



SAN FRANCISCO
BAY AREA
WATER
TRAIL

Accessibility Sub-Committee

Public Meeting

December 3, 2013

State Coastal Conservancy, Oakland

Meeting Summary

Attendees:

In the room:

Ann Buell, State Coastal Conservancy

Galli Branson, ABAG

Laura Thompson, ABAG

Ellen Miramontes, BCDC

David Beaupre, SF Port

Wendy Procter, SF Port

Dan Hodapp, SF Port

David Fazio, Sub-Committee Member

Joy Dryden, Sub-Committee Member

E. Carwile LeRoy, Jr. MD, Sub-Committee Member

Tim Gilbert, MIG

Yuri Jewett, MIG

Attendee by phone:

Christina Rubke, Sub-Committee Member

Susanne von Rosenberg, GAIA

Item #1 –Water Trail Accessibility Plan Survey Results

Tim Gilbert shared the results of the Accessibility Plan online survey. The results are attached to the minutes.

The survey consisted of 23 questions that were developed with the input from the September subcommittee meeting. Findings from the survey will be used as a springboard for discussion of accessibility issues and reinforcement for items as the plan moves forward.

General findings:

Since boating organizations were targeted during the public outreach process, many respondents were affiliated with a boat club or organization. The survey was not able to reach out to an ADA community that is not aware of the opportunities for boating in the Bay Area.

Question: What is the difference between online and mobile applications?

Mobile: Real time weather in app format

Online: via a website

The subcommittee requested clarification between these two features on the survey.

The survey reflected that users want more information on the conditions of sites. Ann created a map showing which sites users already use for boating. The group noted a large cluster in the central Bay Area.

Joy: How was this survey helpful? Can you make conclusions? I would not make decisions based on this survey.

Ann: We can't make definitive conclusions based on this survey but it can help steer us in the right direction and deeper points. Clubs and organizations are popular and well used, and helped us identify and understand the importance of this. Public transportation wasn't very popular because this is a group activity. We did learn about other boating organizations we didn't know about before.

David: I think the information is a great catalyst for conversation.

Ellen: Did people make specific site recommendations? Answer: No.

David B: SF Port would be interested in knowing specifically what responses were received related to desired Aquatic Park improvements. Action: Yuri will research raw data.

Ellen: I think site visits and talking out design solutions are very helpful. The visit to Pier 52 was helpful and it sounds like changes are being made from the insights that were made from that visit.

Joy: I agree. Onsite visits make it easier to assess and provide an opinion.

Wendy: Survey does give a launching point for sites listed. What amenities did they find that were useful site by site?

Ann: Galli is pursuing overnight possibilities.

Wendy: ETC does trips for more than day.

Ann: Specificity is heard over and over

Ann: We can follow up with those who indicated they are interested on the survey.

Ann: The quarterly meetings with the water trail allows for public comment regarding sites and accessibility issues.

Ellen: More responses would have been nice. I would have liked to learn more about transfer systems. It would have been nice to have responses that could be used as “marching orders” for improvement. I like the idea that people can participate site by site at the sub meetings.

David B: It would be a good idea to keep the survey open. We have done this using Google docs and it works well.

Ann: Concrete ramps are an accessibility feature. See Beneficial Designs report.

Joy: Not universal. Restricting majority users to use disabled features.

David F.: There is room for misuse of funds. A concrete ramp may be considered accessible, but it still can't be used by a lot of people. How things are presented and represented needs to be transparent. EZ docks are specific for kayak use.

David B.: It's important to note that water sports can't address a single user at a single time. We need to do our best to address multiple users at a single time, this is the goal.

Joy: Does the website have a place that people can comment on accessibility? Survey is too non-specific. Is there a way for someone to give input site specific etc.

Galli: There is a comment form on the site that is on side

David F.: Maybe be more specific and designate that they are looking for ADA info.

Item #2 – SF Port Presentation for Crane Cove Park

David B: Pier 52. We are making the adjustments as recommended and they should be in place at the end of the month.

Pier 70 presentation. Additional public meeting is scheduled for Monday, 12/9 at Pier 1, 6:30pm.

Types of material: reinforced subsurface conditions to accommodate chairs. MOBI mats to accommodate access to beach. Both. Reinforced needs to be more researched.

David F.: Wheelchair sharing, like bike sharing. WHILL has a good product. Is this possible?

David B: We could reserve a space at the aquatic center for a club to manage wheelchair storage etc.

David F: Will port regulate the hours of operation?

