00:00:00

JL  Good afternoon. Let’s call to order, if we may, the special meeting of the committee to protect seawall’s levies and utilities. The meeting will proceed in accordance with the noticed agenda, the first item of which is the open forum. That is a forum for any citizen wishing to address this committee on an issue that is not on the agenda. Seeing none, let’s move to the scheduled items. The first is to approve the minutes of the meeting of June 6th 2019. Those were circulated. Is there a motion?

BR  I have a comment on the minutes.

JL  All right. And, what is that?

BR  Bill, I have a comment on the minutes. I think it’s very good because I think some people were confused before they… I don’t mean people here necessarily, but before they saw the minutes, that the items that we said these should be looked into, but that’s exactly what we were saying. The word, as I was reading the minutes they say, should be investigated further. And, that’s very different than saying, no matter what the cost, we’re all for it or whatever it is. So, I’m very glad that the minutes did point out that we were recommending things for further investigation.

JL  Terrific. And, I take it by that you mean that the minutes are accurate, you don’t have any concerns. Terrific.
I think they’re wonderful. Particularly in that respect about which people could get confused.

Terrific. Thank you. So, we have a motion that’s been seconded. All in favor, aye.

Aye.

Opposed. Okay, it passes unanimously. Next is an update on the design concepts and we have Craig here and Travis. Craig, I think, is going to give us a brief overview of what has occurred since our last meeting in June. It’s captured I think pretty well in the memo that went around yesterday, but I think a nice introduction from Craig will be helpful and then we’ll turn to Travis who will walk us through the designs.

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yes, I’ll bring you up to date about what has transpired since June when we last met. And, of course, following that June meeting was the June meeting of the city council at which the chairman delivered recommendations to the city council. And, since then we have continued to do research. The engineers have done their borings. We have learned a few good things like maybe the sand layer under San Rafael isn’t quite as extensive as we thought earlier. So, the need for sheet piles is still there, but maybe fewer sheet piles. That should have an impact on the cost. A positive impact on the cost.

We hired One Architecture, and as you will remember in one of our committee meetings, Matthias Bouw from One Architecture Amsterdam, presented to this committee and talked about a different approach to taking a look at how we not only protect the city but enhance the city and look for what he called co-benefits. So, we hired One Architecture and Travis Bunt is here with us. He’s just dropped in from Hong Kong today. So, he’s on 16-hour. Yes, does he have a mask? No, I don’t think so. We’re looking forward to his presentation [overtalking]. And, we asked One Architecture, when we hired them, to do two things. Look at the protective measures that these seawalls would give us and see if there were a way to enhance those. And, at the same time, look for the co-benefits and possibilities for enhancing the experience of the people in Belvedere with the ocean or the bay.

So, they have come up with some concepts. I’ll fast forward to December where the city council had its annual retreat and explored some of these concepts. They have been slightly changed since then as a result of comment at that retreat, as well as comment from the meetings that were subsequent to that retreat. Among those meetings were meetings with people who live on West Shore, especially those first six houses that are of such great importance to the particular scheme that we all endorsed, which was to put the wall on the outside of… on the bay side of those homes, thereby protecting the homes. Those have been… We haven’t met with everybody among those six, but we have met with four I think, right, Robert?
And, good meetings. Some good feedback. Some changes to the concept as a result of that feedback. We also met with the San Francisco Yacht Club board of directors and that was a very positive meeting as well. Some feedback, which we will incorporate, mainly related to the entrance of the yacht club and how people could be dropped off there like they are today. You know, is there a way to adjust the scheme? But, otherwise quite positive. I think the prospect of a park in front of the club - a bigger park - was a positive.

And then, we talked with a member of this committee, Andy, um, representing the land company, and had a very good conversation as well. So, we’ll continue those kinds of conversations with stakeholders as we move along and try to finalize or coalesce around a concept, set of concepts that could then be taken into schematics.

The most recent public interaction was on Monday night at the town meeting where we previewed a few of these concepts. Not all of the boards that you’ll see today, but some of them. And, had some... We didn’t have a question and answer period at that time, so there was some talk after the meeting and most of it seemed relatively positive. So, here we are and our goal today is really to listen to what Travis and his team have come up with. They’re slightly different from what we talked about in June. Hopefully, there are improvements on what we talked about in June. I think you’ll see that there probably are. And then, I’ll hand it back over to you, Jim, as to what the next steps are for today.

00:06:40

JL Thank you, Craig. I think what we will do today is driven by what we hear from Travis and what the reaction is from this committee. But, it could be that we have some input on the designs, some suggested changes. It could be a stamp saying we approved and recommend is drawn. We could come to a point, in other words, where we can make a recommendation to the city council about this committee’s view and I think that would be a motion we could make if we want to. If there are questions that we think can be answered but aren’t available today, we could schedule another meeting, perhaps after the city council’s February 10th meeting but before its March meeting, if we think that will be a useful effort.

Or, if there are other outcomes from today, open questions that we think can’t be answered or suggestions and so forth, there could be a different motion that could be a suggestion to the city council perhaps to do a study session or something like that. So, I would like to get to some recommendation at the end of this meeting. But, what that is remains to be seen and I think it will be based on the input we hear from everyone today. Travis. Thank you.

TR Maybe it might make sense to bring some of the boards over because it’s a little hard to see [overtalking].

JL I can certainly sit over there.

00:08:06
TR We were brought into this project around the end of the summer to take a look at what the engineers’ initial schematics were, and to think about ways that the design could be improved, that it could be more integrated and so forth. Outlining a couple of the principles that we started with and… But, I am a little jetlagged, so I may be a little, ah, distracted.

But, so we’ve been working on these types of projects for the last five or six years as a number of cities are starting to worry about sea level rise and flood protection. And, kind of the traditional way of doing this is just to have an engineering company come in and throw up a big concrete wall and then you’re protected. But, these tend to be pricey projects, big investments, and, regardless of what you do, it’s going to have a big impact on your coast line. And so, what we tried to do is number one, to look at ways that it can be more integrated into the fabric of the cities and the communities that are receiving it.

Number two, from a functional standpoint, we look for ways to make the system entirely passive. So, you may remember from June that some of the initial concepts had moveable gates and deployable elements and so forth. And, all of these add… anything that has to be operated adds risk into the system. So, ideally, you have something that is just there, it’s part of the city and it protects you every day without having to worry about getting a crew out there 24 hours before a storm’s coming or something like that.

And, the third thing that we try to look to do in these types of projects is understanding that there’s a big impact just construction-wise to put in a flood wall, to put in a levy or something like that, but you are literally ripping up part of your city. So, a part of your town. Why not use that as an opportunity to put things back better than they are today. So, look at other issues and problems that could be solved like pedestrian crossings and so forth.

And, as Craig mentioned, we like to look at the benefits and opportunities to enhance public space and so forth. And, I think that what we’ve done here accomplishes that. Let me move to this intersection. So, both San Rafael and Beach Road… Where we started was looking at the city’s roadway and how we might reorganize and optimize space within that right away by narrowing lanes, reorganizing exactly how the parking is laid out in order to make space to create these linear parks. And, essentially, the more width that we can get for the park, the easier it is to start to grade up landscapes and essentially hide a flood wall or a protective element within it.

And so, in San Rafael, we’ve narrowed the roadway and shifted the parking around a little bit in order to give us enough width to create kind of a sloping landscape that hides the wall. And, essentially the town side has a nice sloped planted band of greenery and then it widens the pedestrian shared-use path along the waterfront. So, kind of keeping the same qualities of what that path already offers, but making it more accessible at each of the crosswalks. At each of the existing crosswalks, there’s a universally accessible ramp that will allow anyone to come up and over the height of
the flood protection and onto the path.

00:13:28

In this current design, we're showing a ten-foot-wide path, which is about twice as wide as the path is today. One of the things we had heard months ago when first starting this process, was that with the narrow path there's issues with people passing each other in different directions and so forth. So, by making it a little bit wider, it's safe and accessible for everyone.

