

TASK FORCE MEETING #5 SUMMARY

CITY OF REDWOOD CITY INNER HARBOR SPECIFIC PLAN

*Tuesday, November 12, 2013 | 7:00 P.M. – 9:30 P.M.
Seaport Conference Center, 459 Seaport Court, Redwood City, CA 94063*

TASK FORCE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Jeff Birdwell, Bair Island Aquatic Center
Sean Brooks, City of Redwood City, Economic Development
Orlene Chartain, Docktown Resident
Jim Dudley, Redwood City Park and Rec. Commissioner
Rich Ferrari, Ferrari Property Representative
Mike Giari, Port of Redwood City
Greg Greenway, Seaport Industrial Association
Melissa Hippard, Greenbelt Alliance
Dave Holland, San Mateo County Manager's Office
Chris Mann, Granite Rock
Gail Raabe, Redwood City Resident and Bayfront Advocate
Carole Wong, Redwood City Resident

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Laura Stetson of MIG (consultant to the City) welcomed Task Force members and the approximately 35 members of the public attending the meeting. This meeting was the fifth in a series of meetings to develop a specific plan for the Inner Harbor area of Redwood City. Following a review of the previous meeting summary, Ms. Stetson outlined the agenda, which included an opening public comment period, followed by a presentation by Task Force member Gail Raabe on king tides, a presentation by the consultant team on conditions affecting Inner Harbor planning, exploration of topics for subsequent meetings, a second public comment period, and closing discussion of next steps.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

During the first public comment period, members of the public shared comments and suggestions on a variety of themes related to the vision for Inner Harbor.

- Docktown has created a Google Plus community discussion forum for the project:
<https://plus.google.com/u/0/communities/105246721271362675452>
- Consider alternative forms of public comment and participation, such as MindMixer
- Consider Redwood City's overall parkland standard of 3 acres per 1,000 residents and the City's need for more parkland to support new development.
- In any plan developed for the area, consider the potential loss of public access to the bayfront; the only sustainable community would be like Docktown. Note the related Patch survey input about Pete's Harbor.
- Consider Lyngso car/truck interactions.
- Consider air space above the study area in relationship to the San Carlos Airport (e.g. any height restrictions).
- In a 2002 visioning process, a portion of Pete's Harbor was envisioned as a public park and described as access for open space.

III. TASK FORCE MEMBER PRESENTATION: EXAMPLE OF A KING TIDE

Gail Raabe delivered a presentation of key locations around Redwood City affected by the highest tide in December 2012, called the king tide. She noted that at the mouth of Redwood Creek the tide was as high as 9.4 feet. She went on to highlight the California King Tides Initiative. Task Force Member Mike Giari commented that the next major tide would be over 10 feet at 10:30 AM on December 31, 2013.

Locations covered in the presentation included:

- Sequoia Yacht Club
- SBSA Plant
- Homes at Redwood Shores
- Pete's Harbor
- Seaport Center
- Alan Steel & Supply Company
- One Marina
- Ferrari Property
- Docktown

IV. CONSULTANT PRESENTATION: PHYSICAL AND JURISDICTIONAL CONDITIONS AFFECTING PLANNING IN THE INNER HARBOR

Laura Stetson and Matthew Gaber (MIG) joined with Patricia Berryhill (ESA) to give a presentation on externalities impacting the planning process in the Inner Harbor. Ms. Berryhill began with a review of baseline studies and biological surveys. The California Department of Fish and Game has a definition for wetlands (must be above mean high tide). The term "wetlands" is encompassing of different types of marshes, including remnant, salt, and harvest. She then moved to a short discussion of the risk of upset/hazards.

Ms. Stetson spoke on infrastructure and circulation/mobility & the quarter mile walk-shed. The discussion then moved to economics. The team concluded the presentation by covering issues related to commerce, water activities, and fishing.

Task force members briefly discussed the presentation and brought forth the following considerations and questions:

- 10 years ago the Ferrari property was not wet; but it is now holding more water.
- The site should be raised but it is unclear exactly how much to get out of the 100 year floodplain. Might need to build to 15 feet for the end of the century to stay out of the floodplain.
- Are there currently building codes accounting for sea level rise?
- What is the status of infrastructure quality as it pertains to water, recycled water, sewer, and storm drainage? (The consultants noted that Fuscoe, the engineering consultant for this project, has experience with green infrastructure.)
- What is the forecast for retail? What about demand for recreation?
- If the shape of the water in the planning area changes, who has jurisdiction?
- Regarding jurisdiction, can the City negotiate with State Lands? With sea level rise, as the tides rise, the jurisdictional footprint will change.

