

TASK FORCE MEETING #10 SUMMARY

CITY OF REDWOOD CITY INNER HARBOR SPECIFIC PLAN

*Tuesday, April 8, 2014 | 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 Coordinator
Mike Brown, Docketown Property Owner Representative
Amy Buckmaster, Redwood City/County of San Mateo Chamber of Commerce Representative
Orlene Chartain, Docketown Resident
Jim Dudley, Redwood City Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Rich Ferrari, Ferrari Property Representative
Mike Giari, Port of Redwood City Representative
Greg Greenway, Seaport Industrial Association Representative
Shelli Haaf, State Lands Commission Representative
Melissa Hippard, Greenbelt Alliance
Peggy Jensen, County of San Mateo Representative
Chris Mann, Graniterock Representative
Gail Raabe, Redwood City Resident
Carole Wong, Redwood City Resident

I. Welcome and Introduction

Laura Stetson 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 marked the tenth Task Force gathering in a series of meetings to develop a specific plan for the Inner Harbor area of Redwood City. Ms. Stetson reviewed the agenda with the Task Force. The meeting agenda included: a public comment period, the review of plan scenarios, a presentation on Parks and Recreation considerations, Task Force evaluation of plan scenarios, and next steps. Task Force Member Jim Dudley, Parks and Recreation Commissioner, gave a presentation on Park and Recreation considerations. Ms. Stetson and Richard Barrett of MIG facilitated the evaluation of the plan scenarios. The meeting concluded after a brief overview of next steps for the project, led by Ms. Stetson.

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 mainly revolved around: 1) Floating homes and water access; 2) streets, roads, and parking; 3) recreation; and 4) a few additional comments. Members of the public expressed the following:

Floating Homes and Water Access

- Expressed desire for a vibrant waterfront
- Supported Option B; flip location for water access and floating homes to account for noise that can affect floating community
- Suggested grandfathering Docketown
- Expressed support for the preservation of *existing* floating communities
- Suggested that the City work with the State Lands Commission to keep Docketown residents in place until Ferrari property opens up for the relocation
- Encouraged Redwood City to review retaining/improving the floating community on Redwood Creek *if* Ferrari proposal does not develop
- Suggested creating a group of guiding principles that would address floating home communities
- Suggested the creation of a new, environmentally sound, floating community
- Stressed the importance of floating homes for individuals and families on fixed incomes, and as a retirement investment for affordable housing
- Stated belief that floating homes do not take away from water access; access points can still be open to the public

Streets, Roads, and Parking

- Expressed support for two pedestrian bridges
- Did not support dedicating land for public streets; suggested pedestrian corridors instead of roads with respect to the Jay Paul property
- Supported pedestrian access through Chestnut connection
- Suggested fostering a city-wide shuttle service
- Proposed some public (shared) parking spaces in the area on weekends; believed many employees of the area would be Redwood City residents

Recreation

- Expressed desire for organized recreation (e.g. soccer fields and organized sports)
- Suggested public access to docks be improved
- Suggested the reclamation of the marina for open space and recreation

Other Comments

- Informed the group of blog comments online that suggested some online community members are in disagreement with the Inner Harbor planning process
- Expressed concern about floating homes being located at BIAC; water runs down that area of the creek during storms and may require temporarily relocating homes

III. Review Plan Scenarios

After the public comment period's conclusion, Mr. Barrett provided an overview of two land use/mobility concepts for the Inner Harbor Specific Plan area. The overview included a map of each concept, which outlined proposed land and water uses, roads, and trails. Mr. Barrett pointed out four issues addressed by both concepts: 1) the extension of Blomquist Street; 2)

accommodating to State Lands Commission requirements; 3) access to the water's edge; and 4) the inclusion of floating communities. Mr. Barrett surveyed the Task Force on the preferred recreational designation on the Ferrari property, specifically active versus passive (wetlands) recreation. Responses from Task Force members varied.

The Task force provided comments on the information presented:

- It is important to differentiate between protected wetlands and park land
- Plans as shown appear to allocate less than the current 2.5 acres to BIAC

IV. Park and Recreation Considerations

Parks and Recreation Commissioner and Task Force member Jim Dudley presented parks and recreation considerations for the Task Force to consider. Mr. Dudley summarized the 2008 Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment findings including the greatest need is soccer fields. He referred to the 2010 General Plan and the 2014 Inner Harbor Guiding Principle Number 5:

Provide recreation and open space amenities in the Inner Harbor in support of the citywide adopted parkland standard.