SW Do you want to answer questions as you go along, or you want to save questions for the end?

TR Maybe kind of per… We don’t have to wait until the end [overtalking]. First [unclear] now then that's basically my introduction and, yes, you can.

SW I don't want to interrupt you though if you’re…

TR It’s perfectly fine.

SW I thought of a few questions. The first one was, obviously, this is protecting us ideally from sea level rise I think through to 2050.

TR Yes, you can use the microphone.

00:14:36

SW As I understand, these plans are to protect us for sea level rise and storm events through to 2050. And, my question is, if sea level rise exceeds expectations or we're looking beyond that date, how adaptable is this new configuration vis-à-vis just a simple sea wall?

TR Right. So, there will be in certain cases there’s a sheet pile underneath, but essentially, we have a highline of protection and the design is such that you could come in later and incrementally add a foot or two. And, we are, compared to the first iteration, which was operating on a fairly narrow band, again, the wider, the more space that we have, the more easier to adapt later. So, it’s more adaptable in a sense than the previous iteration, simply because you have more space to operate in.

BM Just to be a devil’s advocate, Travis, the first iteration I think you’re talking about we would have a solid wall all along the bay side of the path instead of having the wall between the walkway and the road. But, what concerns me is that, under this iteration where you have the walkway between the pathway and the road, as you said, you’ve got to have entrances and exits from it. It certainly seems, in response to Sally’s question, if sea level rise occurs more, it’s easy enough to add to the height of the wall, but what about the entrances and exits from the pathway?

TR Now, so there’s two ways that that can be accomplished, but most likely we would just re-grade those paths.

00:16:37
BM But, to raise the level of the pathway you’d have to [overtalking] the building.

TR I should back up and explain that one of the things that has also happened within the last six months of the engineers doing their analysis is that the engineers are the ones that have pushed the line in because of the sub-surface condition - in an area where they originally wanted to put the flood protection there was a lot of sub-surface rocks and so forth. So, we had initially come to the council with two different approaches. Both raised linear parts, but one with the wall close to the water and one inboard. And, it was ultimately selected to do this approach because of the cost implications of being in that riprap area [overtalking]. Am I explaining this [overtalking]?

BM Could be [unclear] and say definitively that there was riprap under there or that just there was a whiff that there was riprap under there?

TR I believe they found some along… It’s not uniform along the whole thing. There’s some areas that they ran into some rock, which they assume could be riprap.

BM And, were those sections where they now still think we still need sheet piling?

TR Do you know?

BM Because we’re not planning on doing sheet piling along the entire waterfront anymore.

TR I’m not sure if I understand the question.

BM In those areas [overtalking].

TR In those areas where they found rock were those also areas where we were planning to do sheet piling?

BM The sheet piling on San Rafael Avenue is that first third from West Shore Avenue about several 100-feet. My… I’m not sure. I’m not sure about that. I’ll check.

TR I think it’s worth noting that this is at the concept level and, as the technical considerations are more narrowed down, the design can definitely adjust to those realities and perhaps, if the engineering on the sub-surface allows it, there are portions of this where the highline could push closer to the water.

BM Well, can I ask another question? Because there has been some feedback of concerns about widening the path, whether that’s going to encourage bikes to use the path. But, along that same line, in your first comment, you mentioned that we would be narrowing the roadway.

TR Yes.

BM Given that this is one of only two roadways off the island in an emergency if people have to get off the island in case of a fire or something. Most of us have had the experience of trying to pass bikes along the street and, if it gets narrower and the
bikes stay on the street, it's not that clear at this point whether the bikes are going to be on the street or on the pathway. But, certainly, I would worry that if the bikes are going to stay on the street and we've narrowed the street, we're making it even more difficult. I would suggest more than half the population of the island uses this street to get off the island.

BR Are you saying…? I thought you were only talking about a narrower Beach Road. Are you talking about narrowing the San Rafael Avenue route?

TR Yes [cell phone]. By a few feet.

BR Yes, but if you've driven down there today, any day, they have a sign in the middle for the crossings, there'll be yellow signs. You can barely get by. And, as a matter of fact, I was there just yesterday calling to ask the police department. I don't think there's 10-foot clearance.

TR Ah, there’s 14-feet.

00:20:32

BR On each side. So, you're going to get it down to around…

TR Ah, 11 to 12.

BR Well, I [overtalking].

TR Well, 14 is highway width.

BR But, I'm simply saying each of you should think about it. I'm not telling you what to do, but I'd urge you to consider. When you've been driving on San Rafael Avenue at the present time, not the theoretical 14/12, whatever it is, but how you feel about it when you go by particularly those avenues where they have the crosswalk signs in the middle of the street, which are very important to have so that people could stop for people on the crosswalk. How easy it will be to get by there? How comfortable you'll feel with bicycles using it? [Overtalking].

TR I've [overtalking] to change.

SW Meaning what?

TR That if there’s an obstruction right now in the middle of the road that that would change with the [overtalking].

00:21:27

BR But, it's a safety. In other words, they're concerned with children crossing the road and a bus and everything else. There's a reason why they put those yellow signs there. Yellow signs should be there now from a safety point of view and they should be there when you get it done. But, they shouldn't be there when they don't have to be there when you get it done [cell phone] because then [cell phone] necessary [inaudible] then they shouldn't be there now. The two things are incompatible.
JL  Andy, did you have a question?

AA  I did. Thank you. I just want to double-check because, FEMA, the entity has a whole lot of regulations that are rather unusual and rather stringent.

TR  Yes.

AA  And, I’m sure you’re coordinating your plans with FEMA requirements and I just hadn’t heard the f-word mentioned [laughing].

TR  Yes, my understanding is that there is a desire for this to be FEMA-certified in the end. That’s a different conversation, but there are basic design guidelines that you must meet for it to be certifiable. So, from my perspective as a designer, I’m just trying to make sure that I meet the parameters with the design and then it’s kind of up to the city to go through the process of actually certifying it.

AA  Right. And, you’re keeping your eye on that?

TR  Yes, absolutely. And, the type of restrictions that FEMA imposes deal with the geometries and as well as offsets for what types of things can be planted and so forth. So, one of the things that we’re trying to do, and a bit why you see the waviness in the plan is to, at certain points, pull the sheet pile away from the street so that you have enough room with the setoff to be able to plant trees. So, yes, it’s embedded in the design approach.

UM  Conceptually is the sheet piling upward of the masonry wall or is it to the waterside or to the roadside.

TR  If we’re looking on here, our assumption is that it’s essentially following this edge, the inside edge of the path.

UM  The roadside.

TR  The roadside, yes.

SW  I know there have been a lot of iterations in relation to parking. And, I just want to know in this latest iteration is there the same amount of parking and is it in approximately the same location as currently?

TR  It’s roughly the same amount. There are other versions that we had which added new spots at either end, but those have been taken away based on some other conversations. But, it’s roughly the same amount of parking.

SW  And, in roughly the same location [overtalking].

TR  And roughly the same locations, yes.

SW  Okay.
BR: The only argument or the only inconsistency that I’ve heard for this is that people on the path are sometimes finding they’re interfering with each other. I’m not sure how much expense is justified. I mean we’re not talking about expensive, but [overtalking]. You see [overtalking] people would walk down the path, I don’t happen to walk down the path. But, do you find it a problem that people will be bumping into each other or something [overtalking]?

SW: And, I do think, from my perspective an added benefit is if it does become shared use and the school kids on their bikes can ride on the path rather than on the road. That would be a huge benefit for both drivers and for the kids themselves.

JL: So, can I ask is it an open question right now whether the barrier, the wall depicted here in red on this board has to be on the roadside of the path? It is the question that did bother us earlier and it sounds like it’s an uncertain?

TR: So, I would answer your question this way. From my perspective, we can design a park that works with it wherever it needs to go. Currently, the engineers prefer it in the location that it’s shown. But, the scheme….

00:26:11

BR: For cost reasons.

TR: Yes. But, the scheme can be easily adjusted to work with it in any place.

