

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
CIVIC CENTER MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, BASEMENT LEVEL
440 Civic Center Plazas, Richmond, CA
May 11, 2011
6:00 p.m.**

BOARD MEMBERS

Andrew Butt, Chair
Otheree Christian
Michael Woldemar

Raymond Welter, Vice Chair
Eileen Whitty
Don Woodrow

Chair Butt called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Butt, Vice Chair Welter, Boardmembers Whitty and Woodrow

Absent: Boardmembers Christian and Woldemar

Staff Present: Carlos Privat, Lina Velasco, Jonelyn Whales, Alan Wolken, and Michelle Seville; Arts Commission

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 13, 2011:

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Woodrow) to approve the minutes of April 13, 2011; unanimously approved.

AGENDA: Boardmember Whitty requested that item 1 be added to the Consent Calendar, as it is held over from April 27, 2011. Item 5, the BART Parking Garage Artwork Study Session was moved to the top of the agenda to accommodate the presenter's schedule. Items 2 and 4 remained on the Consent Calendar. Item 3 was removed from the Consent Calendar.

Chair Butt questioned and confirmed there were no members of the audience wishing to remove a Consent Calendar item.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

CC 1. PLN11-047	ELM PLAY LOT ON 8TH AND ELM AVENUE	
Description	(Held Over from 4/27/2011) STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE COMMENTS TO STAFF REGARDING DESIGN OF PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO ELM PLAY LOT IN THE IRON TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD.	
Location	INTERSECTION OF 8 TH STREET AND ELM AVENUE	
APN	534-192-005	
Zoning	CRR (COMMUNITY REGIONAL RECREATIONAL)	
Owner	CITY RICHMOND	
Applicant	CHRIS CHAMBERLAIN	
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ	Recommendation: HOLD OVER TO 5/25/2011

CC 2. PLN11-059 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE (NPS) VISITOR EDUCATION CENTER ON HARBOUR WAY

Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO REHABILITATE THE OIL HOUSE AT THE HISTORIC FORD ASSEMBLY PLANT FOR USE AS THE ROSIE THE RIVETER/WWII NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK VISITOR EDUCATION CENTER.

Location 1414 HARBOUR WAY

APN 560-181-113

Zoning MIXED USE (KNOX FREEWAY/CUTTING BOULEVARD CORRIDOR SPECIFIC PLAN)

Owner FORD POINT LLC

Applicant MARCY WONG DONN LOGAN ARCHITECTS

Staff Contact LINA VELASCO Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

CC 4. PLN11-062 PORT OF RICHMOND SUBARU SHED EXPANSION ON CANAL BLVD

Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW FOR A ±5,000 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SHED AT THE PORT POTRERO AUTOMOTIVE FACILITY AT THE PORT OF RICHMOND.

Location PORT POTRERO AUTOMOTIVE FACILITY ON CANAL BLVD.

APN 560-320-017

Zoning M-4 (MARINE INDUSTRIAL)

Owner SURPLUS PROPERTY AUTHORITY

Applicant TRANSDEVELOPMENT GROUP

Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Welter) to move the Consent Calendar consisting of Items 1, 2, and 4; unanimously approved.

Chair Butt stated that anyone wishing to appeal had ten days to submit their appeal in writing to the City Clerk's office no later than 5:00 p.m. on Monday, May 23, 2011, and he noted the appeal process after each affected item.

STUDY SESSION

5. PLN08-069 BART PARKING GARAGE ARTWORK

Description STUDY SESSION TO REVIEW PROPOSED ARTWORK FOR THE APPROVED BART PARKING GARAGE.

Location 1600 MACDONALD AVENUE

APN 540-072-018

Zoning OFFICE/RETAIL/INSTITUTIONAL (CITY CENTER SPECIFIC PLAN)

Owner BART

Applicant RICHMOND COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Staff Contact LINA VELASCO Recommendation: **RECEIVE PRESENTATION-NO ACTION**

Lina Velasco gave the staff report, stating that the item before the Board was previously approved by the DBR in 2009 with the recommendation to the Planning Commission that the artwork return to the Board as a Study Session. She stated staff is presenting the artwork that has gone through the review process prior to it going to City Council for final approval.

Ultimately the owner of the artwork will become BART, the owner of the garage. She introduced Alan Wolken of the Redevelopment Agency.

Alan Wolken, Director, Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency, presented the background stating that since they had been before the DRB in December 2008, they had gone through the process following their guidelines for solicitation of public art for the BART garage. They had been through an RFP process in 2009, with seventeen submittals that they shortlisted down to five. Those teams then brought in mockups and examples of proposed art.

