

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2017

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804
December 14, 2016
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Eileen Whitty, Chair
Meredith Benz
Tom Leader
Mike Woldemar

Ray Welter, Vice Chair
Brant Fetter
Jonathan Livingston

Chair Whitty called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. and noted that the Assistant City Attorney was not present for this meeting.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Eileen Whitty; Boardmembers Meredith Benz, Brant Fetter, Tom Leader, Jonathan Livingston and Mike Woldemar

Absent: Vice Chair Ray Welter

Staff Present: Lina Velasco, Roberta Feliciano and Hector Lopez

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 11, 2015

Chair Whitty stated the only members who were on the Board for these minutes were herself and Boardmember Woldemar, and she questioned whether the minutes could be approved or not.

March 25, 2015

Chair Whitty stated the only members who were on the Board for these minutes were herself and Boardmember Fetter and she questioned whether the minutes could be approved or not.

December 9, 2015

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Whitty) to approve the Minutes of December 9, 2015; approved by voice vote: 4-0-1-2 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Livingston and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Welter; Abstain: Leader and Woldemar).

Boardmembers suggested that those minutes being forwarded as a recommendation to the Planning Commission include more detail and be prepared in a timely manner and that old minutes where members were not present be prepared as action-only minutes.

Ms. Velasco stated she will discuss this with the transcriber and ask that more current meetings be done first and to capture key comments, and then work on older minutes next. Staff will work with the City Attorney on whether the older minutes can be prepared as action-only minutes.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2017

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Fetter) to approve the agenda; approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Leader, Livingston, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Welter.

Public Forum – Brown Act – There were no speakers.

City Council Liaison Report – None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Whitty announced that there were no Consent Calendar items and she asked and confirmed members did not wish to place Items 1, 2 or 3 on the Consent Calendar. She announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, January 3, 2017 by 5:00 p.m.

Public Hearing(s)

1. PLN16-615 MENDEZ RESIDENCE

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW RESIDENCE ON A 5,000 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL
Location ALAMO AVENUE
APN 561-191-049 AND 561-191-050
Zoning RL, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Applicant SCOTT MENDEZ (OWNER)
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **HOLD OVER TO JANUARY 11, 2017**

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Fetter) to hold over the matter to January 11, 2017; approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Leader, Livingston, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Welter.

2. PLN16-576 LIFELONG MEDICAL CARE CLINIC

Description STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGN FOR A NEW COMMUNITY HEALTH CLINIC CONSISTING OF A THREE-STORY, ±34,870 SQUARE-FOOT BUILDING WITH A SURFACE PARKING LOT
Location 150 HARBOUR WAY
APN 540-290-025
Zoning CM-5, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, ACTIVITY CENTER
Owner LIFELONG MEDICAL CARE INC
Applicant SGPA ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING
Staff Contact ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: **PROVIDE COMMENTS**

Roberta Feliciano introduced the item and said the matter was a study session for the Board to provide comments on the project and she provided a brief overview of the project, noted a subcommittee of the DRB reviewed the project with the applicant and owners.

Boardmember Livingston asked and confirmed with Ms. Velasco that the form-based code was not yet in effect but the City would like the Board to discuss the project with the expectation that the form-based code will be in place. Ms. Velasco further clarified that the Council adopted the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2017

zoning update and reserved a chapter for form-based code. The City's consultant is working on definitions to correspond with the zoning update and staff hopes to present it in February.

Ms. Velasco stated if the direction is to have the engaging pedestrian frontage along Harbour Way, this should be part of the feedback provided. Staff's idea was to bring the project to the Board early to provide comments and then staff will review it in a more stringent way to be in line with the form-based code.

Chair Whitty commented that there is a lot regarding parking that seems to go back and forth and noted page 5 of 6 states there are 9 on-street spaces with 24 foot aisles and 32 on-site surface parking spaces and also the Planning Commission approved a variance.

Ms. Velasco stated the applicant has a temporary facility on the site now and was granted an approval for a temporary structure but this is now the permanent building.

Chair Whitty said also proposed is a separate employee-only parking at 100 MacDonald Avenue and she confirmed with Ms. Feliciano that 35 spaces are proposed to be provided, the lot is within ½ mile and will be subject to design review, and that this will return to the DRB as part of the project.

