On February 11, 2014 and in the Redwood Room of the Veterans Memorial Senior Center, the City of Redwood City conducted a community workshop as part of the Redwood City Inner Harbor Specific Plan planning effort. Almost 60 residents and other interested individuals participated in this hands-on, facilitated open-house style workshop. The workshop’s purpose was to obtain the community’s opinion regarding opportunities for the Redwood City Inner Harbor Specific Plan area. The event consisted of five stations:

- Welcome and Introduction
- Guiding Principals
- Land Use
- Mobility
- Plan Alternatives

Participants were provided comment cards to accommodate additional feedback. Eleven members of the fifteen-member Task Force also attended to listen to the community member input and observe the workshop process overall. This Workshop Summary provides an account of the participants’ comments, responses and participation.

**Welcome and Introduction Station**

Participants were guided to the first station, Welcome and Introduction. Laura Stetson, with the planning consulting firm of MIG, provided a 15 minute presentation discussing the Inner Harbor planning area’s site location, history, and planning setting. The planning setting included current General Plan designations, property ownership, and opportunities and constraints such as biological resources, air quality, noise, economics, mobility, etc. The presentation concluded with an overview of the open-house format and workshop station instructions. The presentation is included as Appendix A.

**Guiding Principles Station**

At this station, participants reviewed display boards containing ten Draft Guiding Principles for the Inner Harbor Specific Plan. The Guiding Principles were listed in the first column; next to each Guiding Principle were three columns with the following headings:

- “Support”
- “May Support If…”
- “Do Not Support”

Participants were given colored dot stickers; for each Guiding Principle, the participant was to place a dot beneath the heading that most closely agreed with their opinion. When a participant placed a dot beneath “May Support If...” or “Do Not Support”, the participants were asked how the Guiding Principle could be changed so that the participant could “Support” the principle. Participant comments were written on flip charts for future reference.

Seven principles were supported by an overwhelming majority of participants; however, all ten Guiding Principles had some number of “May Support If...” votes. Guiding Principle 2 is the only Guiding Principle that had more “May Support If...” responses than “Support”. Only two Guiding Principles — Principles 6 and 7 — received any “Do Not Support” votes, with one and two votes respectively.
The following table summarizes the results of the activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Principles</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>May Support If…</th>
<th>Do Not Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Serve as a model for land use and mobility approaches that respond creatively and appropriately to projected sea level rise.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achieve a balance among habitat, recreation, educational, and revenue-generating uses within the Inner Harbor.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Optimize and maximize use of the waterfront for public-oriented, water-dependant uses and activities.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enhance and emphasize boater access to Redwood Creek and the Bay for recreation and educational purposes, with particular attention given to human-powered watercraft.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Create new and improved pedestrian, bicycle, and auto connections between the Inner Harbor and Downtown Redwood City, and between the Inner Harbor and adjacent developed areas along the Bay.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Complete the Bay Trail connection through the Inner Harbor.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accommodate a floating home community in location(s) suitable for residential use to the extent allowed by applicable laws.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ensure compatibility and connectivity with adjacent institutional and industrial uses.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Require that sustainable and adaptable development approaches be incorporated into land use and infrastructure improvements within the Inner Harbor.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. All development will provide public benefits.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously stated, if participants selected “May Support If…”, the participants were asked to record their condition(s) for support or comments about the guiding principle. Though the comments covered a variety of subjects, some general trends emerged.
General Trends
Floating homes/residences and live-aboards are considered a top priority. Multiple participants indicated a desire/concern for affordable floating homes that can accommodate a variety of income levels. Protecting Docktown also stood out as a common priority. Community members also expressed that they would support mixed uses as long as the commercial uses do not inhibit the provision of live-aboards in the future.

In addition to floating homes, comments also addressed user safety as a primary concern in regards to Guiding Principles focused on pedestrian, bike trail, and trail connections. Participants also wanted “public benefits” in Guiding Principle 10 further defined.