Task Force members had the following questions and comments regarding parks and recreation:

- If Blomquist is the levee, fields would become inundated from sea level rise; would the City invest in that and would they be rebuilt
- Has the City identified new land for parks and recreation?
 - Yes, possibly San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) land
- Does the park ratio include private land parks?
 - Yes, parks developed within private development to meet the City's parkland standard requirements are established for public use and are therefore counted
- How will fields be accessed other than by car? Concern was expressed about trip generation and parking needs.
- Is compatibility with other land uses being considered?
- There are two, two-acre fields in the Inner Harbor Specific Plan area proposed, plus approximately 0.3 acres of parking for a total of 4.3 acres in Mr. Dudley's presentation

V. Task Force Evaluation of Plan Scenarios

The Task Force members reviewed the information presented in agenda item 3, provided comments on the two scenarios, and raised questions about the contents of a specific plan. The Task Force prioritized a discussion on what the group's May report to the City Council should include. The discussion resulted in the decision to reconvene the Task Force on May 16, 2014 for further discussion on 5 topics:

1. Open Space and Recreation: Types and definitions
2. Water-oriented recreation
3. Floating communities
4. Development density and intensity
5. Blomquist Street—use, alignment, and traffic mix

Questions and comments collected during the discussion include:

- Include the following assumptions in the Specific Plan
 1. Blomquist Street Extends
 2. Balance of Uses
 3. Performance Standards
 4. Types of Open Space
- Decide how much detail to include in scenarios
- Discuss development density and intensity
- Create plans with some flexibility within EIR—vary intensities
- Prefer process in which City Council approves guiding principles, then develop alternatives based on technical studies for Specific Plan
- Add detail to guiding principles rather than create land use plans
- Step back to Guiding Principles and Vision Statement; look at Inner Harbor within those guidelines
- Provide City Council with detail
- Make plan less specific
- Provide more information; explain impacts between uses and mobility (for example)
- Remember that Specific Plan is both policy and regulatory; replaces zoning ordinance
- Note that the EIR process includes more than one alternative
 - “No build” alternative
 - “environmentally superior” alternative
 - Includes studies on traffic, noise, safety, etc. for each
 - Other alternatives that may include more or less development
- Consider providing City Council with two alternatives with varying levels of intensity
- Prefer that two options provided be different from one another
- Take “consensus” to City Council, even if it includes two alternatives or some level of dissent
- Acquire City Council’s approval then
 - Discuss options to be included in the CEQA process
 - Develop specific plan draft for future Task Force consideration

Ms. Stetson facilitated a brief sub discussion focused on parks and recreation priorities for the specific plan. Three main points were discussed by the group:

- Include fields
- Seek synergy between active and passive recreation
- Consider that fields may not be appropriate

At the conclusion of the discussion, the group summarized priorities and issues:

- Create a plan that features “best of both”

- Identify “open space and recreation” in specifics
 - Define open space
- Identify, eventually, where wetlands occur (and do not occur)
- Leave Docktown as is and not moving to Ferrari; may be a more ecological choice
- Identify what uses and location do not agree
- Add statement on shelter in Guiding Principles
- Address floating community
- Identify water recreation size and location
- Decide on type and intensity of development
- Address Blomquist Street

VI. Next Steps

Ms. Stetson summarized the result of the discussion in the previous agenda item and confirmed with the group that the Task Force would reconvene on Wednesday May 16, 2014. The agenda would include discussions on the following topics:

1. Open Space and Recreation: Types and definitions
2. Water oriented recreation
3. Floating communities
4. Development density and intensity
5. Blomquist Street—use, alignment and traffic mix

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 P.M.

REDWOOD CITY
INNER HARBOR
TASK FORCE #10
APRIL 8, 2014

ASSUMPTIONS

1. BLOMQUIST EXTENDS
2. BALANCE OF USES
3. PERFORMANCE STDS.
4. TYPES OF OPEN SPACE

QUESTIONS

1. HOW MUCH DETAIL? (KNOW)
2. CHOICES - DEPENDENCIES ON DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY
3. CREATE PLANS WITH SOME FLEXIBILITY WITHIN EIR - VARY INTENSITIES
4. PREFERRED PLAN THAT REFLECTS T.F. GUIDING PRINC
5. C.C. APPROVES GUIDING PRINC THEN DEVELOP ALTS BASED ON TECH STUDIES FOR SPECIFIC PLAN
6. ADD DETAIL TO GUIDING PRINC. NOT TO PLANS
7. STEP BACK TO G.P. DIVISION CC LOOKING AT RCII & OUTSIDE OF GP.
8. C.C. NEEDS DETAIL
9. PLAN TOO SPECIFIC
10. IMPACTS BETWEEN USES & MOBILITY (FOR EXAMINING)
11. SP IS BOTH POLICY & REGULATORY - DELAYS ZONING ORC RANGE
12. EIR PROCESS INCLUDES ALTS
- "ENV. SUPERIOR" - OTHERS
- "NOT BUILD"
- TRAFFIC, NOISE SAFETY, etc.

