

**MEETING #10**  
**CITY OF SAN LEANDRO**  
**SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**(SHORELINE CAC)**

February 17, 2010  
7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.  
Marina Inn, 68 Monarch Bay Drive, San Leandro

**M E E T I N G   N O T E S**

---

Committee Members: Audrey Albers, Clinton Bolden, Victor Chen, Diana Cin, Dave Clark, Peggy Hynd Combs (Vice Chair), Michael Cook, John Dilsaver, Tom Fitzsimons, Marilyn Fong, Alfred Frates, Babs Freitas, Rezsing Gonzalez, Adrienne Granger, Jeff Houston, Rebecca Jewell, Susan Leiga, Robert Leigh, Matt Maloon, Rene Mendieta, Kent Myers (Chairperson), Michael Nolan, Gil Raposo, Carole Rinaldi, Victoria Robles, Caryl Ann Symons, Ronnie Turner, Dan Walters.

Absent: Marie Chiu, Bob Haynes, Jr., Kevin Jones, Tina Kuang, Lee Thomas.

Consultants: Brad McCrea, Bay Conservation Development Commission; Ed Miller, Cal-Coast Development.

City staff: Public Works Director Michael Bakaldin, Senior Transportation Engineer Reh-Lin Chen, Business Development Manager Cynthia Battenberg, Senior Development Specialist Elmer Penaranda.

Public present: Dave Johnson (Chamber of Commerce), Susan McReynolds, Audrey Velasquez (Marina Inn), Zac Weinberg and John Hilker (American Golf Corporation), Councilmember Jim Prola, Vice-Mayor Joyce Starosciak.

---

**I. Call to Order**

Chairperson Myers called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. Mr. Penaranda conducted a silent roll call of the Shoreline CAC based upon the name tents that the members picked up or did not pick up at the front door of the meeting room.

---

**II. CAC Business**

**A. Presentation of research and analysis of the following and discussion of how they impact development:**

**1. Bay Coverage—Brad McCrea, Bay Development Design Analyst, San Francisco Bay Conservation Development Commission (BCDC)**

Mr. McCrea, gave a powerpoint presentation which provided an overview of BCDC and the challenges and constraints of creating a master plan for the Shoreline Area.

BCDC is both an environmental protection agency and an economic development agency. It tries to balance these two objectives and reach sound policy decisions for shoreline development and usage. The decision makers comprise of a 27-member Commission, including nine elected officials that represent local counties; nine appointed by the Governor and Legislature; and nine people from local, federal and state agencies that also have some control over the Bay.

Permitting projects is one component of BCDC's work. It has a staff of 32 which manages approximately 1,600 square miles of bay. San Francisco Bay is one of the most urbanized estuaries in the world. It and the adjoining delta, comprise the largest estuary on the west coast of the North and South American continents.

BCDC has Jurisdiction over two areas: all the water-covered areas of the Bay, including all the tidal marshes, and smaller creeks and sloughs flowing into the Bay and around the edge of the Bay; and a 100-foot-wide band, measured back from the shoreline. Its goals and policies on fill are as follows:

#### Three Primary Goals

1. Prevent unnecessary fill in the bay
2. Maximize public access to and along the shoreline
3. Plan for future

Fill in the Bay can be approved only for:

1. Water-oriented uses
2. Minor fill for public access
3. Minor fill to improve shoreline appearance

The Bay is shallow, on average about 11 meters deep. Much of San Pablo Bay, Suisun Bay, and the South Bay are very shallow; about 3.5 meters deep; thus the Bay is very easy to build on. By the 1950s, a third of the Bay was gone due to filling for development along the shoreline. Between 1850 and 1960 two square miles were filled every year.

In 1959, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reported that 60% of the remaining Bay, another 325 square miles, could be reclaimed with landfill projects. Citizens revolted. Under the leadership of three East Bay women, in 1965 the citizens of the Bay Area convinced the California Legislature to create BCDC to stop the Bay from continuing to get smaller. Although the Legislature didn't know it at the time, they had created the nation's first state coastal management agency.

To maximize public access, the *McAteer-Petris Act* was adopted and states that: "...existing public access to the shoreline and waters of the San Francisco Bay is inadequate and that maximum feasible public access, consistent with a proposed project, should be provided."

BCDC's San Francisco Bay Plan policies on public access state that: "Maximum feasible public access should be provided in and through every new development in the

Bay or on the shoreline....” In 1965 public access around the Bay was limited to about only 4 miles. Today, over 200 miles of shoreline is open to the public.

BCDC’s Public Access Design Guidelines were adopted in 1984. The guidelines provide suggestions for site planning and recommendations for designing and developing attractive and usable public access areas. The guidelines are not legally enforceable standards, but are an advisory set of design principles that are intended to complement the design standards of local municipalities within the region.

