag and vandalize the materials it is hard to remove, and now they have seen people now going from fractured fin back to nothing as it is easy to take a roller and cover it up than to spray paint and brush it. It is a maintenance nightmare so they often go with differential textures.

Boardmember Woodrow thanked his colleagues on the ADA plan, but he predicts it will be used less than 1% of the time. Someone in a wheelchair will look at the ramp and dodge the cars. He would not go down the ramp because he would not be sure he would get down in one piece, let alone get back. Mr. O'Keefe pointed out that it is a very long ramp but it is gentle, and he did not think one would be in danger.

Public Comments:

Bruce Beyaert, Chair of TRAC, gave credit to the EBRPD for stepping up to the plate on this project. He distributed the Bay Trail map and described how the project hooks in from the east and said they are also working on a project on the south side. TRAC's major issues include the width of the Bay Trail, the Class I trail's separation from the road, the two-way multi-use trail with clearance for objects which is very important, which could include joggers, pedestrians, baby strollers, and people roller blading. The EBRPD standard is also the Bay Trail's standard;

10 foot paved, 2 foot DG on each side, and said shoulders are used. He asked and confirmed with Ms. Althoff that the 10 foot bridge clearance also includes the 2 foot setback from the concrete wall and rail. Mr. Beyaert noted the City's Bike and Pedestrian Plan recommends that for major thoroughfares road diets to settle things down and 11 feet, and he felt 10 feet was inadequate. He asked to see the road lanes narrowed and at least 10 foot setbacks. He said landscaping would be important and meet clearance from shrubs and trees. The Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan recommends a 3 foot horizontal clearance. He also hoped for a way to reduce the overly wide 14 foot road lanes and have at least 10 feet of Bay Trail clearance, 2 foot setbacks from the concrete wall given all of the elevated curves and fences.

Mr. O'Keefe noted the travel way is 12 foot lanes with 2 feet of shoulders on the bridge, which is important so that cars do not use that, so they are providing a normal standard. Mr. Beyaert pointed out that the City now requires 11 feet and he thinks the area is being created as a very narrow and dangerous trail there, and obviously, they cannot widen the bridge.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the fall off at the edge of the bridge side is the arch shaped chain link structure. He confirmed that on the roadway side of the walkway of the Bay Trail is an 8 inch curb and 34" high railing. Boardmember Woldemar said he said this is not a high traffic or high speed area and he asked if it was conceivable that someone could sign off on a 10 foot traffic lane and 2 foot shoulder, taking those 2 additional feet on each side and adding it into Mr. Beyaert's equation. Mr. O'Keefe said it is possible, but the minimum standard typical lane width is 4 feet and frankly they have taken an exception here by calling it a low volume road and this is the reason they are able to reduce the width of the shoulders to 2 feet. He noted AASHTO standards allow for a reduction of the 4 feet based on very low volume local roads.

Chair Welter asked if the AASHTO standards are mandatory, and Mr. O'Keefe said no; a guideline.

Ms. Velasco said the Board understands Mr. Beyaert's issue that has been raised and now there are on-going conversations from all comments received tonight in what can be addressed given budget constraints and standards that need to be complied to. She thinks this is what the next steps are, and they will hold follow-up meetings with the Park District and come to a resolution. Boardmember Woldemar asked if staff was holding them to the AASHTO standard, and Ms. Velasco said part of what has happened is that the staff that has provided early guidance to the Park District is no longer here and they have gotten very far along in the project and staff is also trying to come up with solutions given budget constraints while meeting the needs of the community. They are looking for flexibility and will try to address them.

Boardmember Fetter voiced one final suggestion regarding the fence curving over the trail, and he suggested art be placed on it to make it interesting.

Chair Welter and boardmembers thanked Ms. Althoff, Mr. Mariscal and Mr. O'Keefe for their presentation.

**BOARD BUSINESS:**

**A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements - None**

**B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements**

Boardmember Woldemar stated in the last paragraph of the minutes, it indicates that Mr. Mitchell said staff would schedule a study session in the near future and it has been two

months. He asked if a session had yet been determined for landscaping. Ms. Whales said no date has been sent as of yet, and she will check with Mr. Mitchell.

Upon request by Boardmember Woldemar, Ms. Velasco announced that the City has received an administrative draft of the form based code which will replace the zoning ordinance in some areas of the City. Staff is working with the project advisory group on trying to identify some big picture issues that may have been missed. In March, staff expects holding study sessions of the DRB, the Planning Commission, the RNCC, with more specialized presentations with neighborhood councils. It is going through the vetting process with City departmental staff, and they are targeting June/July for an adoption date. Final hearings will be held with the DRB and Planning Commission for final recommendation to the City Council.

Chair Ray Welter questioned how this feeds into the work done on the 23<sup>rd</sup> Street corridor, and Ms. Velasco said staff put a hold on this because of the General Plan. Now progress has been made, it will all come as one form based code.

Boardmember Woodrow said since the City has a full City Council, he asked if a member could attend the DRB meetings.

**Adjournment:**

The Board adjourned at 7:56 p.m. to the next meeting on February 27, 2013.