Mr. Wolken stated that the areas slated for the art are the sheer walls on the east and west garage elevations and staff asked the artists to bring forward concepts for art on those locations. The art was reviewed by a committee made up of representatives from Public Art Advisory Committee (PAAC), Richmond Arts and Cultural Commission (RACC), the Richmond Arts Staff, the Redevelopment Agency staff, and the Metro Walk Homeless Association. The selected artist was Mildred Howard. He said Ms. Howard was in attendance this evening to share some of her art pieces from around the country. Mr. Wolken also indicated that Ms. Howard had solicited the assistance of Ishmael Reed who worked with LEAP students to come up with the poetry that will also be seen on the east and west elevations. Other project participants/reviewers in attendance were Winifred Day, Kay Shibley, and John Winder architect. Upon review by the committee, the project was then presented to BART. Mr. Wolken indicated that they had to work very hard to get BART to allow art on their parking structure. BART will have to maintain the artwork which needs to fit in with their minimalistic/low maintenance parking structure. The art presented this evening has been reviewed and approved by the BART architect and their art coordinator.

Mildred Howard began by showing some of her prior works, stating that she has worked with poets and architects for over thirty years. She presented several poems and pieces; including a poem that she did with the poet that wrote "Pursuit of Happiness", a piece on Geary Street in San Francisco near the Fillmore Auditorium, a piece she did for a homeless shelter in Novato, a house she did that is now a part of the Crocker museum, a piece commissioned by the Museum of Glass in Tacoma, WA using red objects and red light, a piece that is now part of the Darossa collection in Napa, a piece she did for the Oakland State building, a piece in an old train station, a bathroom wall done in Oakland at Youth Uprising, just to name a few. Ms. Howard also showed a project she did on Stevenson Street in San Francisco consisting of bronze benches with a lock and key theme.

Boardmember Woodrow asked how she came by the image of a key and lock for the project. Ms. Howard answered that she was inspired by Harry Bridges as he opened up doors and that her locks are open to reflect that.

Ms. Howard showed a piece she did for concourse A of San Francisco airport, a piece she did called Safe House, a piece she was just commissioned to do at Hunter's Point with the architect Walter Hood who did the landscape for the De Young, a stained glass window going in the new wing of SF General, and a purple glass house to go in the new wing of the Sacramento Airport. Ms. Howard stated that she is the BART Parking Garage Artwork project lead and artist, working with noted poet Ishmael Reed and noted architect John Winder.

Ms. Howard showed a rendering of the artwork indicating the size compared to a person. She indicated the poem will be in faceted corten steel on the east and west side of the building with the words of the poem in the negative space and lit from below. She stated that the words would be offset from the wall and that the structural engineer is working on that distance now. She indicated that the east and west sides were two different pieces with two different poems. Currently a structural engineer is determining the specifics of the numerous pieces of corten steel and the wall attachment scheme.

Vice Chair Welter inquired about the mounting, whether it would be tube steel or pins. Mr. Winder answered that they are trying to determine the best blind fastening method although there has been some discussion about purposely seeing the fastening mechanism, perhaps rivets or rods and that the fastening mechanism has not been finalized.

Vice Chair Welter inquired whether the piece will be shop fabricated as one large piece installed at once and Ms. Howard answered that it is approximately 12' by 40' and it will have to be fabricated and installed in pieces.

Chair Butt questioned exactly where on the building it would be installed and it was answered that it would be along 15th and 16th Streets, not MacDonald Avenue. There were also questions as to how the shape was made and Mr. Winder answered that it was CNC digital cutting using either laser or water jet methods and then to a metal fabricator who folds it. Boardmember Woodrow confirmed that the methodology uses steel break and bend techniques which can be quite complicated.

It was noted that the project has not yet moved into the construction drawing stage and will not until approved by the DRB and City Council. Mr. Winder stated that the subcontracted metal fabricator has already agreed to a set cost basis

Ishmael, the project poet discussed some of his body of work. He also discussed how he researched and interviewed the people of Richmond for inspiration and read his two poems.

There were no additional questions from the Board.

ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 3. PLN11-061 TREATMENT PLAN FOR CA-CCO-297 ON MARINA BAY PARKWAY**
- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| Description | REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL OF TREATMENT PLAN FOR THE PROPOSED RELOCATION OF AN EXISTING COMPRESSED NATURAL GAS LINE, A COMPONENT OF THE OFFICER BRADLEY A. MOODY MEMORIAL UNDERPASS PROJECT, THAT IS LOCATED WITHIN THE LIMITS OF A KNOWN PREHISTORIC ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE, STEGE MOUND ARCHEOLOGICAL DISTRICT, A RICHMOND HISTORIC LANDMARK. |
| Location | MARINA BAY PARKWAY |
| APN | 560-100-007 |
| Zoning | M-1 (RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT/BUSINESS PARK) |
| Owner | CITY OF RICHMOND |
| Applicant | RICHMOND COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY |
| Staff Contact | LINA VELASCO |
| Recommendation: | CONDITIONAL APPROVAL |

Alan Wolken, Director, Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency, gave the staff report. Mr. Wolken indicated that they were before the DRB several months ago regarding the Bradley Moody Memorial Underpass project. He said a component of that project is utility relocation and that currently the PG&E high pressure gas lines go across Marina Bay Parkway east to west, parallel to the tracks, entering the NE corner of the Pulte Homes project. As part of the grade separation the utilities need to be relocated to the east side of Marina Bay Parkway traveling through Redevelopment Agency owned property, specifically the Police Memorial site, and running down Pearson Avenue paralleling the underpass, and across Marina Bay Parkway to Jetty Drive and up the landscape easement parallel to Pulte and into the Pulte project where it

enters today. The challenge they have is that when PG&E relocates their compressed natural gas pipeline, it will go through the Stege Mounds Archeological District. He also said Alex DeGregory, the PG&E consulting archeologist, will present the archeological recovery strategy.

Alex DeGregory also introduced Chris [REDACTED], the cultural resources specialist from PG&E. Mr. DeGregory stated that PG&E retained him to create a treatment plan for this project, including research design that will provide guidance to the field and lab efforts and an overall course of action. Mr. DeGregory indicated he had essentially four main topics to present: 1) project location and description; 2) regulatory framework; 3) Stege Mounds information; and 4) proposed methods for treatment of the archeological site.

Project Location and Description: Mr. DeGregory referred to a specific graphic orienting the project. He said the project is part of the Moody Underpass project, an underpass under the railroad, and that they are relocating the high pressure natural gas line.

Regulatory Framework: Mr. DeGregory stated that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, with the City using a specific exemption that applies to any railroad separation project that eliminates an existing grade crossing. He stated that the regulatory framework they are working under is the structures code that provides protection for architectural, cultural, and archeological sites in Richmond as part of the building regulations under the Municipal Code. This ordinance specifically defines the Stege Mounds Archeological District as a Richmond historic landmark, and as such any alterations must be approved by the DRB.

Stege Mounds Archeological District Information: Mr. DeGregory indicated that these sites were studied in the 1970's as part of a redevelopment project and the Stege Mounds themselves, a complex of five bay-shore mounds, are prehistoric village sites. They are part of the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historic Places. Mr. DeGregory indicated that the Stege Mounds are a significant archeological manifestation and was formerly designated as a Richmond Historic Landmark. Mr. DeGregory showed an artist's reconstruction of what they might have looked like when they were inhabited. He stated that the mounds were originally reported in 1905 and ten years later they were leveled as part of a proposed real estate development. Artifacts were collected at this time by a Berkeley professor, along with plotting the actual location of the mounds specific to the street layout.

In 1979 and 1981 California archeological consultants were hired by the City to study the mounds. Mr. DeGregory showed artifacts that had been recovered from Contra Costa 297, the site that PG&E will be excavating. Recovered artifacts included arrow points, shell beads, clam shell beads, bowls, mortars, whistles, and burial remains dated at approximately 1370-1700 AD.

Boardmember Woodrow asked what happened to the artifacts that came out of the site. Mr. DeGregory answered that the burial artifacts were repatriated to the tribe and the archeological artifacts not associated with funerary is presently housed at a curation facility at a State university, although they found many under **George's desk** at Contra Costa College when he retired.

Mr. DeGregory stated that they think the site was occupied when Sir Francis Drake landed and the native inhabitants knew about the historic land when the first Europeans discovered California. He also stated that one of the things that makes this site particularly significant is that it is not like most of the bay shell mounds that were occupied on and off for thousands of years with a comingling of artifacts, making it difficult to pull things apart and put them in order. This site is a single component representing an approximate three hundred year time frame, with the lake sites being more rare and unique. They expect that archeological site may be as deep as nine feet due to fill and that may be several feet below the water table, requiring sump pumps

for excavation. He also indicated that they will try to figure out the correct boundary of the mounds.