CM: Travis, if you were going to move it so that the pathway was on the roadside rather than… I know that when we’ve talked, one of your goals had been to really maximize the experience of people walking on that path with the water. You know, so they’re looking right at the water and they’re not looking over the wall or something. But, if you were to change it so that the wall was on the outside and the path was on the roadside, would it make it narrower?

TR: So, the alternative option that we had looked at was, if this red wall was more say to the center, would be to raise the whole path such that essentially there was no wall. But, part of the reason I think that this option was selected was because there was concern about having the path be too high relative to the community. And so, in this scheme, we essentially tried to integrate it as a seating element. It could also… You could conceivably flip this and have a seating element along the riprap side, but then you would not have the same experience you do today where basically your path is kind of on the edge of the water.

00:27:50

So, I’m agnostic, but it can work either way. It just depends on what your aesthetic and experiential priorities are.

BR: But, the wall would only be [whispering] what? 18 inches higher than the pathway, right?

TR: Somewhere in that range [overtalking]. Basically, the highest point that right now we
think we need to get to is about three feet above the current crown of where that path is. And so, some of that... So, your structural element would have to come up that high and then some of the visual spatial impact of that we’re taking up with raising the path and the landscape and seating elements and so forth.

BR  What you intend is to keep it so that it’s bench height from the path.

TR  Essentially.

BR  Essentially. Nice feature.

NK  Yes, it is.

BR  I have a question. I know you’re not a contractor, but it looks to me like what most of this has to do with putting things on top of stuff that exists there. Not big excavations and things like that. So, how long…? Let’s assume we didn’t do either and then there was finally, after all these years there was overtopping and we said [inaudible] we ought to do something. How long would it take to do the things that you’ve outlined? It looks to me like six months or something, but I don’t know, but I’m not a contractor.

00:29:21

RZ  Yes, I can probably address that. A similar question came up earlier from some other comment that we got. And, you know, for a construction phase it’s a year and a half or so from when you have a shovel-ready project [overtalking].

BR  Would it be better than having sheet pile?

RZ  No, well getting it to a shovel-ready project, the permitting and everything else has to go in, that takes several months as well. It’s a year just to get it through regulatory.

BR  It could... If people said, well, you know, there’s an overtop in 35 years. Well, why don’t we do that and see what happens? Can you make an application and say we’d like to have this thing ready in case we want to do it and then get approval for it and then…?

RZ  It’s possibly you can do that, but those applications expire over time. So, if five years went by and application would lapse and you’d have to reapply again.

BR  But, I’m just only saying this doesn’t look like building the Pentagon or something.

RZ  Right.

BR  The part that they’ve got on the sheets here.

00:30:16

JL  Thank you. Can we clarify that? Bill’s question’s a good one, but I understood the red T-shape wall that’s depicted on these boards to be a new wall that would require excavation and concrete and would be a foundation, an engineered wall. Is that right?

TR  That’s correct, yes.
Okay. And then, we’re putting stuff on top of existing pathways and so forth.

I’m not comparing it to say sheet piling where they have to come with big drivers and drive things down. But, obviously, you have to do some digging, but, yes. Thank you.

Yes, so one third of it I guess we’ll hire the sheet pile in addition to the T-cap there on San Rafael side and then there’s the entire beach roadside will require sheet pile. But I think the question is about whether we wait for an event is kind of a question of how much risk for future damage that the city wants to take on because would you rather spend several million to put in the protection or wait until $20-million in damage had happened and then have... [overtalking].

$20-million it would take if there was some overtop in the [unclear].

So, what’s the average price of one of these houses?

Eight million.

Eight million.

It’s eight million [overtalking] that’s the land and stuff I guess. A [unclear] value is better than [unclear]. Couple of million.

So, if you had a flood event that even just went to the first row of houses and every single one of those had to renovate its first floor, that’s an incredible amount of money. Has anyone done a renovation of a kitchen or anything like it? Like, very quickly you’re going to get up to more than the cost of this project. And, I imagine as a requirement for this you’ll have to do a cost-benefit analysis that will articulate that.

Also, maybe I know we’re getting in... I know this wasn’t the purpose of the meeting, but I feel uncomfortable like there’s an elephant in the room that we’re not talking about, which has to do with the cost because we’re putting that off to later. But, for instance, you’re mentioning the sheet piling. The sheet piling has nothing to do with flooding.

What do you mean it has nothing to do with flooding?

I mean it has nothing to do with flooding. The sheet piling is down, it’s underneath. It has nothing to do. The riprap is what [overtalking].

It holds the riprap.

Say again.

It holds the riprap.

No, it doesn’t hold the riprap.

It does.
BR The riprap.

TR It holds the street.

BR But, the street is... You see when we’re saying earthquake with flooding. And, maybe the earthquake is completely justified. Maybe it's not completely justified. But, it's the question of... It’s getting to be like a Christmas tree with a whole lot of things happening on it that really... If the water came over San Rafael Avenue, the street is not going to disappear. So, the sheet piling that was going to be underneath, as Bob said, that was going to be underneath the wall then you’d say, well, they’re connected, but they’re not even connected anymore. So, I’m sorry to get off with the design, but the design can’t be separate from the engineering.

00:33:43

BM Your initial point I believe is correct. The sheet piling is primarily to mitigate the risk of an earthquake.

TR Right.

BM Now, when we first asked Stetson about the benefit of having the sheet piling under the wall or separate from it, we said it would be nice, but it makes no difference for the earthquake mitigation where the sheet piling is. Whether it’s right under the wall or five feet away from the wall.

TR Right.

JL I guess the point... Just to be clear, the point that Bill is making, or one point at least I guess that you’re making, is that because the sheet piling under this current design is not going to be integrated with the wall and the elevated path, as was considered or discussed before, they could proceed separately. Is that the point you’re making?

BR I may be wrong. You’re the engineer. I’m not. But, one of the appeals of the sheet piling I thought was that it could serve as the anchor for the wall and [overtalking].

BM When I first raised the questions that’s what I was thinking, but Stetson’s answer was it’s not all that important.

BR Well, I thought what would happen is that it would make the wall less expensive because you wouldn't have to have a different foundation for the wall, the sheet piling would serve as the foundation. So, maybe I was confused about what it is.

00:35:07

BM Yes, when I first asked that question, Stetson said it’s not all that important. And, I’m not the engineer, Glenn here is the engineer.

TR My understanding is that the one third extra sheet piles because they’re structurally necessary to support that portion of the flood protection. And, the reason the other two thirds does not need it is because you can do a gravity system. The reason that you’re going to have a sheet pile is because, otherwise, that part of the flood protection
will not be structurally sound.

BR That's not what was said by Mr. Stetson when he was here. We got all involved with earthquake which may be very, very important. I'm not saying one way or the other. But, [overtalking].

JL Since then we [overtalking].

BR We went from raising the wall to all of a sudden having sheet piling and I think that they've gotten conflated.

TR Well, I don't.

JL Glenn, do you have insight on this?

00:35:58

GI Yes, I do. Since that time, we've had a lot more information on the sub-soil condition and I believe that's what's given rise to the notion of which section really needs it and which sections don't. So, we just had a lot more information.

JL And so, can you address, Glenn, the question that's sort of implied by Bill's comments about whether it would be possible to do the sheet piling or sensible to do the sheet piling separately from elevating the path?

GI Well, it doesn't seem to make any sense -- once you're mobilizing, you might as well get it all done, and contrary to what Bill is thinking, the sheet piling would be the quick part.

BR Would be a what?

GI The quick part.

BR Oh, the quick part.

GI Not the lengthy part. The lengthy part is the building of the wall.

BR It may also... I believe that Mr. Stetson indicated, and Robert could maybe say more about this. That has nothing to do with the flooding. There's no suggestion that a flood is going to wash away the riprap. That's never. No one has ever, ever said anything like that in this room. Did anyone remember anyone saying the flood, the water's going wash away the riprap? Never.

00:37:05

GI So, that is the wrong question.

BR Well, what is the right question?