Chair Whitty voiced concerns with accessibility to the project by the clients and staff.

Ms. Feliciano stated this can be part of the discussion but in the form-based code it states on-street parking for non-residential uses can be used towards that count.

Chair Whitty referred to street parking and asked how this will be designated only for clients.

Ms. Velasco said the approach with the form-based code was to create transit-oriented neighborhoods. The incentive here is there are alternative options in the sense there is a bus stop and major transit stop and this will hopefully discourage driving and use of walking or transit modes.

Boardmember Woldemar voiced concern with the lack of disabled parking spaces, as well as on-street parking, given the use of the facility and nearby uses.

Boardmember Livingston said the form-based code also does not encourage this type of use and instead shops. People will not be able to park 3 blocks away if they are injured and it seems contradictory.

Ms. Velasco said it is a clinic and people may be going for wellness visits. She did not think the intent was that people who were hurt or frail were necessarily going there. She recognized the point taken and deferred comment to the applicant.

Chair Whitty also noted many facilities have valet parking from their vehicle and this could work well, given the limited parking. She asked and Ms. Feliciano pointed out BART's location, City Hall and the two new housing projects on 21st and 22nd Streets.

Chair Whitty called upon the applicant to present.

ALEXIS BURKE, SPGA Architecture and Planning, applicant, introduced Nance Rosencranz from Lifelong Medical Care, and Steve Oliver, Project Manager. She asked Ms. Rosencranz to provide an overview of the facility's operations.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2017

NANCE ROSENCRANZ, Lifelong Medical Care, applicant, referred to the packet submitted regarding their services and provided an overview of their 40-year licensed community health center. She said 11,000 of their 52,000 patients live in Richmond and the facility is to serve the 6,000 patients now being served. They have 3 sites in Richmond which she identified and described and said the idea is to combine all 3 into this site.

In response to Chair Whitty, Ms. Rosencranz said Lifelong Medical Care patients are uninsured and of low income levels. The facility serves people regardless of their ability to pay or their immigration status. They will also offer dental care at the site as well as walk-in no appointment 7 day a week urgent care. They do not perform surgery or MRIs but they do provide standard x-rays.

She clarified that patients are required to be ambulatory. Urgent care and pediatrics on the first floor, dental and adult medicine will be on the second floor, and family medicine on the third floor. She noted there is a critical shortage of primary care physicians in the U.S. and they are trying to develop a training program here and are in discussions to partner with Kaiser Permanente and Sutter Medical. They currently have 6,000 patients, 2/3 of which are adults and they anticipate growth to 7,000 patients and, in most cases, 60% to 70% of patients get a ride and the rest walk or take public transportation.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to parking and said the current proposal has 41 spaces plus 25-35 off-site spaces and many people in the building being serviced. In cases of emergencies, he thought the size of the facility was possibly too large for this location.

Ms. Rosencranz said the number of parking spaces for the entire site is not that many because the parcel is not that large, as well as limited access in and out and it is cost-prohibitive to put podium parking in which is why they went with surface parking. They chose at this site because it is very close to a lot of public transit. She confirmed their facility in San Pablo was located at 2023 Vale Road across the street from the old hospital.

Ms. Rosencranz then presented a map of the site showing on-site trailers and she said some members approved the temporary buildings some time ago. They need to retain the medical trailer during construction to provide services and the construction process is proposed to be phased.

Boardmember Woldemar asked about staging for constructing the building.

STEVE OLIVER, Project Manager, replied that they do a lot of work in downtown San Francisco and they will have some off-site areas for delivery of materials and they also propose to start earlier and work later on the project.

Ms. Rosencranz then presented the transit line map, bus stop locations adjacent to the project site, and she reviewed the schematic floor plans, circulation, the handicapped parking area, landscaping of the parking lot per the form-based code minus one tree and parking.

Boardmember Livingston questioned if they could remove the trees from the plan and add more handicapped parking spaces and use the wall as a green screen.

Ms. Rosencranz stated they would be completely open to this but it might look grim. Boardmembers suggested a mural or trellises as alternatives.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2017

Chair Whitty asked that when the applicant returns, she asked to show what it would be like in the parking lot looking at the building and out towards the other side of the parking lot, or an eye level perspective.

Boardmember Woldemar asked and confirmed with staff that the full set of plans were to scale.

