TASK FORCE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Jeff Birdwell, Bair Island Aquatic Center
Sean Brooks, City of Redwood City, Economic Development Coordinator
Mike Brown, Docktown Property Owner Representative
Orlene Chartain, Docktown Resident
Rich Ferrari, Ferrari Property Representative
Melissa Hippard, Greenbelt Alliance
Gail Raabe, Redwood City Resident
Carole Wong, Redwood City Resident

I. Welcome and Introduction

Lisa Brownfield of MIG (consultant to the City) opened the meeting and welcomed the Task Force members and approximately 25 members of the public who were in attendance to the meeting. This was the ninth Task Force meeting in a series to develop a specific plan for the Inner Harbor area of Redwood City. Ms. Brownfield reviewed the agenda for the evening with the committee. The meeting agenda included a public comment period and a discussion centered around the continuation of the previous meeting's topics of sea level rise (SLR) and mobility within the framework for developing and selecting project alternatives. The outcome of the latter discussion would provide the direction regarding land use and open space/recreation components to be included in the two alternatives to be developed. Task Force members reviewed the March 11, 2014, Task Force Meeting #8 wall graphic and provided clarification comments. This wall graphic continued to be used in the March 25, 2014 discussion*. Ms. Brownfield took questions about One Marina and the State Lands Commission letter. Ms. Brownfield and Richard Barrett of MIG (consultant to the City) facilitated the aforementioned discussion. The meeting concluded after a brief overview of next steps for the project, led by Ms. Brownfield.

*Note: This summary features new comments made in reference to previously made comments in Task Force Meeting 8. Comments from Task Force Meeting 8 included in this summary will be denoted by italicized text.

II. Public Comment

Following the Introduction, the floor was opened for a public comment period to allow members of the public to share their comments, concerns, and ideas in relation to the Inner Harbor Plan. The comments focused on: 1) The State Lands Commission (SLC) and SLR, 2) contribution of ideas and concerns to the discussion on framework for alternatives. In addition, one member of the public prepared a written statement handed out to the Task
Force, which discussed the idea of applying a pedestrian and bicycle roundabout concept from the Netherlands to the Highway 101 crossing. One member expressed a preference for public comment at the end of the agenda rather than the beginning of the meeting. Members of the public expressed the following:

**State Lands Commission and Sea Level Rise**

- Expressed concern over the impact of upcoming SLR decisions on minimum freeboard figures (distance between the waterline and lowest portion of the house)
- Articulated concern about inadequate flood protection for Pete’s Harbor even if land is raised to San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) levels. Stated belief it would become the property owner’s responsibility to protect him/herself from SLR when levee is not enough.
- Questioned impact of United States v. Milner on the Redwood City Inner Harbor property owners and specific plan (Circuit Court of Appeals case in which landowners who had coastal protection structures on their land that were liable for trespass). Listed adaptive sea level rise tools in place in Redwood City Inner Harbor outside of the sea wall:
  - Pillows
  - Removable Pads
  - Aquatic homes
- Expressed belief that the City would have the resources to deal with jurisdictional issues called to question in SLC letter; the issue has not gone to the SLC members yet to discuss the following suggested remedies
  - Legal changes
  - Request for grandfathering
  - Move off grant boundary
  - Land swap
- Suggested both Redwood City and SLC should consider changing public needs for the public trust

**Public Contributions to the Discussion on Framework for Developing and Selecting Alternatives**

- Encouraged Task Force to consider Bay Trail connection and the creation of a network of launching and landing sites for human powered boats
- Suggested Task Force consider the City’s park standards for Docktown. The standards require 3 acres of open space for 1000 residents; suggested new front yards with waterfront access
- Informed the group about a bird nesting issue with the One Marina plan implementation, specifically with respect to the timing of construction near roosting/nesting areas. Expressed desire for harmony to be achieved between the Inner Harbor plan and natural habitats of animals
- Expressed appreciation for symbiotic relationship of the Docktown community with Redwood Creek; encouraged Task Force to preserve public and homeowner access to the creek as part of the nautical community
- Supported development of pads and launch ramps on Redwood Creek, and a preserve next to Granite Dock
III. Framework for Developing and Selecting Alternatives

At the March 11, 2014 Task Force Meeting 8, the Task Force discussed a framework for creating project alternatives. Some points discussed applied generally to the project, while others focused on four specific topic areas 1) Sea Level Rise, 2) Mobility, 3) Development (Use), and 4) Open Space/Recreation. This discussion was intended to be an agenda item for two meetings, including Task Force Meeting 9 on March 25, 2014. For this meeting (3/25), Task Force members reviewed the wall graphic featuring their comments from Task Force Meeting 8, expanded on some points, and added new ones. All four previously mentioned categories were discussed during the March 25th meeting, with the great majority of comments contributing to the subjects of Development and Open Space/Recreation.

The italicized text denotes Task Force member comments made on March 25, 2014 regarding the March 11, 2014 meeting content. For a full list of comments from Meeting 8, see Task Force Meeting Summary 8.