GI Is it possible to build this little T-wall without proper support. And, the engineers have determined that to build that little wall you need the support of the riprap [overtalking].

BR And, you said [overtalking]. This is a [unclear] architect.
TR Yes.

BR Could you tell me is there an engineer...? Is there someone here from Mr. Stetson?

JL No. No one here.

TR I think it would be good to have Mr. Stetson clarify.

BR Yes.

00:37:33

TR Every other flood protection project I worked on everywhere in the world has sheet pile underneath it. And, it is to protect the whole thing from distorsional force because if you get water... You get a wave it pushes against your flood protection. And, the taller the wall, the deeper the sheet pile. Stetson's engineers have determined that, at certain parts, they think that they don't need the sheet piling, but I think that's different from saying the foundations are not necessary for the flood protection.

BR It's the same riprap along the whole length, so [overtalking].

TR Riprap does not protect you from floods. Riprap protects you from erosion.

BR Riprap is protected from flooding. We had a flood in 1984, it overtopped, we've had nothing since. We put in riprap.

TR Riprap protects the levy that's behind the riprap [overtalking].

JL I think this is a fair point to seek for Stetson. Maybe we can make a note of that. I think it's fair for us to at least put a point on that and understand it.

SW I think -- clarify for me. So, they're now saying we only need sheet piling in certain areas for earthquake reasons or for wall reasons.

TR Well, my understanding is that it's related to flood protection.

00:38:52

SW So, putting aside the flooding. In terms of if we're just earthquaking this levy, we only need sheet piling in one place to protect the levy from shifting. Is that correct?

JL Yes, maybe can you clarify this?

BM But, I thought after Stetson did their study we concluded that we only needed sheet piling along a third of the water front for both earthquake and water reasons.

BR Exactly.

JL It is. Yes.

SW That's correct.

GI Exactly right.

BR I believe that the effect of riprap on the flooding is that it [unclear] in the FEMA
regulations, the amount of overtopping. Riprap breaks up the wave force. That’s how it effectively [inaudible].

SW And, can I just confirm one other point. If we do have intermittent floods, as we all know, those floods will dissipate low tide. But, my understanding is still, without these sea walls, the utilities underneath will still be vulnerable and at risk even from the utilities that are underneath. Is that still correct?

TR That is still correct, yes.

BR Since you raised the question. I’ve done some research. We’re supposed to research. The sewer pipes are now being put in plastic pipe and therefore, they’re flexible. You maybe have seen them being installed up here above city hall and they bend when you lift them up. They’re specifically designed to resist earthquake and to be able to be bent. The electrical… the electrical wires that can’t get damaged by overtopping unless that happens over and over again. I’m going to call it the transformer box. That’s probably not the right word.

RZ That’s right. Sub-structure transformer box is there in the ground, yes.

BR We had testimony here. We’re very clear that the only thing that would damage the electricity would be… And, this was the keyword and I drew attention to it. You may remember. Repeated infiltration. Repeated infiltration. And, I asked, well, so if this happens once or twice is that going to cause it? No. It had to be repeated infiltration. With respect to the water pipes, obviously, they’re not going to be damaged by flooding because they’re full of water. Nothing would happen. And, in terms of the gas line [overtalking], a flood is not going to make a water pipe collapse. How could that happen? I mean, huh, can anyone…? You’ll tell me that it can happen. And, the gas lines by a flood are not going to be affected at all. From the earthquake maybe, in my third opening argument [overtalking].

RZ There is an argument and that’s what Stetson told us.

BR Okay, but we’re talking about [overtalking].

JL That’s how we got into this originally. Originally we were [overtalking].

BR Now we ask the question about flooding and I was only responding to [unclear] question is it seems to be discussed in an earthquake too. But, I believe you asked the architect, would flooding affect the utilities. And, it’s that to which I was directing my answer.

SW Can Glenn clarify on that?

GI I don’t want to go there. Why aren’t we spending more time on design while we have the architect here?
BR Answer the question.

Public I can’t understand where you’re putting parks on the walking path.

TR I’m sorry.

Public Where would these parks be? I live in the blocks between Windward and Hilarita Circle. The last thing we want is somebody putting a park there in front of our house, now we have to see through it now.

TR You already have a green belt and a path there. It’s just widening it.

00:42:52

Public It was landscaped. I saw a picture of trees. It’s bad enough if we’ve got a wall there. Our house, I think we bought in 97. We’ve never seen a flood there. It was a little bit of... There was a very high wind and it came to... We had some splashing on the riprap and pretty much what we got was particles of decomposed insulation. That white stuff, hard insulation. That’s what hit San Rafael Avenue. I think San Rafael Avenue was raised in the 80s. So, our house is below, but our house is three feet above bricks [overtalking] and we’re not really concerned about flooding anytime because you would need a real tsunami. The tsunami that came through ten years ago from Hawaii was this big. I mean it was a ripple on the water, photographers were there it is. It’s like three inches tall.

The water in front of 50 San Rafael at high tide, not king tide is maybe two feet deep. And, at low tide, you can walk out a few hundred yards there. And, we did undergrounding, that’s all glued conduit pipe that was put in. I don’t what PV. I’m sure theirs is sealed. That’s all sealed from the water and it’s all bay mud. Everything in that block I know for sure is bay mud. And, a geological engineer who was familiar with that in Peninsula [?] Road. So, it won’t liquefy like the [unclear]. There’s no sand. It’s just muddy. So, but anyway, I’m just concerned about losing our apartment. [Inaudible] was that about a week ago?

JL Yes.

Public I’m not sure if it’s [unclear], but it [unclear] the fact that you’re narrowing the road. That the emergency exit from Belvedere Island and West Shore and anyone else who can’t go through the traffic jam would get run over. I have to go through it and that’s not counting emergency vehicles. And the parking. There’s no other parking on San Rafael Avenue. Not on Windward, not on Hilarita. You can’t even make a U-turn on Hilarita there’s so many cars. Or, they have to park up on Lagoon Road, which is also costly. And, we also have probably the only legitimate side walk on that portion of San Rafael Avenue that actually people can walk on. It’s four feet wide. You can’t walk on the side walk on the rest of San Rafael. It’s all trees and roots and or no sidewalk.

But, I live there. I have a long time running up until couple of years ago. Ran every day there and also [unclear] always working in front of my house. It’s like the rich, but I can count on two hands how many kids I see actually going on the bike path. Well,
it’s not a bike path. It’s a walking path, not like a paved path. But, it’s not used that much. Most of the people are walking on the sidewalk. They are not over there on the bay. Partly that the surface there is the same as the Tiburon, multi-purpose. It gets very mucky. It has too much clay in it or something. I don’t know what’s wrong with it.

We walk every night with the dog. We pass people coming by saying hello. Nobody has to step off the path. It’s enough for normal people. So, I don’t know why they would need to make it bigger if it’s a real sidewalk across the street. And, the fact that there would be a park. That’s pretty much in the email [overtalking].

00:46:41

JL Can we [overtalking]. I just want to follow up on one question that comes from what he just said. And that is, you talked before about how the roads presently on San Rafael are 14 feet wide in each direction.

TR It’s between 14 and 16 feet wide.

JL So, the minimum is 14 feet.

TR Yes.

JL Okay.

TR And, that is like expressway-width lanes.

JL And, is it right? You talked about how the width of the park allows you to gradually bring the height up.

TR Yes.

JL But, is it correct that, if the walking path that’s proposed was not ten feet wide, but say, was six feet wide, that you could still maintain the grade that you need to get up to that elevation and the extra footage would go back into the road? Is that just right conceptually?

TR Yes, there’s multiple things that we can do to refine this section and exactly how wide different things are… I said this is a concept. Part of the reason that the path was made as wide as it was, was initial concern about bicycles and safety. And, I imagine that if this path were improved and not muddy, it would probably get more use.

Public That’s where I talk about the rain [unclear], obviously dry weather nine or ten months of the year it’s not muddy, it’s perfectly usable.