Boardmembers had the following comments based on the site plan:

- Boardmember Woldemar asked for bulb-outs at each of the two corners. Boardmember Fetter voiced his support for this but stated this is a drop-off area and he cited potential blockage of traffic. Boardmember Woldemar suggested to backset the building off the back of sidewalk so there is enough of a gathering or announcement space.
- Boardmember Woldemar asked for an announcement element to the front door which could be done by way of another bulb-out or bring trees towards the street.

Ms. Burke suggested their aspiration to make the corner of Harbour Way and Bissell Avenue as the primary entrance to the facility, but knowing programmatically, the middle of Bissell Avenue is really the heart of where the building resides. They would be happy to preference one of the three doors significantly over the other but this may mean diminishing the entrance on Harbour Way which would not be adhering to the form-based code and asked for direction from the Board.

- The corner entrance door should be treated well possibly with glass to respond to the rest of the neighborhood. There is a church across the street and the architecture should reflect itself on that corner if it is an entrance.
- Chair Whitty asked to move the entrance to the glass atrium and label it as “main entrance.” Label the door on Harbour and Bissell “urgent care” and then the door at the other corner as “children’s wing” and put it in neon or make it fun.

Ms. Rosencranz said they are happy to diminish the door on Harbour Way but she wanted to be sure it is something the Board can support.

Boardmember Livingston said he was not sure of this and suggested leaving it to the architect and then have the Board review it. He did a massing study and reviewed the building’s length which is 215 feet long, and the form-based code says anything more than 150 feet needs to be broken into smaller bits. He took the building and broke it into this and used the glass core and it was a way to break up the massing. Ms. Burke said this was their intent with the massing.

- Boardmember Fetter said when it comes to program and main traffic concerns and wayfinding, there are people parking in the back and there is an entry there and not an issue. The issue is how people find the facility’s entry either by driver- or pedestrian-entry. Pedestrians are entering on two corners and he asked if the applicant was asking them to come further down the street or walk through the building. He thinks this is simply an issue of wayfinding and signage to guide people and not actually the form of the building. He believes in having the massing and form guide people but when presented with a traffic pattern so strongly influencing the aspect of wayfinding it negates that critical need.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2017

The mass of glass in the center then is not that important except to the drivers. Therefore, having three distinctive entries is not detrimental as they will have this anyway, but he thought way-finding and signage were essential.

Ms. Burke said when getting inside the building there is only one place to go—funneled to the center and all information is available at this center so there is no wrong way to go or wrong door to enter into.

Ms. Rosencranz added that from a programming perspective, they also want to secure their borders, given the building is a medical facility, and people will have to go around the front and she did not want to waste that corridor.

- Boardmember Woldemar said if they could have a centered entry on the north and south, that corridor running from the center off to the west into the corner entry is wasted space, which Ms. Rosencranz had stated. He said by taking the floor plan and moving it north, this will compact and gain inches so that the walkway on the southern side aligns with the entire walkway all the way across and this provides 6-8 more parking spaces.

Ms. Rosencranz agreed this would be fantastic but they cannot fit their urgent care program into the depth of the smaller part of the plan. They want to provide more building along the Harbour frontage to have as much continuity from one building to the next, as well.

Boardmember Livingston stated the building needs modulation and it is too plain and it will need that room.

Boardmember Woldemar stated without the diagonal corner on his sketch he asked if it was any worse or better. He suggested bringing all of the people on both sides of the building to the center and then focus on the center entries, the treatment up above to separate the two to make it look like two buildings, and this leads to more efficiency.

Boardmember Leader thinks the back and front on Bissell is the most important for people who have not been there before, and the corridor seems like wasted space for the number of people who will really enter from there.

Ms. Velasco stated from a form-based perspective and the amount of glazing that would be required on Harbour, the elevations are not storefronts and tall windows, so how the floor plan speaks to the pedestrian experience is then the next challenge if the entrance is moved to Bissell.

Boardmember Livingston concurred and said the project needs to look like a downtown building based on the form-based code. Boardmember Fetter said he agreed and said fenestration, windows and connection from the inside to the outside of the building were needed.

Chair Whitty questioned the need for more glass along Harbour Way.