In site planning, considerations for public access should be as follows:

1. Make Public Access Public. This objective can be accomplished by developing public access so that the bay trail is the primary design element-creating delineation between public areas and private development; and using site furnishings, such as benches, trash containers and lighting, to provide visual cues that the space is available for the public.
2. Make Public Access Usable. This objective can be accomplished by maximizing user comfort by designing for the weather and day and night use (i.e., shaded seating areas); taking advantage of the existing site opportunities, such as fishing, picnicking, swimming or boating; providing children’s play opportunities; and incorporating improvements that can be used by persons with disabilities, and providing public parking.
3. Enhance Visual Access to the Bay. This objective can be accomplished by locating buildings, structures and landscaping so that they enhance or dramatize views of the bay, and organizing shoreline development to allow bay views and access between buildings.
4. Enhance the Visual Quality of the Shoreline. This objective can be accomplished by using forms, materials, colors and textures that are compatible with the bay and adjacent development; providing visual interest and architectural variety to public access areas and buildings along the shoreline; and using building layout to create a diversity of public spaces along the bay.
5. Provide Connections and Continuity along the Bay. This objective can be accomplished by providing clear and continuous transitions to adjacent developments and shoreline trails; providing connections perpendicular to the shoreline at regular intervals to maximize access and views to the bay; and connecting shoreline access with the local park and open space systems.
6. Take Advantage of the Bay Setting. This objective can be accomplished by orienting development to bay views, utilizing the shoreline for bay-related uses that activate and enliven the adjacent public access areas.
7. Ensure that Public Access is Compatible with Wildlife. This objective can be accomplished by preparing a site analysis to generate information on wildlife species, employing appropriate siting, design and management strategies (such as buffers or use restrictions) to reduce or prevent adverse impacts on wildlife.

The plans prepared by the groups and the developer were reviewed by Mr. McCrea whose main comment was that the proposed development cantilevering over the inner harbor area was determined to be *fill* into the Bay. It would be considered excessive

(unnecessary) and would not be permitted. The plans must be prepared to have minimal or no fill in the Bay.

## **2. Traffic—Reh-Lin Chen, City of San Leandro, Engineering and Transportation Department**

Transportation Engineer Chen gave a powerpoint presentation which gave an overview of a preliminary traffic analysis of proposed new development at the shoreline. Transportation planning analysis covered trip generation, trip distribution, mode choice and trip assignment. Roadway system impact analysis studied roadway handling capacities, intersection capacities and operations and mitigation measures.

Two-way traffic access to the shoreline area via Marina Boulevard and Fairway Drive was preferred versus one-way circulation. The two-way traffic scenario would amount to Levels of Service (LOS) A or B on Marina and Fairway. LOS A, B, C and D are allowed.

Projected traffic volumes for the shoreline, considering the impact of the proposed Kaiser hospital and medical center with adjoining retail development would require configuration of various intersections including: Davis/Doolittle; Doolittle/Marina, and Marina/Merced. The shoreline's contribution to mitigation at these intersections would be approximately 1.5%, 13.5% and 7.5% respectively. In addition to traffic mitigation costs the shoreline development would be required to pay traffic fees including Development Fee for Street Improvements (DFSI) which is estimated to be \$1.67 million based on Discussion Plan 2 floor area and the fair share for Interstate 880/Marina Interchange which is estimated to be \$690,000. The estimated total sum of fees is \$2.36 million.

Discussion, including questions and answers, between the Shoreline CAC, Mr. Chen ensued (comments from the CAC are non-italic; comments from Mr. Chen are in *italic*).

- Fairway Drive should be considered to have additional lanes, up to four, to handle additional traffic capacity to the shoreline area for the expected higher intensity development.
- In addition to Marina Boulevard and Fairway Drive handling east-west access to the shoreline area, Williams Street and Neptune Drive should also be considered in handling traffic volume to the shoreline.
- Magnetic loops and coordinated timing at signalized intersections were strongly recommended. *All intersections will include synchronized systems with the detection loops. It will be a new advanced system that will enhance and improve capacity and through-put volume.*

## **3. Compatibility with Golf Course—Cynthia Battenberg, Business Development Manager**

Manager Battenberg provided an update on discussions with American Golf Corporation (AGC) regarding how the proposed project could compliment/impact Monarch Bay's golf operations. AGC shared their plans for the future, which given the economy and a decrease in overall golf play, did not include significant investment in the golf facility.

AGC did express interest, however, in providing expanded food and beverage service in a larger club house should the development plans including funding for such.

The possibility of expanding development into to the Monarch Bay nine-hole executive golf course, which was suggested by public on numerous occasions, was also explored. The nine-hole course although not a significant revenue generator, attracts 40% of the play. The course, however, sits on approximately 40 acres, and in general only 25 acres are needed for a quality nine-hole course. ACG indicated that they were amenable to allowing the course to be redesigned to allow for additional development.

Based on this information, John Harbottle, a renowned golf course architect, has been retained to redesign course to provide additional developable space. The new design will be sensitive to maintaining the present quality and performance of the current executive course as well as be sensitive to the City's ordinance which requires protection of the monarch butterflies which overwinter on the golf course.

Manager Battenberg clarified that the CAC's role is to provide input to the developer and the developer will perform and provide the final design.

**B. Next Meeting Date.** The next Shoreline Development CAC meeting date is scheduled for March 17, 2010. The next meeting will provide each of the three groups approximately one hour with Cal Coast to discuss how the information presented on bay coverage, traffic and the golf course impacts the project.

---

**III. Public Comments.** No public comments were given.

---

**Chairperson Myers adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.**