TR And, in terms of your first concern was about the trees. So, one of the things that we did early on is do a study like house by house just to see where the windows were where people had views. And, so the location where we have put the thicker plantings generally align where it’s not blocking anyone’s view. So, mostly they’re near intersections and where we determined that the houses either had a wall or… About half of these houses have walled gardens and don’t actually have windows that, at the first floor…
Public: Most of these are one-story homes on that area I’m talking about.

TR: You’re in almost the middle area, right?

Public: Well, we’re [overtalking] basically [overtalking].

TR: There’s one [unclear] in the middle that has almost all of the houses that have lots of glass on the first-level view. So, it’s…

00:49:21

Public: Between Windward and Hilarita there’s all the fronts of the houses, that’s the view. That’s the value of the home.

TR: And, so we have specifically tried to keep the thick pieces of vegetation away from that block so as to maintain the views of those houses in this design. And, it’s again, something that would continue to be refined as the project would be developed. Again, it’s concept. There’s probably another year of developing the fine details of how it would be implemented.

Public: If that’s the design, has anybody looked at making them all loop from the boardwalk or [unclear] San Rafael Avenue? And, one length with wired light path and [overtalking].

TR: One of the first options that we showed the city was that and it was determined that that wasn’t politically viable.

Public: Are you done?

TR: There was one more point that you made there that I wanted to address.

BM: No, wait let me respond a little bit more to that, please. There are at least one or two city councilmen that thought that, if what happens is all the people that are on the existing old path on bicycles were to now turn into and come along San Rafael Avenue, which most of them don’t now. They keep going straight on Tiburon Boulevard down to the boardwalk. But, there was concern that if the outcome of this is that there were a significant increase in cyclists coming along San Rafael, that that would not be acceptable to the people that are on San Rafael Avenue.

00:51:30

But then, it also dumps all those bicycles onto the rest of San Rafael Avenue where there is no bike path. There is no sidewalk. And, the people on the island have enough problems with bicycles now. And, if you doubled or tripled the number of bicycles on the streets, I think the people would not have a good reaction to that.

BR: Yes, my understanding with bike traffic is by and large mostly people who are biking a bridge and miss… And, make the wrong turn [laughing]. [Overtalking].

BM: How do we get them down to town? So, well, you can keep on going there, but you should have gone straight and then at least you go back. It’s scenic there, but other than that, it degrades pretty quickly.
So, if I may come back to your question about the parking. There was an earlier version of this plan where everything was much wider and we had reduced a lot of the parking. And, because of the feedback, I assume, from yourself and others who are on the street, we’ve been massaging the street section to reintroduce the parking back. And, as I say, it’s all a process and it will continue being refined with input like yours and other residents.

00:52:58

Public What I did with this is I took a couple of pictures on my phone. I took the typical parking [unclear]. I can’t park in front of my house because someone else has parked there. There’s only 18. Pass those around. This is a typical day. This is what it really looks like.

?? Yes, that’s really bad.

Public We don’t have garages even big enough for a car.

CM I wonder if it would make some sense to spend some time on Beach Road, so that we make sure we don’t get through this meeting without dealing with Beach Road. We can always come back to San Rafael.

JL Thank you, Craig. I agree. Let’s do that and we’ll get Travis’ presentation and then we’ll have questions relating to that.

TR Beach Road seems to be less controversial as I mentioned.

BM There’s only one owner [laughing].

NK Yes, thank you, Sheriff [?] [laughing].

00:53:58

JL Peter, go ahead, please.

UM Just before you go to Beach Road.

TR Yes.

UM I’m just curious. The extensions I [unclear] for parking down from across San Rafael [overtalking] West Shore. I don’t think they’ve planned enough parking. Parking off West Shore Avenue. The previous slide [overtalking].

JL Yes, the question, is that necessary. I had the same question, Peter. I think it’s a good one.

UM I guess it’s greedy, but you seem to be [unclear] private property and I’m wondering what that is.

TR No, this is all right of way.

UM It’s not. I’ll tell you for sure it’s not, but okay.
TR  The bit where it’s showing green here is [overtalking].
UM  If you go backwards to the previous one. That one.
TR  Yes.
UM  With that yellow and it crosses the side of the building right there.

00:54:52
TR  Oh, this is just the existing driveway.
UM  No, no, it’s not. But, it’s okay. I used to own that parking, so I can tell you typically it’s not. But, that walk path, that’s private property right where the walk path is. I can promise you that.
TR  This? It’s a little triangle pathway.
UM  Right by the edge of the house where the shadow line is. Right there.
TR  Yes.
UM  That yellow path right there. That path that you’ve drawn, that’s private property right there. So, and I’m just curious about the extension of that grass, aside from a slow red [unclear] onto the path, what is that that you do on the [unclear] green [overtalking], but it really hurts that property.
TR  So, what we were looking at. There is a small pocket part at the beginning of the path and what we were looking to do was simply expand the landscaping around that park and make it more green. It should not be on the private property. And, if it actually is drawn that way then it’s misdrawn because the expansion is taking advantage of the narrowing road. It should not be touching the private property.

00:56:07
UM  But, it makes that house subject to a shared driveway and having to alter its entire front yard, basically [overtalking]. It just seems a lot to ask one party to bear such a burden.
TR  Well, that’s certainly not the intent and perhaps… Wait a second. Perhaps it’s misdrawn. Are you saying this is not the entrance to that house?
UM  No.
JL  He’s correct. I think this is just a mis-drawing, right. It can’t possibly be the case that you’re intending to build it as it’s depicted here because that wouldn’t work. It sounds like the sort of thing that conceptually is depicted, but would get hammered out when it is actually drawn.
UM  Okay, that’s wrong. The structure is the garage and on that same plane [overtalking] you drive [overtalking].
TR  Okay. Then our base file is wrong because it did not show that there was a driveway
Peter, correct me if I'm wrong because this has always been my concern right down here. Well, certainly, my concern was parking they were going to take that out. But, based on your knowledge which is better than any of ours is, so where the parking lines are I believe that all that green band along there is actually all taking away width of the street there.

00:57:30

Actually that's the [unclear] short. I would say the parking line [overtalking].

Right here which [overtalking].

If you pulled that [unclear] there, right there, the parking line is probably around the little fountain there. Probably about right there.

Okay.

It goes this way. It goes the same angle as the coastline.

Understood. So, we'll need to verify that we have the correct base file.

Of course.

And, Travis, my concern was that because I was pretty sure that all of that greenery was in what is now a street, which would dramatically narrow that street right there and the fairly critical curve.

I'm not sure of the point of that park extension is right anyway. I think all it does is just restrict that driving area and leave [unclear] parking on the front [overtalking].

Yes, I think when you go to actually draw it up from this concept, you'll find that what Peter is saying is correct. That not only does that encroach as it's depicted here on that property, but, and what Bob said also is correct, that it would dramatically narrow that intersection of West Shore and San Rafael. So, I don't think we need to debate it here, but I think we need to go back to look at it. If people agree on the concept and it gets drawn, I think you'll find that that has to get revised or as you draw it, it would look a little bit different.

Absolutely.

Can I have a second [overtalking].

I think I would have liked that, and what Chris John was saying as well, elements that impact properties in particular, at least put a designer if you have one too because certainly, a designer will need to look at this [unclear] from the perspective of having X individuals [inaudible]. I mean please look where am I impacting individuals.

So, that would be part of the process.
NK Those are good points. What might be useful -- taking a second look at this -- is to clarify what you were referring to before as the red line. To clarify where on that picture the flood barrier exists so that it’s clear that part of it’s the aesthetic aspect and part of is the essential barrier portion of it. I think it continues on along to West Shore, doesn’t it?

TR Yes, this is the [overtalking] wall.

00:59:57

NK Right. And so, I think that would help clear it up. But, thank you very much. And, again, it’s conceptual so there’s lots of opportunity for change. Very good points.

TR Thanks [overtalking]. So, the concept is that we are trying to avoid the use of any deployable elements and gates -- I think the original concept had like 14 or 15 gates that would have to be operated. And, what we’re doing here is, right now Beach Road is a separated with a median in the middle. We’re basically consolidating the [unclear] to one side and then that gives us enough space to basically slope up and raise the waterfront area and be able to do this in such a way where there’s no gates required, so fully passive.