13. POSSIBLY PROVIDE 2 ALTS. TO C.C. W/ VARYING LEVELS OF INTENSITY
14. 2 OPTIONS MUST BE DIFFERENT
15. TAKE "CONSENSUS" TO C.C. EVEN W/ 2 PLANS.
16. NEXT STEPS - C.C. "BLESSING" THEN WHAT?
 - OPTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED DURING CEQA PROCESS
 - 3 MOS TO DEVELOP DRAFTS FOR TIF REVIEW

7. OPEN SPACE - DEFINE PLANNING COMM.
8. WATER RESERVATION
9. SIZE & LOCATION
10. TYPE & INTENSITY OF USE
11. BLOMQUIST

SUMMARY ISSUES

OPEN SPACE

1. INCL. FIELDS
2. SYNERGY BETWEEN ACTIVE & PASSIVE RECREATION
3. FIELDS MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE
4. LEAVING DOOR TO W. AS IS & NO MOVING TO EXPAND CITY BE ESSENTIALLY SETTER
5. WHAT USES & LOCATION CAN WE AGREE ON?
6. GUIDING PRINC SHOULD INCLUDE STATEMENT OF POSITION



REDWOOD CITY

INNER HARBOR

TASK FORCE #10

APRIL 8, 2014.

ASSUMPTIONS

1. BLOMQUIST EXTENDS
2. BALANCE OF USES
3. PERFORMANCE STDS.
4. TYPES OF OPEN SPACE

QUESTIONS

1. Ho
2. C
3. C
4. F
5. C

QUESTIONS

1. HOW MUCH DETAIL?
(NOW)
2. CHOICES - DEPENDENCIES ON DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY
3. CREATE PLANS WITH SOME FLEXIBILITY WITHIN LEIR. - VARY INTENSITIES.
4. PREFERRED PLAN THAT REFLECTS T.F. GUIDING PRINC.
5. C.C. APPROVES GUIDING PRINC THEN DEVELOP ALTS. BASED ON TECH. STUDIES FOR SPECIFIC PLAN.

6. ADD DETAIL TO GUIDING PRINC.
NOT TO PLANS.

7. STEP BACK TO G.P. VISION
CC LOOKING AT RC/4 OUTSIDE OF G.P.

8. CC NEEDS DETAIL

9. PLAN TOO SPECIFIC

10. IMPACTS BETWEEN
USES & MOBILITY (FOR EXAMPLE)

11. S.P. IS BOTH POLICY &
REGULATORY - REPLACES
ZONING ORDINANCE

12. EIR PROCESS INCLUDES ACTS
- "ENV. SUPERIOR" - OTHERS
- "NO BUILD"
- TRAFFIC, NOISE, SAFETY, etc.

13. POSSIBLY PROVIDE 2 ALTS.
TO C.C. W/VARYING LEVELS
OF INTENSITY.

14. 2 OPTIONS MUST BE DIFFERENT

15. TAKE "CONSENSUS" TO CC.
EVEN W/2 PLANS.

16. NEXT STEPS - CC "BLESSING"..
THEN WHAT?

- OPTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED
DURING CEQA PROCESS.
- 3 MOS. TO DEVELOP DRAFT S.P.
FOR TIF REVIEW

-
7. OPENS SPACE - DEFINE
FRATINGS COMM.
8. ~~FRATINGS COMM.~~ RECREATION
WATER RECREATION -
9. ~~FRATINGS COMM.~~ SIZE & LOCATION
10. TYPE & INTENSITY OF DEV.
11. BLOMQUIST

SUMMARY
ISSUES.

OPEN SPACE

1. INCL FIELDS.
2. SYNERGY BETWEEN ACTIVE & PASSIVE RECREATION
3. FIELDS MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE

* SUMMARY

1. CREATE 1 PLAN w/ BEST OF BOTH.
2. IDENTIFY "OPEN SPACE & RECREATION" WITHIN SPECIFICS -
3. EVENTUALLY IDENTIFY WHERE WETLANDS OCCUR (& DON'T OCCUR)
4. LEAVING DOCKTOWN AS IS & NOT MOVING TO FERRARI MAY BE ECOLOGICALLY BETTER.
5. WHAT USES & LOCATION DO WE AGREE ON?
6. GUIDING PRINC SHOULD INCLUDE STATEMENT OF SHELTER.