Proposed Methods for Treatment of the Archeological Site: Mr. DeGregory stated that the basic plan is to go in with mechanical equipment to track out the lines making sure that they are not disturbing anything important. They will then do a combination of mechanical exploratory digging and controlled archeological excavation to insure they do not disturb artifacts. They are proposing to do about two hundred cubic yards of disturbance at the site for installation of the pipelines and that he plans on doing about thirty cubic yards of controlled excavation, approximately fifteen percent of the disturbed project, which is a large sampling. He also stated that PG&E is willing to spend about \$300,000 on the recovery project, which is adequate funding to do what they need to do to treat this properly.

Mr. DeGregory plotted areas where he thinks controlled excavation is a priority and presented a draft schematic of his plots. He indicated that the plotted areas are flexible and could change if they run into previously disturbed areas, as they would do controlled excavation in intact areas. Mr. DeGregory also presented schematics of Cal/OSHA approved open trench work configurations.

Chair Butt asked if the pipe was going below the water table. Mr. DeGregory answered that they were not sure how deep the pipe was going to be, but he thought maybe six or seven feet, under the five foot water table mark. Boardmember Woodrow inquired as to the diameter of the pipe. Mr. DeGregory answered that they thought it was a 12-16 inch diameter pipe.

Boardmember Whitty wondered if the mounds were from the 1300's, and whether the water table risen from that point in time. Mr. DeGregory indicated that was a very good question and that no one is certain, but the Ellis Landing site was about 27 feet tall with about 12 feet below the water table, so clearly sea levels have risen. He also stated that there is only about 3000 years of historical evidence even though we know this area of California has been inhabited nearly 12,000 years and that much historical evidence resides under water in the area of the bay.

Board member Witty wondered why the tide keeps rising. Mr. DeGregory stated that one needs to look at the big picture; that we are living in a warmer climate and archeologists extrapolate that data. The subject of isostatic rebound, the rise of land masses depressed by the huge weight of ice sheets during the last glacial period, was also brought up.

Board member Woodrow stated that the ice was a thousand miles away so he thought the influence of uplift and soil compaction were more prominent factors in the raising of the sea level.

Boardmember Welter asked if the entire length of pipe excavation would be stepped as in the drawing. Mr. DeGregory answered no, only focused areas because they will be working in the trench using a mini-excavator, installing shoring where necessary. Boardmember Welter also asked if there was anything out there now that was interpretive like a plaque. Mr. DeGregory answered no there is not.

Chair Butt asked Mr. DeGregory where the existing line is, whether it showed up on the map, to compare how they are rerouting the line. Mr. DeGregory indicated that the existing line runs along the railroad tracks.

Mr. DeGregory also mentioned that they are planning to work with Native American tribes throughout the process. When human remains are discovered there is a process that must be followed, first with the coroner and then with agencies that define the treatment of the remains. The Native American representative will be on site during the work.

Boardmember Woodrow asked if there would be an on-site archeologist at all times during the project. Mr. DeGregory answered that PG&E has recommended that an archeologist monitor the areas outside of the known limits of any archeological sites. If there is a discovery outside the boundaries, they will back track. They will also do exploratory augering outside the boundary areas to try to avoid any unanticipated discoveries.

Boardmember Woodrow asked if there was a plan in place for curating any discoveries. Mr. DeGregory indicated that there was a plan outlined in the treatment plan to curate artifacts. Members of the Board agreed that it would be very appropriate to exhibit any artifacts in Richmond. Mr. DeGregory thought that was a great idea. Ms. Velasco indicated that she had been speaking with Mr. DeGregory prior to the meeting, telling him that as part of the Pt. Molate project the discoveries were provided to the Richmond Museum of History. She indicated that they would need to check with the museum first to insure they could hold the materials. Boardmember Woodrow felt that perhaps the National Park Visitor's Center might work well, and Ms. Velasco stated it could be recommended that those opportunities be researched.

Boardmember Woodrow asked how many mounds were once there. Mr. DeGregory answered that there are five mounds now, but in 1905 there were over 500 mounds recorded. It was questioned whether they were trash piles and Mr. DeGregory answered that these were village sites with accumulation of subsistence debris. He also indicated that there is some thought that these mounds were intentionally made as monuments, as there is evidence they were villages, sacred places, and cemeteries occupied off and on for thousands of years.