The comments are as follows:

Sea Level Rise
- **Build “fortified” wall around public facilities**
  - Adjacent uses outside of Sea Wall to be adaptive to SLR

Mobility
- **Assume that Blomquist will extend north across Redwood Creek (2 lanes in addition to the center lane)** per the General Plan
- **Retrofit Maple Street Bridge for improved pedestrian access**
- **Build a new pedestrian bridge; consider replacing Maple Street Bridge vs. constructing a new one at Walnut**
  - Complete Bay Trail

Development
- **Assume BIAC will need to expand**
  - Balance open space with density/ intensity
- **Consider a Community Benefit Improvement District (Redwood City Council authorized formation of such a district for Downtown on 3/10/14)**
  - Integrate private and community development
  - Tiering of buildings with view considerations
- **If R&D, does that include light industrial?**
- **Preserve historically valuable features**
  - Openness between buildings; water themed plazas
- **Consider infrastructure uses**
  - General plan descriptions check (hotels not compatible uses)
  - Floating uses i.e. aquatic center, Google barge, yacht club
- **Maintain views to water; views to hills from water**
  - Waterfront promenade
- **Research viability of hotel at One Marina (130-140 rooms, 6 stories)**
- **Discourage a sound wall west of Maple Street**
• Prioritize aesthetics—Use appropriate building materials for area (natural materials by water as opposed to metal and glass)
• Design buildings to be bird safe
• Be receptive to community- holistic shared community
• Prefer higher density and good, affordable and market rate development over single family detached uses
• Maximum height of land-based housing two stories at water’s edge
• Think about shared parking or central parking lot structure
• Consider that the plan area lands/uses are approximately 1/3 city owned, 1/3 public, 1/3 existing municipal services
• Encourage the development of neighborhood-serving retail (not big box) and office space for incubators; market as “funky” neighborhood to invent and grow businesses and ideas
• Support efficient land uses that are synergistic
• Consider utilizing park-in-lieu fees being collected by the City with residential development to purchase land for additional open space
• Consider tailored vertical and horizontal mixed use
• Create a buffer from industrial uses
• Avoid increasing traffic in plan

Open Space and Recreation
• Consider a range of open space types, including associated buildings (restrooms, boat docks)
• Seek balance between open space and development
• Include observation points with education and interpretative signage
• Maintain as much wetlands area as possible and maintain as an essential feature to preserve, protect, and enhance
• Accommodate for migratory shore birds: high tide roosting and feeding
• Use wetlands preservation efforts/ open space of Chrissey Fields as a model
  o Allow public access to wetlands
• Mitigate risk levels
• Respect and observe history
• Prioritize localized, informal recreation instead of programmed and scheduled team sports
  o Less focus on active turf field sports that require lighting and result in significant use, parking needs, etc.
  o More focus on passive recreation: fishing, hiking, biking, kayaking, pick up sports, room for Frisbee, etc.
• Prioritize green infrastructure to solve engineering needs such as drainage
• Center recreation around water (boating/fishing/sailing/rowing etc)

Ms. Brownfield discussed how the Task Force’s and public’s input will be used with the technical reports to create two draft alternatives. As an example, two draft working studies were presented based on the Task Force’s March 11, 2014 comments. In addition, two concepts created by Task Force members, specifically Carole Wong and Orlean Chartain, were also presented.
IV. Next Steps
Ms. Brownfield reminded the Task Force that two draft alternatives will be presented at the upcoming April 8, 2014 Task Force meeting for it to consider and select or synthesize. If a preliminary preferred plan cannot be established during the April 8th meeting, then the Task Force will meet on April 16. The draft preferred plan will be presented to the City Council at its April 28, 2014 meeting for its consideration and direction.

V. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 9:45 P.M.
DEVELOPMENT

- Charles River as example
  - 2 story boat houses
  - New corridors to water
  - 4 U.S. (check views)
  - Check San Carlos Flight Paths
  - Shared parking
  - Residential may draw/retail
  - Too much parking
  - Small scale retail/appropriate
  - Neighborhood retail
  - Single family detached - no
  - Higher density - affordable market rate
  - Aesthetics important
  - Sub replaced allows (in some areas)
  - Sherher - in black or not
    - Connect with existing, near transit

- Neighborhood serving retail
  - Office - incubators - funky neighborhood
  - Venture & growth
  - Bike repair shop
  - Big box - no
  - Not parking intensive
  - Supportive of waterfront & connectors & trails
  - Central parking lot/structure
  - ½ city owned, ½ public, ½ existing
  - Density transfer for more of need
  - Efficient land uses that are
    - Synergistic
  - Can use infrastructure to buy open space
  - Tailored very & focus much more on use
  - Very mixed development works OK.
  - Buffer to industrial
Development

- Be sensitive to traffic impacts
- Avoid plan that generates big traffic

Comments to Concepts

- Diminished open space
- Plan open space with a mechanism to make it happen