And, as well, looking for co-benefits, looking for opportunities to expand public space and parks and really create a feature centered on the city’s skyline view in the middle of the project. So [overtalking].

BM Travis.

TR Yes, sir.

BM That would require BCDC approval in filling the bay.

01:01:46

TR So, there’s two versions [overtalking]. So, there’s two versions [overtalking]. So, the base line version stays completely in board of the current [unclear]. And, we have what we call a philanthropic opportunity of utilizing the city-owned parcel here. But, this is not integral to the flood protection project. That’s simply noting an opportunity to perhaps create some interest and excitement, get philanthropic investment in the project and so forth. But, you’re right it would require a [overtalking] and so forth if it was to go forward. And, that’s why it’s shown as an option.

CM And, I think the concept is not to fill in the bay there. It’s to go over the bay.

TR That’s another [overtalking].

CM Yes, like a dock. But, yes, you’d need their approval.

AA That little prow he was just talking about is much fatter at one part, and if that was [inaudible] toward the China Cabin instead of next to the motorboat thing, there would be a lot less impact on the private property.

CM Good point.
TR Yes, exploring it this way to maximize the area where you could be looking at the city skyline in the sunset. But, the actual form of it definitely could be changed quite a lot.

JL I think that’s quite a good point. That’s one of the things I noticed first as well. It really does seem to disfavor the apartment building as opposed to the China Cabin?

NK Yes.

01:03:47

CM It could totally be flipped.

JL That might be academic anyway.

NK Yes.

TR And, this is just an add-on, so it’s not core to the project. I think the more important thing to understand is the way that it would change the waterfront and the street section. So, we’ve been also working closely with Robert, spending a lot of attention on this intersection where right now is a traffic circle. So, one of the things that we recognized early on is how difficult and unsafe it is for pedestrians to get from inside the town to the waterfront. The only crosswalk is all the way up here. And so, what this does is it normalizes the intersection, which also makes it easier for trucks if they need to get in for loading for the yacht club.

And, it expands this part. Expands also the parking opportunities in this area, but creates a safe series of crosswalks and progression to the waterfront. And, I think as the design progresses, this area will continue to be refined, particularly with input from the yacht club and the private owners. But, this is our current state of development in trying to balance the needs of all parties and make sure that we have space for the flood protection. Also, so you understand how this is working functionally. This part between the trees and the yacht club is basically a clumping up, becoming a raised park and this intersection, as it gets reconfigured will also be raised as a hump and that’s basically where the flood protection hides underneath that raised road to connect up the hill.

JL How much would the road be raised? How many feet?

01:06:14

TR It varies. But, it’s [overtalking].

RZ About two and a half.

TR Yes, it’s in the range of 18 to 24 inches. So, nothing too substantial, but we do have to kind of feather it better again.

JL And, how does the… Good. I was going to say how do the properties that are in the bottom of this picture, how do they get protection from flooding?

RZ They’re above now. They’re almost…
So, the line of flood protection is within that raised road and following down here. Sorry, my hand is shaking from jetlag caffeine [laughing] [overtalking]. So, these buildings are behind that flood protection. Everything is behind that flood protection. The only things that are not are the buildings that are on the structure outboard. And, that made this area a lot more complicated sectionally say than San Rafael because we basically now have two heights of promenade.

So, there’s a lower promenade that maintains existing access and the ramps to these buildings and then there’s a higher promenade that looks out over the water and is at its most prominent where it kind of bulges out here in the middle. It takes advantage of the fact that this whole area is currently -- you’re not allowed to park there anyway. So, it kind of takes the extra width of the road to create kind of a second little park and moment here. But, ultimately all connected by a bit of a green belt.

One other feature that we propose, because we had heard from some stakeholders that you have people trying to put in kayaks and standing paddle boards and they’re like climbing all over people’s like private homes and platforms here. So, this area to the edge of Belvedere is also a city-owned parcel. And so, we looked at kind of creating some sea steps there. You can kind of see up here. So, where that little beach is. Creating some sea steps that would allow people more direct access to the water, yes. So, those are some of the concepts that we’re looking at here.

So, at its highest point, how high is that walking path going to be?

It’s basically the same height as what the railing is today.

That people will be walking on top of that height.

Yes. So, the railing is right here. Your lower promenade and then at that height where that railing is today there would be the upper promenade. And, the nice thing is that potentially it ends up giving you this unobstructed view to the skyline because you’re actually looking over the top of the existing railing.

And, in the other direction it’s just the road. It’s just the [overtalking].

The other direction similar to San Rafael. There would be a landscape slope back to the road.

So, for people living on the other side of the road, it’s not blocking too many views from [overtalking].

Again, like three or four feet above current [unclear], so below your standing height,
What about the streets that come in to these roads? They have to... Because, you know, if they end up three feet higher then they're going to have to [overtalking].

Beach Road stays the same. Beach Road stays the same height.

But, widening it, the area stays the same.

Yes.

[Inaudible]. So, the pavement of where you drive on that's not going to be up at all.

It stays the same except [overtalking] the intersection. This intersection has a little bit of a basically a speed hump. But, the rest of the travel lanes of Beach Road stay at the level they are, yes.

Has [overtalking].

So, since this is the other... only other way off the island or .. does this plan narrow, to any extent, the drivable width of the lanes?

It's narrowed somewhat, but there's still, I believe, 11.5 feet wide, which, in this area generally, an urban planning guidelines would suggest ten foot wide roads.

Even for a road that's the only escape route off of the island [overtalking]. When you say somewhat, define somewhat. Are we talking again six inches or a foot and a half or...?

Yes, probably each lane around a foot and a half narrower than it is today. I see that this is a big concern to [overtalking].

Understandably with [unclear] in California go through the width of a fire engine. But, our new fire engines are larger than that. We have an issue of coming down a ten-foot [unclear].

So, just be clear. You're talking about 11.5 feet per lane.

Per lane.

In a now undivided Beach Road is what you propose. So, you're talking about a 22, 20-foot wide surface.

Basically, just enough for a [unclear] fire engine to pass [overtalking]. So, with the parking lane, the widths are only around 32 feet of paved area.

Does anyone have a count of how much parking is lost along there?

This is about a 10% reduction of parking. So, it's a handful of spots. We've mostly moved and concentrated, but as shown there's a few spots that are lost from what it
is today, but very few.

BM So, can you describe the path of travel for vehicles going from lower Beach Road to upper Beach Road? Let’s say coming down Beach Road, go to that intersection, please.

01:13:22

SW And, turn left.

TR So…

BM Can we have a closer-up view from that intersection.

CM Can you zoom in? You want to zoom in on that.

UM The other slide.

JL Why don’t you just go to the slide that depicts there’s that like [overtalking].

NK I don’t think so.

TR Oh, this intersection.

NK Yes. I think it’s this [overtalking].

TR Yes, so this is a stop and they have a right-hand turn, yes. So, it’s [overtalking].

UM [Unclear] this is a stop or not. How do these cars [overtalking]?

01:14:01

TR So, this would be a left-hand turn.

UM Stop or no stop?

TR Um, it’s not drawn right now [overtalking].

UM Does it have a stop?

TR I guess that would be something that Robert’s office would want to study.

UM That could be messy.

NK Yes.

TR It’s cleaner than what it is today.

UM No, I meant without a stop.

TR Oh, yes.

SW It’s cleaner because?

TR It’s a right-angle, a normalized intersection. So, it’s a typical turn right, turn left type turn rather than what’s now is that the [overtalking].
SW Longer [overtalking].

TR Traffic circle, which makes it harder for pedestrians and traffic to navigate each other. These right-angle intersections are better for pedestrians.

01:14:59

SW I'm just thinking of what happens during the end and the beginning of school where all the school buses are… Quite a number of buses are coming through and then they stop and everybody has to stop behind them. Now, it will be in both directions that they'll have to stop because there's no [overtalking].