Ms. Velasco stated when staff worked on the form based code they looked at opportunity sites, and Harbour Way was one of the few streets from the shoreline to the northern neighborhoods. The idea was for an active frontage and to Boardmember Livingston's point about use being on the ground floor, the clinics are allowed when it is behind an allowed use, with the idea of the active frontage which could be the pharmacy component, the lobby entrance, and tall windows.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2017

- Chair Whitty suggested redesigning the project to take the main entrance out, add more glass, and add a coffee shop.

Ms. Burke said they could possibly put the wellness component of the program on the Harbour Way entrance which is a much more public space. There is a community room that hosts events, classes, yoga, and a teaching kitchen. They would have to move imaging and lab away from the urgent care to do this, but they could accomplish this and have large glass openings for that programmed space.

This would require people to enter at the front to check into a class but they could also have an entrance out to the street but it likely would need to be locked when the space was not open for community events.

Boardmember Livingston referred to his sketch, stating his intent was to make the ground floor building adhere to the form-based code. He asked and confirmed with the applicant that translucent glass can be used on bottom floors where privacy is needed, and Chair Whitty asked for LED lighting also to make it beautiful and she said an example is the Oakland Museum parking garage.

Ms. Burke said they can use translucent glass but it means they will sacrifice some interior adjacencies that work well for the medical operations.

Boardmember Woldemar stated the one spaces on the Harbor Way side is a chest lab and one space is for imaging. He thought there was a functional distribution given the nature of the work that may not be appropriate. He questioned how this would look like "downtown." Boardmember Livingston questioned how a big wall of stucco would look, as well.

Boardmember Woldemar said above that as drawn is a diagonal 4 foot projection of 2 stories tall and he asked how this relates to the ground floor experience or church across the street, and he said it does not. He said the nature of the architecture does not relate well to the context around it; that the sketch has more character that relates to the surroundings. He thinks there are architectural options that would signify people are coming in from two directions. He also questioned which street has more prominence. Staff indicated Harbour Bay is but there is a lot of pedestrian movement also on an east/west basis and he suggested putting the entrances in the center.

Ms. Burke stated their interest is building something with a contemporary aesthetic because clients like it and the context is limited to the church and townhomes. They are not trying to create something that is already there.

- Boardmember Livingston asked the applicant to design the building according to the City-adopted styles or transects in the form-based code.

Ms. Burke suggested that when they return they will present adjustments to the building's style that adds some of what has been adopted while still keeping the building contemporary.

Boardmember Leader said Boardmembers were not all in agreement with the traditional style which he disagrees with and thinks it is a question of proportion, scale and detail to accomplish what that would do in a language that makes more sense for this type of building.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2017

Boardmember Fetter agreed and said there is a lot to this, as modern architecture is not easy, but he thinks a bigger question is what Boardmember Livingston brought up which is what the transect dictates.

- Boardmember Woldemar said he was bothered by the project's mass and said it is very tall. It feels like the west and north sides will fold in on the streets because of the weight of the upper floors. He noted that previous renderings visually depicted the east side of the building as 2 stories, but it was actually 3, so he suggested ways to mitigate some of the bulk and mass. He confirmed that trees should be 8-10 feet from the base of the building and suggested planting closely spaced tall growing trees that become a screen to the rest of the architecture.
- Boardmember Leader noted there is a huge parapet and Ms. Burke agreed and said this was intentional. She explained that they want to install solar PV panels for energy offset on top of the building and they want to screen them from the street. They want to be elevated enough so they can put mechanical equipment underneath them, given the limited roof area. They can relocate them back to the 11th Street side and screen it closer to the mechanical equipment and bring the parapet down on the Harbor side.
- Chair Whitty referred to the Bissell Avenue side of the building and said there are three pieces—the Harbor Way building, the new glass entrance and a jail-like building on the left with balconies that block windows and she thinks from the parking lot the building is more attractive from Bissell Avenue. She suggested flipping the glazing from the rear to the front. Ms. Burke said the balconies are up to 42 inches and the windows up to 8 feet, so there is quite a bit of glazing. She said there is more glazing on the front but more punched elevations on the back.
- Chair Whitty asked to do something about the balconies such as making them Plexiglas or something else. Ms. Burke said if they removed the long corridor, they would probably eliminate the majority of that glazing.

Boardmember Fetter referred to the balconies and said these get so little use and he questioned their use. Ms. Burke said they are used to maximize the open space available to staff because the building footprint takes up the majority of the ground floor and she confirmed they were 5 feet. She said they are open to eliminating them, modulating them, or breaking them up.