- The Port as a public agency can get use exceptions on State lands, but would need a legislative change to do so. In 2005 the City Council was attempting to go to State legislature to have it resolved.
- For the Ferrari property, must it have no residential; or is there an allowed % of it that could be residential?
- How did Docktown happen if it is illegal? What is the Task Force's charge with respect to Docktown?
- There may be relevant information from a Walnut Creek project with a Federal Act of Congress (Broadway Plaza)

V. MILESTONES AND TOPICS FOR SUBSEQUENT MEETINGS

There was a request to send Task Force meeting dates to committee members. For the record, meeting #6 is on January 14, 2014. Topics to be discussed at that meeting include working toward developing a preferred alternative plan by considering the constraints and opportunities as well as development evaluation criteria. Meeting #7 is tentatively scheduled for February 11 and meeting #8 is tentatively scheduled for March 25.

One Task Force member expressed concern that the schedule seems compressed given the complexity of the subject matter. Two other Task Force members agreed.

A subsequent brainstorming session yielded the following ideas about what the plan should achieve. Many of these comments and ideas, along with public comments, were also captured on the wallgraphic that appears on page 6.

Development

- Keep the bay shoreline open space; limit high density housing
- Consider transfer of development rights
- Provide a balance of parks with other uses
- Compatibility with existing uses (i.e. industrial) and future uses
- Mix of uses (regional and local) – revenue generation, public good. Needs to be a way to pay for public benefits
- Strike a balance with existing habitat
- Incorporate the wetlands in the plan. Maintain and enhance the wetlands. All kinds of General Plan policies support this idea. If incorporated into the plan, we can reduce delays and jurisdictional oversight.
- Create in the Inner Harbor a regional model for how a bayfront community addresses climate change. Be mindful of cost effective ways to address sea level rise. Use available assets.
- Adaptive development - plan for sea level rise and use adaptive structures, consider alternative technology, strike a balance between restoration and development
- Consider/add a floating home community

Accessibility & Connectivity

- Greater public access
- Access to Bay – connectivity
- Consider how to accommodate community access to the waterfront while weighing the risk from sea level rise and flooding Public access
- Connectivity – bikes and peds
- Grade Separation between bikes and peds

- Bikes and walking safety
- Alternate forms of transport and connection to Bay Trail
- Complete Bay Trail link
- Blomquist wants multi-modal access to the Bay, wants to diminish conflicts between trucks, etc.
- Look at creative ways to engage/design (freeway toppers)

Recreation

- Regional recreation destination
- Bay Trail as destination and connection
- Bay Trail/Bay Shore connection
- Use water as amenity
- Opportunity to enjoy water with human powered craft and protect environment
- Regarding commerce - consider compatibility with water and the long term vision. Think about boat rentals and generally how big recreation is as a piece of the overall pie.
- Recreation and access to it
- Land-based recreation

Policy

- Get up to code
- Don't forget current landowners
- Clear guidelines allow for certainty
- Embrace the waterfront but also deal with the challenges
- Harmony with nature and longevity of built environment with natural forces
- In terms of metrics, look at other locations where nature and human-powered water use interact
- Challenge Doctrine of State Lands Jurisdiction
- Make sure the economic analysis is complete
- Compatibility with industry (e.g. Port Industrial Corridor) – Refer to General Plan policy about the Port
 - Active planning for compatibility
 - Compatibility with different modes (cars/trucks), particularly truck traffic
- SWAT Analysis: strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

Following the presentations and review of the topics for subsequent meetings, the floor was opened for additional public comment.

- An informational sea level website would be helpful in showing the layers to issue, including king tide, storm data, and sea level rise forecasts.
- If you accept the premise that the Public Trust Doctrine predicts future flooding in one year, do we not want Redwood City to accept that doctrine?
- Stanley Park, Vancouver separated bike and walking paths from each other. Also Point Reyes recreational boating aquatic center, restaurant, etc. boat rental. It is important to rectify the park imbalance issue in this area.
- Did the Task Force take into account reports about how people are doing economically in the County?

- Many issues relating to balance of uses, access, and connectivity were raised tonight. Can we consider freeway design as something that can be manipulated? Is there a role for freeway toppers on the 101?