Chair Butt thanked Mr. DeGregory for the presentation.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Whitty) to approve PLN11-061 with the one historical finding, the four code findings, and the two conditions; 1) a study be done regarding exhibiting the objects found from the project in Richmond with a facility capable of hosting the exhibit, and 2) A final report is made available to staff; unanimously approved.

Chair Butt asked if there was any opportunity for school children to visit the site during excavation. Mr. DeGregory answered that it would depend on safety considerations, especially with open trenches and the need for privacy with human remains. Chair Butt asked about interpretive plaques. Mr. DeGregory indicated they were trying to mitigate any adverse affects and that interpretive plaques may carry a risk of vandalism.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned the validity of using the presence of oysters to ascertain sea level, stating that oysters like mud as well as rocks.

Chair Butt restated the appeal process.

There was some discussion regarding the City's archeological plan outside the boundary of the PG&E project, given they would be digging approximately 30 feet down. Mr. Wolken stated that the funding was pushed out by the State, releasing the bonds potentially in November. Chair

Butt asked if they could expect funding by next spring, and Mr. Wolken stated that they were planning on going out to bid in January of 2012.

The public hearing was closed.

BOARD BUSINESS:

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements - None

B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements

Chair Butt asked about update on the General Plan. Ms. Velasco said they have presented all the elements at the Planning Commission and received public comments. She indicated they also had a public hearing to receive comments on the draft EIR and that they have a scheduled presentation at City Council on the 25th to discuss alternatives to the North Shoreline land uses being proposed as part of the General Plan. Ms. Velasco also said that it seems that the majority of comments have related to that change area and so they are seeking additional direction from the Council at the study session on the third Tuesday of this month as to whether to continue in the proposed path. They are still in line to get it adopted in July prior to the August recess.

Chair Butt indicated he had received commentary from prior Boardmember Jonathan Livingston with regard to the BART garage art project. He indicated that he wanted to get clarification as to the role of the Board with projects such as this that combined art and architecture. He also indicated that when the project came before the Planning Commission initially for recommendation, they made a recommendation that they look at art deco type precast concrete. He stated that the initial recommendation had been thrown out with this new corten steel plan and wondered if it was the place of the DRB to evaluate art and if anyone had any thoughts regarding this situation.

Ms. Velasco indicated that she did not think Mr. Livingston was on the Board at that initial meeting, but Boardmember Woodrow was. Boardmember Woodrow did not specifically recall the textured wall idea. Boardmember Welter indicated that maybe it was an out of session meeting, but Ms. Velasco reminded him that Mr. Livingston was not on the Board then. Ms. Velasco indicated she would email everyone the resolution that established the public art requirement in CIP projects and the policies and procedures. She remembers that the DRB had several recommendations, some architectural such as changing the chevrons, and she will research her notes and the staff report. She also indicated that it is probably more appropriate for the DRB to review artwork not under the CIP program.

Chair Butt asked his fellow boardmembers if the DRB should have any purview regarding art as it is very subjective. He cited an instance in El Cerrito where there is a lawsuit over public art between the artist and the City and the project is on hold. He stated there is often a blurred line between art and structure, and architectural design features.

Boardmember Welter thought that they needed to be involved with respect to the planning but not the specifics of the art and that study sessions are helpful. He felt it was important that the Board not comment on public art. Boardmember Whitty referred to the fountain that became an issue.

Chair Butt wondered whether it would be beneficial to have a formal discussion regarding this issue. Ms. Velasco stated that policy itself is administered through Michelle Seville and there is a current discussion regarding murals versus graffiti. Chair Butt felt that the DRB

should be part of that conversation. Boardmember Whitty questioned the mechanism for that type of conversation. Chair Butt stated that if it was part of the architecture it would fall under DRB purview and that City Council should clarify the role of the DRB regarding this issue.

Carlos Privat indicated that it would be appropriate to place this issue on the agenda with the City Council for discussion with a motion to pursue. Ms. Velasco said it would be good to have a discussion with Ms. Seville. Chair Butt asked if they could place a study session on the agenda and invite Ms. Seville to present specifics of the mural processes. Chair Butt also stated that signage falls into this area. Ms. Velasco stated that they could not regulate signage content but could put this issue on the agenda for 30 days out.

Chair Butt asked staff what the status of the DRB retreat was, to which Ms. Velasco said was still in process.

Chair Butt stated that he was chastised by Council liaison regarding Brown Act violations and was wondering about email specifics. Mr. Privat stated that one cannot have a discussion on an item that will go before the Board and come to a collective concurrence. However, it is okay if the item has already gone before the Board.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.