Boardmember Livingston noted that right across the street is a park, and Ms. Burke agreed but said often staff have only 10-15 minutes and they cannot get to the park in a timely manner; however, she confirmed they can go up to the roof and they are proposing a patio on the roof. She said she is hearing feedback from staff that even the roof deck is too far away from their work spaces.

Boardmember Fetter said since this is not a full on hospital, he asked why there is such a high floor to ceiling height. Ms. Burke said it is a OSH Pod III and they cannot do open air plenums in OSH Pod III.

Boardmember Fetter said it still seems a bit high and Ms. Burke said they can look at reducing them. Boardmember Livingston pointed out that they need 12 foot minimum clear to the bottom of the ceiling for the ground level but they could simply provide this on all of the frontages. He also asked that the cross section show the drop ceiling. Boardmember

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2017

Fetter asked to see if they could take it down a little by 4-5 feet as there seems to be pushback about articulation of the building and how it treats the street.

- Chair Whitty referred to removal of glazing on the ground floor and asked Mr. Oliver where this would be. Mr. Oliver said if the main entrance moves to the center of the building, they do not need the long corridor. This area will have windows, but there would be less-floor-to-ceiling glass used. Ms. Burke said the frosted glass would be on the Harbor Way side.
- Chair Whitty said instead of making the very horizontal design, she asked to install mullions and make the design more vertical.
- Boardmember Woldemar asked to hear more about selection of colors, thought it was a bit too grey and asked for renderings on boards versus computer-generated colors. Ms. Burke distributed the color and materials board and she was happy to go bolder on the colors.
- Boardmember Woldemar said he was confused about the backset of the windows of various types. It looked like some were a half wall thickness or about 3" and others were flush with the outside face. What was missing was the full back set of 8-10" and this made all of the window depressions which has to do with the character of the building. He asked how each of these relate. Ms. Burke said all punched openings have the 3" backset now and the storefront and curtain wall systems have 3". They could be at the back of the frame which is easy to do.
- Boardmember Woldemar suggested the applicant return and focus on the form-based code design guidelines and tell the Board piece by piece where the book relates to the creative approach and not return with just changes but also the logic. He personally thought a traditional design was easier than a contemporary style.
- Boardmember Livingston said he was not pushing for a traditional style necessarily, but what is important about what he drew is how he tried to interpret the form-based code and traditional aspects of Richmond. He presented a sketch and asked to mix it with Boardmember Leader's crisp approach and use the idea to break down overall mass. He said the building is far too large and massive and it does not reflect the character of the form-based code and traditional forms.
- Chair Whitty referred to W-1 and asked to go more rosewood and orange in colors or something more vibrant than the browns. She also asked to either tone down or delete the green glass. She also asked them to consider valet parking at the employee lot.
- Boardmember Fetter said he sees too many security solutions attached afterwards with the open exterior stairwell at the east end of the building and how it comes down to the street level. He said this will not work for this building because the facility's security team will need to fix it afterwards rather than addressing it beforehand.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if there is a gate on either end along the walkway between cars and the building at midnight and he worries about the security aspect of this. Ms. Burke said they fenced the entire site and have cameras, but said they can look at this because during the day it should be open and welcoming.

Chair Whitty opened the public comment period.

Public Comments:

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2017

NIDIA DE LEON said their church is next door to the side and said when the project was first initiated, there was a lot of landscaping and the church had issues with water underneath and seepage. They are still in the process of getting this repaired and dealing with the damage done. She therefore asked on behalf of the pastor that the applicant address landscaping and potential water and flooding issues which may affect them because they are next door to this building.

Boardmembers asked to have the C3 brought back for the next meeting, but Ms. Burke said it was contained in the packet and noted the entire southern side is a bio-retention area.

Chair Whitty concluded the matter and she and Boardmembers thanked the applicant team.