The complete table of comments captured in connection to the statement, “May Support If...” is available in Appendix B.
Land Use Station
At this station, display boards depicting seven land uses were exhibited. Participants were given four colored dot stickers and asked to place them next to the four land uses that, in their opinion, should be prioritized in the Specific Plan area. Overall, the community supports recreation and open space uses. The results are as follows:

- Recreation (39)
- Open Space (31)
- Trails/ Bikes and Pedestrian (28)
- Residential (23)
- Mixed Use (13)
- Industrial (6)
- Commercial (3)
Again, flip charts were available for participants to provide additional comments on their land use selections. The full list of written flip chart comments have been grouped by topic and are listed below.

**Residential**
- Residential uses ok, but no high density and only if live-aboards permitted on creek
- Alternative residential uses that adapt to sea level rise (floating homes)
- Residential uses as part of mixed use and floating homes
- Floating homes/ houseboats make a great community
- Floating homes and open space
- Floating homes/ houseboats – also not opposed to mixed use
- Floating homes for all income levels
- Residential only if floating homes
- Floating home community important
- Residential to include floating homes
- Retain Docktown as affordable housing
- Floating home community somewhere in plan area
- Not suitable for residential uses
- Residential—floating homes only
- Floating residences—no matter the categorization

**Open Space/Recreation/Sea Level Rise/Water Access**
- Open space that is accessible to the public
- Direct access to water (2)
- Address sea level rise through open spaces along water’s edge
- Access for fishing

**Other Uses**
- Local business/ commercial (no chains)
- Maintain industrial/ blue collar jobs
- Protect existing industrial uses

**Mobility Station**
Participants at this station were each given a blank base map and a variety of markers. Participants were asked to draw/designate where they would like access points and circulation for all modes of transportation – pedestrian, bicycle, vehicle, boating, etc. For those that indicated they prefer not to draw, staff was available to provide assistance. This section features a few photos of maps made by participants. For the all mobility map photos, refer to Appendix C.
Pedestrian
Many participant maps included new walking paths around the plan area. Though suggested routes varied, a large number included Blomquist Street, Maple Street, and the area alongside Docktown within the route.

Several participants indicated a need to widen the existing Highway 101 pedestrian overpass at Maple Street and suggested an additional overpass at Walnut Street. Others drew a pedestrian underpass under Highway 101, connecting the area of Docktown with Main Street. Sidewalks were also suggested for Blomquist Street.

Bicycles
For biking, an extension of the existing Bay Trail was the most popular suggestion. Suggested routes included a connection to Pacific Shores with a bridge across the Redwood Creek, and included the same roads as in the walking paths: Blomquist Street, Maple Street, and alongside Docktown. A small number of maps suggested the Bay Trail extension to run parallel to Highway 101, and some suggested the trail should extend further east to Seaport Boulevard. Of those who suggested widening the existing Highway 101 pedestrian overpass at Maple Street, many indicated bike use of the overpass in addition to pedestrian use.
Vehicular
Few maps contributed by participants included changes for automobile use and circulation; however, those that did indicated similar concerns about traffic safety due to low visibility because of large trucks near the Seaport Boulevard and Blomquist Street intersection. Some participants suggested widening Blomquist Street to improve traffic flow. Two maps made mention of public transit routes along Seaport Boulevard and parts of Maple Street.

Participants were also encouraged to note additional ideas on the flip chart provided. These ideas included:
- Bike parking; transit hub
- Showers at new business developments for commuters
- Connections to CalTrain

Plan Alternatives Station
This station was intended to serve as a summary of the previous stations. Based upon the information gained and opinions given at the Guiding Principles, Land Use, and Mobility stations, the participants were asked to draw/designate one or more land uses on a blank planning area map. Staff was available to assist anyone who indicated they were unable/preferred not to draw. This section features a few photos of plan alternative maps made by participants. For all photos of plan alternative maps, refer to Appendix D.

Ideas for land uses varied amongst participants, but general trends emerged. These trends include:

Residential
Participant maps indicated a desire for an additional floating home community in the area of the creek located north of the top of Maple Street. Low density, mixed use residential was considered an acceptable use by participants, with most locating this use across from Docktown, along Maple Street.
Open Space and Recreation
A significant number of participants drew a park in the area that falls within the boundaries of Maple Street. Public docks were also suggested by multiple participants, located near Docktown and along the water above the northern end of Maple Street. Open space was drawn by many participants along the northern end of Maple Street. The space between Docktown and Maple Street was also marked as a green space by a large number of participants. Many indicated a desire to maintain the Bair Island Aquatic Center (BIAC) in its current location. One map designated the Ferrari property for open space.