David B: Yes, but we are not at that level of detail yet.

Joy: I like the idea of the gravel if it works for longevity. MOBI mats made out of plastic and they do deteriorate. If the gravel could work it's a great idea.

David B: Temples in Japan use this gravel method

David B: MOBI mats can be replaced and are cost effective for us.

David F: Are you proposing entire beach with reinforced gravel?

David B: Not the entire beach. Expensive and glass boats don't work for this as well. Still being discussed.

David F: Will there be swimming?

David B: Hard to regulate swimming. Kayaking next to large ships will also need to be regulated. Ships do not want this. Smart buoys (red yellow green) or a club to help manage/regulate like at Islais Creek.

Beach access is preferred to accommodate the largest range of users.

Joy: I like the idea of the bigger sandier area vs. the boat launch sandy area. It encourages NMSB and other users, too. Be with friends and hang out. Much more of a need for a bigger sand area that everyone can use.

David F: I like the idea of the wheelchair access program for inclusivity. They have product now that locks onto your own wheels onsite.

Ellen: What are the reasons for presenting 2 options?

David B: Beach may not be appropriate condition for existing site. Stakeholders asked to look at other options. Most stakeholders do prefer large beach option.

Wendy: ETC provided input regarding guided trips. Beach is the easiest to have trips. Hard launch or beach?

Wendy: Tidal stairs were proposed at slipway 4, which would have a level surface for launching.

David F: Beach only would be the launching and landing? Slipway 4 could be added back? On back burner?

David B: Yes.

Joy: Transfer steps are helpful for dock launching only. For a beach launch terraces are not as valuable. I wouldn't use the steps if there is a beach already.

Ellen: Terraces not steps, with ramps that connect? Would this be useful?

Wendy: Adaptive aides could be made available.

Carwile: I like the idea of adaptive aides. Terraces might not work for everyone. Seacranes work well. Roll out, roll in does not need its own footing. Temporary hoier lifts.

Dan Hodapp: What is an acceptable method for this? The beach having a steeper condition than 5% is most likely.

David F: Seacrane is a good example.

Joy: People need help by other people to help into boats. Orgs (like BAADS, ETC etc.) will bring the adaptive tools needed. Where there's a need for a lot of assistance that's where organizations can step in help.

Wendy: We can include guidelines like this in RFP when we build aquatic center.

Ellen: Don't want to lose sight of independent access. Some people want to have a different experience than group outing.

Item #3 – Review of Beneficial Design Report

General Comment: The report is quite technical and can turn people off from reading it.

Suggested enhancements:

EZ docs

Finger docks

Overhead transfer assistance

Transfer board

Concrete beach access route – beveled edge comment

Jack London Aquatic Center: Very wide low-float dock that is popular.

Richmond Marina: Typical marina condition.

Ann: Black Point example. This is the water trail conundrum - it works for some but not for all. What do we do when we designate a site? Sites that work for a specific boat type don't work for others. Concrete rails are good for safety but not good for kayak access.

Sites that comply with the law, still does not meet a universal design standard to be considered inclusive. Black Point – meets the law but not much else for some people.

Joy: Our goal should be one very universal access point for every region of the Water Trail. Communicate on website so others can use their own decision what works for them.

David F: Downhill skiing is a good example. Everything is possible. Premise to say it's not possible is not a good idea.

Ellen: BD (Beneficial Designs) in Richmond. Build a new ramp and an EZ dock. Adjacent to compliant dock with a lower float for a little more money. Small piece on existing infrastructure can open up the world of use.

Carwile: I understand there is a limited amount of resources. One designated spot (Saving the Bay documentary) would not allow overnights, which is what I've heard discussed in the past. People want this.

Joy: I don't want to hold back on development of the trail.

David F: We need to set milestones. People need to include a plan of what they are going to accomplish.

David B: Universal water access is extremely difficult. What works for one doesn't for another. There needs to be a level of acceptance that universal design is not possible. A simple improvement such as Pier 52 could happen here at Black Point.

David F: We have accepted that we can't make every site accessible. That's why I propose more public assistance. This contributes to community growth and economic development of the sites.

Galli: As we implement the water trail, should we make it a requirement to have some of these additional features in order to join?

David F: It would be good for the site owners to have a 'plan' to include these additional features as part of the grant.

Joy: We need to design a water trail plan for visual impairment; one for mobility. Recommended sites for different abilities could be communicated since not all can be accessible to everyone.

Thanks to Yuri Jewett for taking the meeting notes.