3. **PLN15-688 UNITY PARK DESIGN**

Description	PRESENTATION OF FINAL PHASE I AND MASTER PLAN UNITY PARK DESIGNS. UNITY PARK IS AN 8 ACRE PARK PROPOSED ALONG THE RICHMOND GREENWAY, BETWEEN MARINA WAY AND 16 TH STREET AND BETWEEN 4 TH AND 8 TH STREETS, INCLUDING THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1605 OHIO AVENUE
APN	540-360-022
Zoning	PR, PARKS AND RECREATION
Owner	CITY OF RICHMOND
Applicant	CITY OF RICHMOND PARKS DIVISION
Staff Contact	LINA VELASCO

Recommendation: **PROVIDE COMMENTS**

Lina Velasco gave an overview of the Unity Park design's final Phase I and master plan. She said several months ago a study session was held with Friends of the Richmond Greenway (FORG) representing the 17 non-profit partners working with the City on this grant project. Marcia Vallier is the City's consultant preparing landscape plans for the project and has been working on construction drawings which will be done for the bid. The Parks and Recreation Commission has heard the project and approved the plans, and the final design is being presented. There is no official DRB action; however, staff is seeking approval of the project by the DRB.

Comments were provided regarding the gateway area, treatment of sidewalks and paving areas, canopy/gazebo component and given limited resources, there is \$3 million of the \$5 million left for the implementation, and Phase I has the majority of the components but would be added to over time. She noted there is one speaker and she provided an email to the Board regarding general objection to a park in the area given its potential to attract less desirable elements.

Chair Whitty questioned when the project began and asked when the neighborhood was in talks. Ms. Velasco replied it was early 2015. Staff held a study session in 2015 and earlier that year, FORG worked with all 17 non-profits who reached out to the neighborhood councils, residents conducted surveys and videos along the greenway, and there has been engagement of residents.

Chair Whitty asked how the project will be finalized and she asked when it will start. Ms. Velasco said after the DRB's final comments the final design documents will be completed. The Council would then release a bid and approve a contract for a contractor to implement the work. There are some grant performance components that the City must complete and a target date to have completion by the end of next year.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2017

Boardmember Fetter referred to the huge green area which is not designed out and he asked and confirmed with Ms. Velasco that the source of the grant was a \$5 million Proposition 84 State Park grant. The first part of the grant was done to acquire 1605 Ohio Avenue which is the gateway plaza/gazebo area.

Boardmember Fetter asked how this connects with the bridge over 23rd Street or connecting the bike path and making it more usable.

Ms. Velasco said the City is not making any changes to pedestrian bridges at this time but they were awarded another grant through ATP and Caltrans will be improving intersection crossings for the greenway. This is consistent with the Yellow Brick Road project, so improvements will be seen over time.

MARCIA VALLIER, Vallier Design Associates, Inc., gave a PowerPoint presentation and review of the outreach and design process. They created a master plan for Phase I and construction documents and had addressed many comments from a year ago. She noted 17 non-profit groups came together and assembled close to 67 people and created two teams; a community outreach and involvement team and a design management team.

A soft launch occurred in January on MLK Day and 3 videos were produced. In May there were about 500 people canvassed and 12 different neighborhoods were contacted from March through May 2015. A website was created, along with door-to-door surveying, press releases, and there are many U-Tube videos relating to the park. She discussed the first presentation, surveys done by the design management team, and elements were integrated into the park based on comments. The design phase I plans were presented in November 2015 and they came to the DRB with those designs in December.

The community outreach team brought the information to the design management team and 15-20 meetings were held. Different sub-teams met weekly and they worked very hard to arrive at many designs. They held multiple charrettes to come up with the various ideas.

There were 5 teams which included: 1) community plaza, 2) the gardens, 3) arts amenities, 3) bikes, and 4) pedestrian infrastructure. Each group came up with design elements, parameters, budgets and cost estimates and drawings produced were great. They also did research regarding codes and CUPs, internal reviews, community outreach and special meetings to come up with the master plans.

Ms. Vallier then reviewed the master plan and the Phase I plan.

Boardmember Woldemar said he thinks the process should be patented. He asked if there is anything in the Phase I plan that will pre-empt the master plan from being implemented.

Ms. Vallier said no; they developed key elements and there will be green murals or striping on the ground that would signal people would enter a park. She presented a citrus orchard and said there are 9 gardens, swales, maintenance of wetlands, pollinator gardens and edible gardens, children's areas, future restroom structure, an interpretive area, seating and planting beds.

All intersections are getting a consistent planting system and fences will be repaired along the Greenway and trees installed. Construction documents are translating the design that the 67 people came up with. She presented raised rock beds and pollinators. She presented the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2017

homeopathic healing garden, a garden in between the Native American Center, and the bee garden, noting there are many different ways plants can heal.