Plan Alternatives Map 1

Commercial and Other
Several maps located small cafes, restaurants, and retail within the Docktown area. Mixed use space was often drawn to extend from Blomquist Street to Highway 101. The area between the railroad and Maple Street alongside Highway 101 was suggested as designated Police and Fire station locations. Some maps marked the same space to include industrial land uses.

Plan Alternatives Map 11
General comments for this activity were also recorded on flip charts. The comments appear below:

- Blomquist Street as levee
- Shift water edge in floating homes onto private property
- Pedestrian bridge connecting Ferrari (property) and land to south
- No residences allowed except Docktown
- City to acquire more land for recreational use. Use “bank” for planned future purchases
- Move floating homes to water so they float
- Floating BIAC boathouse, with 6 pilings

Comment Cards
Below are the main points captured in the comment cards. Note the main points have been organized by topic. All comment cards received by February 19, 2014 have been photographed. The comment card photographs are presented in Appendix E.

There is a general consensus among participants that value Docktown. Community members have a deep attachment to that area and the community within it. Participants would like to see additional floating homes and live aboard options. The participants consider Docktown a good example of adaptations to address sea level rise.

Docktown/Floating Homes/Live Aboards
- Docktown is a family-oriented community
- Docktown is an example of a adaptive solution to sea level rise
- Docktown promotes safety and education through programs and classes offered
- Grow Docktown without turning it into overpriced condos
- Large live-aboard community within the Inner Harbor
- Grow live-aboard community to address demand and sea level rise
- Floating homes and live-aboards are preferred for the Inner Harbor community
- Floating home community should be expanded
- Affordable live-aboard rates allow lower and middle income families to thrive in Silicon Valley

Other Land Uses
- The Peninsula Yacht Club is an asset to the community
- More open space and parks

Mobility
- Improve Highway 101
- Improve Veterans Boulevard – Blomquist Street intersection
- Coordinate with Pete’s Harbor Project for Bay Trail continuity and downtown access

Other Comments
- Use transfer development rights to make an investment in Redwood City citizens
- Dredge the creek to make it navigable up to Highway 101
- Exceed 36” sea level rise estimate to protect infrastructure
- Consider Simm’s Metal in discussion for Inner Harbor area
- Try to attract Google Barge to dock in Redwood City
- Maximize use of recycled water
Appendix A
Community Workshop Welcome and Introduction Presentation

AGENDA

- Inner Harbor Planning Area Overview
- Opportunities and Constraints
- Workshop Format

INNER HARBOR PLANNING AREA OVERVIEW

Why Plan? Why Now?
- Inner Harbor is an asset for the entire community
- Implement General Plan policy
- Create a special waterfront place
- Improve Bay Trail continuity
- Build on Downtown’s success
- Address potential impacts of sea level rise
- 101/84 interchange planning underway

Specific Plan Will Address:
- Vision
- Allowed uses of land and water
- Open spaces
- Mobility: pedestrians, cyclists, boats, cars, trucks, trains
- Infrastructure
- Standards for development and design
- Implementation and financing
Economic Considerations

- Local unemployment rate of 5.3% is low
- City has proven ability to attract a diverse residential population
- Office vacancy is 10%, considered healthy
- Market demand exists for upper end hotel (100 to 200 rooms total)
- Recreation demand?

