



**WATERFRONT COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING  
MINUTES**

City Council Chambers  
June 19, 2007 – 7:30 pm.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Parker at 7:35PM.

**2. ROLL CALL**

Members Present:        Brian Parker                        Steve Granholm  
                                      Bill Dann                                Clay Larson  
                                      Jerri Holan                              Eddy So

Members Absent:        Kathy Diehl

Staff Present:            Ann Chaney

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

No minutes to approve.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**5. REPORTS**

**6. DISCUSSIONS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON MATTERS RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, WHICH COULD INCLUDE REPORTS AND/OR PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS IF ANY:**

**6-1. Waterfront Planning Process – Don Neuwirth (Neuwirth and Associates) discuss ideas for preparing a Work Program for Waterfront planning**

Neuwirth asked for input regarding: 1) Extent of planning area that should be addressed in this process. Should planning area be just GGF, or a larger scale, and should project be coordinated with other jurisdictions and agencies.

2) Outreach part of citizen involvement process and how to get citizens involved.

Parker suggested the Committee offer feedback, but also recommends Neuwirth research and provides pros/cons to different options.

Dann doesn't think bulb should be included within the planning area as there are many issues, and the area is basically set aside as parkland. Suggests focusing on GGF property, and how it connects with City.

So would like to consider the entire waterfront. Multi-jurisdictional planning can be difficult.

Parker stated he does not support a multi-jurisdictional planning project.

Recommendations could be included in plan regarding Berkeley area. Focus on linkages, compatible uses with State park, additional uses for open space.

Holan recommends looking at the property as a whole, including property owners, and meeting with WTA regarding ferry sites.

Neuwirth commented he is examining how to involve community of Albany that is not regularly involved, and whether to utilize existing institutions including schools, PTA, senior center, etc, or create a new institution for outreach such as house meetings, tours and workshops at waterfront.

Dann suggested a community meeting could gather citizens.

So suggested a survey be sent out. PTA meetings would also be a good way to reach community.

Parker stated he has attended many PTA meetings, and is concerned waterfront planning discussions would create a place of contention to otherwise functional meetings. Recommends finding an alternative opportunity where dynamic of organizing battleground/contention does not occur. Supports idea of structured small group meetings, as they could be less intimidating. Parker supports educating community and involving schools.

So suggests Neuwirth identify pro/cons of different outreach options including small group meetings, larger community meeting, etc.

Neuwirth stated he will be recommending a variety of outreach options as part of the planning work plan, and the goal is to involve community members that don't regularly participate in development planning processes by introducing other issues like public health and safety.

Holan would like to see Neuwirth's professional findings regarding planning process, including a comparison to other cities that have conducted waterfront development.

Larson would like budget information for how to fund a planning process.

Parker stated Measure C makes this process different from other processes. Taking a plan through environmental review in preparation for Measure C vote will be expensive. Does not want to commit the city to the cost if Magna is not on board at that point, because Magna could spend money fighting ballot measure. Suggests a process set up in stages so that if Magna is not on board, city is not bound into a process that goes to a Measure C vote.

Neuwirth stated he would research what Measure C requires. If a vote under Measure C is the preferred outcome, the planning process will need to work backward toward that desired outcome.

Neuwirth plans to identify vision of waterfront, analyze site constraints, identify project alternatives, and Magna could bring forward their alternative.

Chaney suggested opportunities for outreach including a planning session with high school and middle school students, use of cable television with a fun educational item, tours of the site, and a community-wide brainstorming session.

Public Comment

Joan Larson: look at ways to include community that has not yet participated in waterfront planning process.

Ed Moore: suggests a study of site aesthetics to develop a framework to analyze alternatives.

Trevor Grayling: asked for a clarification regarding last meeting as to whether meetings with Neuwirth and various interest groups are open to the public.

Parker stated he suggested leaving it up to groups to determine whether they would be open to the public.

Norman Laforce: Multi-jurisdictional/multi-agency process difficult as Berkeley has Measure N, State Park property has a difficult process as well. Important to get community involved and educated, and that a scope is developed. Concerned if process ends up with something going on ballot under Measure C if Magna is not on board. Downzoning has happened historically and can be an option.

Howard McNenny: Albany Waterfront Coalition will be meeting with Neuwirth Saturday at 9am in the Edith Stone Room, public is welcome to attend.

Allan Maris: regional recreation area, examine both regional and local connections, including ferry.

Holan stated downzoning could result in lawsuit by property owner, very expensive for city.

So expressed interest in ensuring community engagement is multi-cultural, and non-English speaking groups.

Neuwirth stated he will bring plan to Council in September, and will share draft with Committee and P&Z.

**6-2. Instant Runoff Voting – discuss interest in presentation at a future meeting**

Holan stated the item is good but not appropriate for Committee.  
Dann agrees, should go to Charter Review Committee not WFC.

Larson expressed concern regarding Parker's email on this item that was sent to the Committee prior to the meeting. Larson stated the comments made in the email were intended to prejudice the issue.

Parker stated the City Attorney's opinion is that an email is not in violation of Brown Act if Committee Members do not respond.

Larson would like to come up with an orderly process for sending emails that does not prejudice items on the agenda a future meeting. Larson thinks a presentation would be educational.

#### Public Comment

Joan Larson: suggests it be considered as part of planning process, encourages Committee to research it further.

Parker stated the Committee is not under obligation to spend time talking about any one idea for an extended amount of time. Parker has not found any cases of this process being used in California.

So agrees presentation would be worth hearing, as long as total time of presentation is limited to 20 minutes.

Dann stated the item is irrelevant to this group.

Parker agrees, but suggests hearing item, and limiting it to a half hour, so the Committee can have the opportunity to make a determination regarding the item.

Parker will schedule the presentation.

### **7. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS**

Larson commented that a Berkley High School group developed catapult at bulb. Chaney stated the City was not notified. There is an approval process for events at the bulb. Chaney will notify the group of permit process.

### **8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

#### **8-1. Next Meeting July 5, 2007**

Larson suggested a better process for communication among members be discussed at an upcoming meeting and that all discussions on agenda items that occur prior to a meeting should be included within the packet for public.

Parker: next agenda will include regular status updates, Committee Members should call or email Parker, and cc City staff if they have any agenda items.

### **9. ADJOURNMENT**