TR Correct.

SW There's no feeding them into the road anymore, so there's going to be big traffic jams for those periods of time, potentially.

UM Absolutely [overtalking].

BR This is not the time when you're dealing with CEQA things. But, in the CEQA considerations, there's always the possibility presented of nothing. In other words, there's always no, don't do nothing. And, it has a value because someone, well, you know, if you can get started down at design and you say, well, I guess it's there, okay, let's go ahead. And then, you say, well, but hold it. Maybe what we got isn't so bad as it is. So, I have a question to ask you. And, you may… Or, to ask anybody because you probably don't have the information. When, if ever, has Beach Road overtopped? I've been here since 1972 [overtalking].

BM Big storm.

BR Big storm of 21. That's 100 years ago, 99 years ago. So, we got involved with Beach Road because the wall was falling down. That was the basic reason that there's so much attention on it. And, the sheet piling is going to be done there. No issue. It obviously has to be done. But, this wall has nothing to do with the sheet piling. So, my question is, if it hasn't overtopped in 100 years, um, again I would ask, could we…? I don't know when it will or if it will ever overtop. I don't know. But, I know it hasn't for 100 years.

01:16:53

And, so don't just ask yourselves this question about whether the thing is necessary. Ask yourself whether, when the voters hear that it hasn't overtopped in 100 years, that they're going to be anxious to put a great deal of money into putting a wall in that will change things. So, I would ask again, assuming it would be a wonderful plan if there was danger of overtopping. But, is it possible to make the plan in a way that if there's a problem that then you go ahead and do it and a year later you've got the thing all placed? Do you understand what I'm saying?

Because I will tell you one thing, for instance, the houses on my street have sold recently… The amount of money the city's going to be getting from the taxes from the
houses from the houses on my street, you’re going to sort of be on ea, sy street. And, that’s going to be coming more as we grey hairs disappear as the houses are sold. And then, there will be much more money available to do things. So, where now is it going to significantly fall. The city management said in the report, if a tax is necessary. Well, of course a tax is going to be necessary. You’ve got a budget of $ 8-million and you’ve got and expense of $ 20-million, of course, it’s going to be a tax.

01:18:18

So, I’m saying this may be very good, but could we wait? I frankly don’t find the current design unpleasant. Now, maybe I’m just old fashioned. And, the idea, well, we’re launching kayaks and whatever. And, I think is the thing do we really need people parking their vans at the most dangerous intersection in Belvedere and taking their kayaks across the street to put them in the water. Is that really what we need? So [overtalking].

JL I think [overtalking].

BR When looking at your design I’m only saying we do have a certain design to compare it with and that’s what exists now.

JL Thank you. I think those were good points though. And, certainly, a question of do we need this at all is one that is going to be addressed. I think the purpose here is, if there’s something to be done, what do we think of these conceptual designs… and keeping those issues separate is probably the right thing to do for the purpose of today.

01:19:14

SW I have a very mundane question, but is this parallel parking here or angled parking? Because I think parking is important to everybody. Are these compact spaces or are these normal spaces? Because compact spaces end up being half. People park between them and they don’t count for anything.

TR Those are all narrow full-sized.

SW They’re full-sized spaces. So, we’re only losing 10% of parking along the whole.

TR Along the whole [unclear].

UM But, there was a question on I thought as to whether this parking didn’t actually get onto to some of the land, company land that wasn’t [overtalking].

TR I’ll try not to mark up on the drawing here, but on the city’s official maps, the land company is actually taking some of city-owned right of way. I walked down there today to [laughing] look at it [laughing].

BM Bad news.

SW We have two land companies [overtalking].

TR So, the opportunity here was to essentially take back some of what appears to be city-
owned land. But, I walked down there today to try and verify and it looks like we’ll probably want to adjust the design of this to allow for those big trees to remain. So, that might need a little bit of refinement. But, of course, these are things that will happen in the next stage. And, as well, I imagine we’ll probably need in a couple of areas to be updated, serviced where the city’s right of way stops and starts because, yes, as it appears, the reality doesn’t seem… Or, where built structures are doesn’t always seem to line up with where the map says the city line is.

01:21:17

BR So, I’d just like to comment and a positive one for a change. I think it was a brilliant idea to keep two moving lanes to the north side in the evening and thereby eliminate all the [unclear]. And, to create the possibility of a sort of promenade. Congratulations from my point of view for your time.

TR Thank you. It was literally the only way to do this and make it passive.

SW I know you need to incorporate a wall in front of the yacht club somehow. Is there any alterative other than this, so you would keep the roundabout? Sorry, I was asking whether there is a way that the wall can provide the protection it needs in front of the yacht club without taking away the roundabout.

TR So, the roundabout geometry itself, like we don’t necessarily need to change that this intersection is aligned. We could keep the echo of the roundabout, but the reason we went into this direction was our concern about making sure that the trucks would still be able to access the yacht club. The more important thing is that the roundabout is to facilitate the divided road. So, once you remove [overtalking] from this lane that the roundabout can be guiding you towards a lane that doesn’t exist anymore.

CM Travis, isn’t it also true that if you had the roundabout as it is today and you’re trying to incorporate the wall into a berm, you’d have a roundabout that went like that and you’d have to go over the top of the wall in a couple of places in the roundabout?

TR Yes, if you wanted to maintain traffic on the other side of the barrier you would have to [overtalking].

CM You’d call it the Belvedere roller coaster [overtalking]. Do we have a question over here?

UM There is a [unclear] problem I see over here [overtalking]. Because you’re coming off of Beach Road there’s two exits off the island [overtalking] on this plan of San Rafael Avenue and then again, the vehicles coming down Beach Road right now would go straight right down to the yacht club. If you’re doing a quick turn and then had to make a right or a left if there’s a problem with that and that’s you’re not going to be able to get to [unclear]. Right now they come straight down and keep going. And, here they’re going to get stuck.

JL You’re talking about in an emergency.

UM Yes.
JL Maybe just to tease it out. One thing that could occur in an emergency is have an officer there directing the traffic and directing people to run through the stop sign and so forth and expediting it in by blocking incoming traffic and so forth [overtalking].

UM The speed by which vehicles can come down and get off Beach Road now. The number that could exit in an emergency today is superior to what that is.

JL I think that’s fair. I’m just wondering to what extent. How much of a problem would it be if we had emergency responders out there directing the flow of traffic?

BR I like the median. I love roads with medians in them. Am I the only one who likes when you’re driving and other people are coming the other way? I don’t mean just for safety’s sake, but a nice median between them and with some trees growing on it. Isn’t that nice?

JL I think it’s a good question. We talked about the variability on the width of San Rafael. Is there variability in this conceptual design on Beach Road? It would allow you to occupy less space for the two promenades and maintain a median. Or, is there just not enough width?

TR So, we looked at the various different sections. This was the one that was functionally the best. I agree. I like medians. But, that’s three or four feet that was really helpful in being able to meet the grades on the up and overs.

JL Are there other questions for Travis about the Beach Road side?

BM One more. The eventual connection with possible overtopping in Tiburon. Is this designed to accommodate a connection with it?

TR Unfortunately, the picture, as these are just the boards. The picture is small [overtalking] because this wasn’t going in the [overtalking] presentation. So, this is the flood map, the flood zone. And, to fully protect everybody you would need to do San Rafael, Beach Road and this little bit of Tiburon. But, both of these would tie into the high point of that little peak. So, they’re structurally independent, but you have to build both of them.

UM I’m sorry, did you say that it doesn’t tie into it, but the water will come through there if it isn’t there?

TR Yes.

01:27:20

BR Well, that’s wonderful. So [laughing]. If it comes through from Tiburon, now a wall will
serve to channel it right into the lagoon because it can’t get out because we’ve got a wall. Do you understand what I’m saying? If the water comes down Main Street or comes from behind Main Street, it will get trapped behind our wonderful wall on Beach Road and go right into the lagoon if you don’t have the Tiburon piece of it. As I said in my letter to the editor it’s like the Maginot Line. If you’re missing a piece of it [overtalking].