Open House

Four Stations:

- Guiding Principles
- Land Use
- Mobility
- Plan Alternatives

WORKSHOP FORMAT
## Guiding Principles

1. Serve as a model for land use and mobility approaches that respond creatively and appropriately to projected sea level rise

2. Achieve a balance among habitat, recreation, educational, and revenue-generating uses within the Inner Harbor.
   - Must include heavy industrial plants
   - (Balance)? More open space, recreation with less concentration of revenue (support ferry, rec. etc)
   - Mention floating residences as affordable housing
   - “Revenue generation is too broad"
   - If revenue generating mixed use (residential educational, recreational) includes commercial marina with live-aboards
   - More emphasis on habitat and recreation then revenue generating

3. Optimize and maximize use of the waterfront for public-oriented, water-dependant uses and activities.
   - Clarify what “optimize” and “maximize” mean
   - Emphasize public floating home communities/ marinas
   - If does not inhibit commercial mixed use marina with live-aboards

4. Enhance and emphasize boater access to Redwood Creek and the Bay for recreation and educational purposes, with particular attention given to human-powered watercraft.
   - If enhancement of boater access does not jeopardize Docktown
   - Make sure there is a place for motor crafts
   - Concerns about too many canoes/ rowboats on the water
   - More public access

5. Create new and improved pedestrian, bicycle, and auto connections between the Inner Harbor and Downtown Redwood City, and between the Inner Harbor and adjacent developed areas along the Bay.
   - Blomquist shouldn’t connect to Whipple—too much traffic
   - Concerned about safety of bike trail going to Blomquist (road condition)

6. Complete the Bay Trail connection through the Inner Harbor.
   - Bay trail and Docktown symbiotic
   - Only if it doesn’t hurt Docktown

7. Accommodate a floating home community in location(s) suitable for residential use to the extent allowed by applicable laws
   - If float homes accommodate all income levels, not just higher income
   - Want to legalize current situation
   - Amend laws to ensure a healthy community
   - “Floating home” term stays and includes house boats
   - Floating homes If compatible with industrial uses
   - Floating homes to the extent… State lands grant to Sausalito was amended to allow floating homes—we can do the same
   - No “suitable,” and end sentence at “use”

### Appendix B

Flip Chart Comments Received by Guiding Principle
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **8. Ensure compatibility and connectivity with adjacent institutional and industrial uses.** | • Only if it looks good  
• Only if it doesn’t hurt Docktown |
| **9. Require that sustainable and adaptable development approaches be incorporated into land use and infrastructure improvements within the Inner Harbor.** | • At what cost? To whom? |
| **10. All development will provide public benefits.** | • If public benefits include all income levels  
• Too general—needs more specificity  
• Ten Is wrong, it will only provide benefits to developers, plus a small amount of tax $ [money] |
Appendix C
Photographed Mobility Maps

Mobility Map 1

Why Docktown should be an integral part of the Inner Harbor.

1. Because we are already here and there is no good reason for us all to move?
   a. Our floating community is an appropriate component of the street marry.
   b. Our floating community is an appropriate response to rising sea level.
   c. Landowners can make money on property secured from the city to sell land.
   d. Any State Lands leases are subject to change.

2. The plan estimates we have seen, it could cost the city upwards of $20 million dollars in relocation fees and legal fees to move us.

3. We are an important asset to the city and the Inner Harbor that will help the city realize its goals:
   a. We are people who protect and have a relationship with the creek.
   b. We can clean the creek on a regular basis as you know.
   c. We keep kayaks, sail, and snorkle on the water on a regular basis and can provide those activities on a marina.
   d. We can light up the water and engage with the wildlife in a positive manner.
   e. We can be an attraction, as in Seattle and Baltimore, that brings people to the area and gives life to the destination point for boats, day toppers, and yachtsmen. People can rent boats and yachts, embark on tours, and return with the waterfront experience.

4. We have pilots that meet all the goals outlined by the planning group, including environmental protection, public access, recreation, and tax revenue.
STATION 5 - PLANALS

- BLONDOVIST AS LEVER
- SHIFT WATER EDGE IN - FLOATING HOMES ON PROPIETOR
- PED BRIDGE CONNECTING FERRARI & LAND TO SOUTH - Great idea!
- No residences allowed except docktown
- City to acquire more land for rec. use "Bank" for planned future purchases
- "Move floating homes to water so they float!"

FLOATING B.I.A.C. BOATHOUSE, w/ six pilings
Appendix E
Photographed Comment Cards
Add to Idea Board

I see level rise

A large infill of it would look like

required to build on top of that level. Rate

protect/building into a community can

leaving large are-

open spaces and recreational natu-

ally with some level rise