From Marina Way to 16th Street is the heart of the park. Key components are play area, a meeting/gathering space, a structure, restroom, plaza space, an open space that can be used for basketball during the week or for farmers markets or festival space, and an edible forest. What is common is stormwater treatment which is brought up from pipes to be made part of the design.

She presented the master plan and said two key elements will return to the DRB and Planning Commission; one is a small café or food cart and another, a satellite bike repair shop. She said gateway elements such as murals on fence panels and the Arts and Culture Commission will work with all art components. She presented play areas, a restroom, swale, bridges, a basketball area, a succulent garden, and she presented the construction drawings. Original paving was very boring and they are doing different striping patterns so it looks more like fabric. It comes from 16th Street down to Ohio Avenue and the area will have a half basketball court for older kids and seat walls with a metal edge for skating.

They articulated the paving pattern. The shade structure is a wooden trellis which was made more interesting. They also took the swale in and around which is now improved. She presented the ground plane mural and in response to Boardmember Livingston, she described the fence of wood with a strong wire welded mesh which takes the existing fences on the Parkway. She presented and described existing and new structures.

Boardmember Livingston asked to show where lighting might be, which Ms. Vallier pointed to in the 3-D drawing. She said the ground drops away and the pad stays level and is accessible from the end. They are recycling redwood and creating seating areas and she presented photos of stairs with hand rails and skate stoppers, amphitheater style seating, the restroom with corrugated metal and grey concrete walls used in the paving bands, the edible forest, great lawn, and an elevated amphitheater area.

Chair Whitty opened the public comment period.

Public Comments:

RUBY ROPP, Richmond, questioned the plans affecting nearby homes and said her home has been shot at 3 times. She said she knows nothing about the plans, said she lives right on 13th Street, cannot even go outside, attends the Coronado neighborhood meetings and did not think the area would improve. She suggested the grant be put towards education, said she has lived in her home for 46 years and thinks her home will be in jeopardy with this new design. She received no flyers but did attend the community meetings.

Boardmember Fetter recognized that the area was difficult but said the plans should improve the neighborhood. He suggested police presence in the area, and Ms. Ropp stated there is a shooting every day.

Ms. Vallier said she will contact Ms. Ropp tomorrow, set up a meeting with her and the outreach team to ensure she is brought into the process. They did speak with the police department and noted that all shrubs are low which creates safe places to see the park corridor so police can see into the park.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2017

Ms. Vallier continued her discussion and talked about the restroom structure which locks at night. She then described the great lawn, said kids in the neighborhood got over 250 signatures for a skate and bike park and helped create its design. She said Dirt World and Dennis or "D2" and his wife helped them with the Kennedy pump track and this is being created one block over.

Boardmember Livingston questioned lighting and thought people on either side would be affected by this. Ms. Vallier stated the lighting is all dark sky lights. They all have shields and the intensities are 2,500 to 3,000 lumens which will not interfere with neighbors. It is not a direct bulb but rather it pops out and reflects off of a hood.

She presented the proposed site furnishings, raised beds, stone beds, potting benches which will return to the DRB, repeat of metal and corrugated roofs, said there is very little plastic at the Adventure Play area and she described its elements. She said there is a 5 year warranty which extends to 10 years and said the park in Berkeley has these elements. She then presented an older kids' playground area which will include a hammock, net climb, walls, hopping pods, and a bird's nest swing for 3 people, a natural looking training/fitness area, and a slide with a mound.

Ms. Vallier completed her presentation and asked for questions or comments from Boardmembers.

Boardmembers unanimously approved the design and thanked Ms. Vallier for the work and process. Ms. Vallier said she thinks the project was very labor intensive but is the finest project she has ever worked on.

Boardmember Leader asked if there will be signage that explains what and where things are. Ms. Vallier said yes; it is interpretive signage, murals, tiles, a directory and all of this will go to the Arts and Cultural Commission. They worked with folks on the Bay Trail logos and can look further at the budget. She noted they have 3 videos on the process leading up to it and said Groundwork Richmond and Green Screen will follow-up with more videos.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements - None

B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements - None

The Board adjourned at 8:35 p.m. to the next meeting on January 11, 2017.