As part of second public comment period, a BIAC member and RWC community member submitted his key objectives for the Specific Plan:

1. Regional recreation destination. I hope all Redwood City owned land is part of this recreation destination. It would include:
 - Hiking, Walking, Biking – Bay Trail access
 - Facilities – showers, parking, storage, meeting rooms (food/drink)
 - Gym – basketball, indoor soccer, gymnastics
 - Outdoor soccer fields
 - BMX park
 - Fitness Center
 - Water Access – SF Water Trail – rowing, paddling, dragon boats, kayak rental, paddleboards, maybe even sailing
 - Sufficient and safe parking
2. The development of the Inner Harbor needs to allow and encourage the existing heavy industrial usage of the Port and surrounding area. Heavy truck traffic, particulates, and noise must be okay with the Inner Harbor uses.
3. Create walking/biking connectivity with the downtown. This is all part of the Bay Trail which is used for walking, skateboarding, running, and recreational/commuter biking
4. Bring it up to code. We need to have usage consistent with the granted use of the land or change the land use code.
5. Recognize the importance of the floating home community. They are an important part of the community. This is the biggest challenge given number #4.
6. Recognize private owners' interests.

VII. NEXT STEPS

Ms. Stetson closed by thanking the Task Force and community members for attending. The sixth Task Force meeting is scheduled for January 14. The City and consultant team will be spending the intervening time preparing technical reports that will inform the decision-making process.

REDWOOD CITY INNER HARBOR
TASK FORCE MEETING # 5, 11.12.2013

II. PUBLIC COMMENT:

- GOOGLE PWS (LEE) COMMUNITY DISCUSSION SITE!
- CLEM-LYNSGSO CAR/TRUCK INTERACTIONS
- KEEP BAY SHORELINE OPEN SPACE - LIMIT HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
- GREATER PUBLIC ACCESS!

III. PUBLIC COMMENT & PARTICIPATION

- ALT FORMS OF PUBLIC COMMENT - MIND MIXER
- CONSIDER AIR SPACE FROM AIRPORT
- CONSIDER TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS
- INCLUDE A/THE FLOATING COMMUNITY
- REGIONAL REC. DESTINATION
- GET UP TO CODE
- CONNECTIVITY - BIKES & PEX
- CURRENT LAND OWNERS IMPORTANT COMPONENT
- BIKES & WALKING "SAFETY"! ALT. FORMS OF TRANSPORT & CONNECTION TO BAY TRAIL
- BAY TRAIL AS DESTINATION & CONNECTION

SCHEDULE:

- SEEMS COMPRESSED WORKSHOP IN MARCH/APRIL
- DEVELOP COMMON CRITERIA VERY IMPORTANT!
- MORE TIME TO REVIEW ALTS

- FREEWAY TOPPER
- LOOK AT CREATIVE WAYS TO ENGAGE/OBSIGN WITH
- BAY TRAIL / BAY SHORE CONNECTION
- CHALLENGE DOCTRINE OF STATE LANDS JURISDICTION
- GRADE SEP BTWN. PEX & BIKES
- BALANCE OF PARKS W/ OTHER USES
- ECONOMIC CONCLUS - MAKE SURE ECONOMIC ANALYSIS IS COMPLETE



V. MILESTONES & TOPICS FOR SUBSEQUENT MEETINGS

NEXT MILESTONES

- ① ACCESS TO BAY - CONNECTIVITY
- CERTAINTY
- COMPATIBILITY W/ EX. USES (INDUST. USES)
- USE WATER AS AMENITY
- OPPORTUNITY TO ENJOY WATER W/ HUMAN POWERED CRAFT & PROTECT ENVIRONMENT
- COMPLETE BAY TRAIL
- COMMERCE COMPATIBLE W/ WATER
- ENGAGE CHALLENGES OF SITE
- INCORPORATE WETLANDS IN PLAN. USE ASSETS!
- CREATE REGIONAL MODEL
- COST EFFECTIVE
- BALANCE RISK/ CHALLENGES OF SLR W/ DESIRE FOR PUBLIC ACCESS
- HARMONY W/ NATURE
- MIX OF USES - REGIONAL & LOCAL
- COMPATIBILITY FORMS OF GRASS/ CIRCULATION... TRAILS

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT:

- LANDBASED RECREATION TOO!
- MULTI-MODAL ACCESS & ROADWAYS
- ADAPTIVE DEVELOP. MT. - ALT. TECH. - PLAN FOR SLR
- BALANCE BTWN. RESTORATION & DEVELOPMENT
- CONSIDER / KOD A FLOATING HOME COMMUNITY
- TASK FORCE MEMBERS PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC FORUMS... I.E. BLOGS / MIND MIXER