TR  So, the [overtalking].

UM  It might as well not be there.

TR  There is the possibility that Belvedere could say Tiburon’s never going to build what they’re going to build and you go it your own way and close off… Raise a road and close off that path. It’s just a hell of a lot cheaper if Tiburon takes care of this, as it’s a very small breech point versus what you’re going to have to build if Tiburon did not act.

CM  And, Bill, in answer to your question. When Stetson first proposed the barrier up in Tiburon -- it is Tiburon so you can’t build on their land -- but, it was a very inexpensive option, you may remember. And, Tiburon is going to be interested in that because that barrier for them also keeps the library and city hall from being under water as well the business district.

01:29:05

UM  It’s just a leak.

CM  Not worried too much about that because [overtalking] informal responses from Tiburon officials are, yes, they’ve got a big a problem as we do. They’re going to go along with this. And, in fact, the cost of the original Stetson proposal was I think only $ 100,000 for Main Street.

JL  For the deployable [overtalking].

BR  It was an inflatable balloon. It was like a giant condom and it wasn’t going to… And, it would have to be inflated anytime there was going to be a flood [laugh]. No, it was ridiculous. And, that’s why it was completely abandoned.

TR  Ideally, we would work with Tiburon to [overtalking] a passive solution.

BR  No. I know I [overtalking]. Deirdre from The Ark. I was asking back in the day. I was asking Deidre, well, you know, there’s this Tiburon thing and she’s, well, I approached some of the people at the Tiburon town government or whatever and they said we’re not interested in this. Now, I don’t know. I’m not saying the information I got is incorrect, but it’s not going to be a giant balloon because I think [overtalking].

BM  Yes, after the balloon they came back with other proposals, like Chicago uses. So…

UM  Oh, I’m sorry.

BM  So, don’t assume that the only option was an inflatable balloon. There were other
options that they subsequently came back with. Am I right?

01:30:26

CM Yes. That’s true. There are a number of deployable options and there’s also, as was mentioned before, if for some reason Tiburon did not want to protect itself and did not want to do anything, we have an option for just protecting Belvedere that would tie into this set of [overtalking].

BR But, that’s a 300, as I recall, it was a 300 foot wall that runs behind the Board Walk Market or something.

CM Yes, that’s right.

BR All I’m saying is, before we launch into building three-quarters of the thing, although the opening may be small, a lot of water can come through it okay? And because and, in fact, ours would be worse. We would have a worse situation having a wall and not having Tiburon than not having a wall ourselves because we would trap the water coming from Tiburon in the lagoon. These are all important considerations.

JL Agreed. And, I think they’ve been well-made by you today and in the last meeting and certainly city council is going to have to take that into consideration. And, I guess one question I have … are there other questions for Travis while he’s here about the conceptual designs here on one Beach Road?

BM Just that [unclear] spot. Is that where you drive into Corinthian yacht club or?

01:31:42

NK No, somewhere else.

SW That’s where the ferry comes in.

UM It’s the whole length of old Main Street. So, one block of old Main Street.

TR Yes, commercial street.

BM Thanks.

TR So, it would very much be [unclear] down to save their economic [overtalking].

JL Right, other questions for Travis either about the Beach Road concept or the San Rafael concept?

SW I would just state one concern I have, which is I do worry about the traffic flow from upper beach to lower beach without that roundabout. It does feel like that could be a real jam point there. I could be wrong.

NK I think at some point in the process down the line we may want to have a traffic consultant take a look. There are other points in the city that the traffic safety committee is identifying as points where we might want to have a traffic consultant. I think it’s worth considering whether or not it’s more difficult to come out of the new
egress point, the new proposed egress point and go right. It may, in fact, direct exiting vehicles to the left which would be a different evacuation point off the island. This is only one of the two. We don’t know which is going to be impacted.

01:33:14

These are the things that we ask of traffic consultant to look at. It’s sort of their [unclear]. All good points though, but probably beyond the scope of today.

TR This is another one of those trade-off things …is that most of the things that you do to make things safer for a pedestrian are intentionally to slow cars down. And, it just works against intents for [overtalking] the egress quicker and easier. So, it’s about balancing the priorities. Most of the reasons that cities are narrowing roads now is to make them safer for pedestrians, because it slows cars down.

JL Thank you, Travis.

UM Thank you.

TR You’re welcome.

NK Thank you very much.

JL Are there other comments or questions from this group about how we want to proceed and what recommendations we might make to the city council at the conclusion? It occurs to me that there’s been a pretty good discussion. A lot of very good questions I think. There will be minutes of this meeting, obviously. One thing we could do is have a motion to convey the minutes to the city council and ask them to consider the observations and concerns that are expressed. And, remain open to a request from them that we reconvene, perhaps after the February city council meeting, if that’s something that they believe would be profitable for us to do based on input at that meeting. Is that a motion that makes sense?

01:34:55

UM I would like to ask since the display has only been put up now and the city council meeting is on the 10th. And, according to the staff report, there’s a desire to have the public come in and look at the renderings. I’m not sure that another ten days is enough time. That maybe it should wait to go to the city council until the next meeting because then the people will actually have a chance to look at the renderings and give their input.

JL I think that’s a good point. I mean that is one of the options that we talked about, but I guess the question that is raised is should we propose then to meet again as a body after the February meeting? And then, hold onto our comments until the input at that city council meeting. And, we meet again and then present our observations to the city council.

UM I would say [inaudible].

01:35:54
JL Okay. I mean that's a very good alternative and one that we outlined at the outset. So, I would entertain that motion. And, it sounds like you've made a second [laughs]. Is there a second?

UM I'll make it.

JL Very well. All in favor, aye.

UM Aye.

JL Okay. It passes. So, I think what we should do, Craig, is perhaps could we lean on you and your office to propose a date for this group to meet in sort of the latter part or maybe the last week of February, whatever? So, we can do… When is the March meeting?

CM When is it? March 9th.

JL So, maybe the last week of February.

UM The more public input we get, the more exposure I think is the better. I don't know if we're in a rush. I guess I'm not sure how many people know that it's been in The Ark. It's been somewhat exposed. I think getting people to comment is better than not. I don't know if we can [unclear] new road and the [inaudible].

NK I agree with that. I would certainly like to have a longer rather than shorter period of public comment. And, I want to make sure as much comment as possible gets to the city council. And so, if this group has an opportunity to weigh in, that's great, but I would like to make sure that all written comment be made a part of the record. I'm happy to work with [overtalking] staff to agenda… Excuse me. Excuse me. I'm happy to work with staff to agendize that at the direction of this committee. So, as I understand it, did you want the city to have any kind of study session at all on the February meeting? Or, would you like to wait entirely until March, which is also okay with me? I just want some clarification on that based on the motion.

JL Yes. I mean it sounds like we should clarify that and if anyone else wants to weigh in they should. I think what I was hearing was that this group wants to convene again. Take the input that comes between now and that late February meeting, input that comes to the city council on February 10th at its meeting, and then try to summarize our observations and present them in advance of the March city council meeting. Is that what folks intended?

UM Still not clear. Is the city council going to consider it in February? I'm unclear about what you mean.

JL I don't believe so. I think the city council is going take input based on the [overtalking]. I think it was a meeting intended to take input, not decision-making.

SW I still think it's important to take the input that this committee has already provided today in addition to the public comment to the city and then we can review everything
again afterwards.

01:39:15

JL  I think that’s worth contemplating.

NK  So, shall we agendize this as a study session for February? Is that what you have in mind?

JL  Craig, has this been recorded so that we have it verbatim?

CM  Yes.

JL  Yes, I think the city council really should carefully read the verbatim comments that were made today and, if it’s necessary to have that as part of the agenda of the February meeting, then that would seem to make sense. But, no decision has been made.

NK  Exactly. That’s my understanding. Are we good?

JL  Yes. Sounds good. All right. Well, thank you, everyone. I think this is really helpful. And, if there’s nothing else, we’re adjourned.

01:40:01