



**WATERFRONT COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES**

City Council Chambers
January 3, 2008 – 7:30 pm.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Parker at 7:33 pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Brian Parker Kathy Diehl
 Bill Dann Clay Larson
 Steve Granholm Eddy So

Staff Absent: Jerri Holan
Staff Present: Ann Chaney

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3-1. Approve minutes from December 6 meeting

Minutes unanimously approved as amended. Motioned by So, seconded by Diehl.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Edward Moore: informed Committee he will be on the Berkeley Waterfront Commission Agenda discussing waterfront planning next Thursday.

5. REPORTS

5-1. Burrowing Owl Habitat – Update

Chaney provided an update. The item will be going to City Council January 22nd, including a request to go out to bid on project, and to increase the consultant contract by an additional \$7,000 for ongoing monitoring. Chaney distributed project design and budget documents.

Larson asked the amount of the EBRPD permit fee. Chaney stated the permit fee is \$5,000/year.

Larson asked if the consultant would be developing a monitoring plan. Chaney confirmed that the consultant would be developing a monitoring plan.

5-2. Oil Spill Cleanup – Update

Chaney distributed an email from EBRPD staff Neil Fujita. EBRPD has been inspecting the waterfront area on a regular basis. Water quality testing is being conducted to gauge the level of remaining contamination. The City, Alameda County Environmental Health, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board are also involved. The Albany Plateau and Bulb have been reopened. The beach remains closed and will be reassessed on an ongoing basis. The City had a message board up at the waterfront that has temporarily been taken down due to the upcoming storm.

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

6-1. Consideration of Selection of Committee Chair

Dann nominated Parker for Chair. Diehl suggested a Vice Chair also be chosen, So agrees.

Granholm seconded the nomination for Parker to continue as Chair.

Larson nominated Granholm for Chair.

Vote: In Favor – Dann, Diehl, Granholm, Parker, So. Opposed – Larson.

6-2. Select Committee Member or Subcommittee to act as a liaison regarding the oil spill

Diehl stated interest in having a liaison from the Committee. Granholm and Diehl are willing to serve as a subcommittee.

So asked what the subcommittee would be charged with.

Diehl stated the subcommittee would work with EBRPD and others to have a voice in reviewing any issues involving the oil spill, and assist in developing a pool of trained volunteers for future issues.

Dann motioned that Granholm and Diehl comprise a subcommittee to work with City staff and others regarding the oil spill, seconded by Granholm – unanimously approved.

Public Comment:

Francesco Papalia: supports the Committee being involved with this item and assisting in organizing volunteers for any future issues.

6-3. Waterfront Planning Process; consider dates for possible consultant interviews

Parker suggested the Committee identify dates for interviews to ensure availability of Committee. Chaney stated the RFQ was sent to 23 local planning firms. Larson asked if the RFQ was posted to the website. Chaney will confirm.

RFQ submittals will be received by January 25th, the subcommittee will review and identify most qualified firms for interviews.

Parker suggested February 19th, 20th or 21st for interviews.

So raised the importance of having the meeting in the Council Chambers since the meeting must be televised. Chaney agreed the meeting should be held in the Council Chambers, and added available dates of February 25th and 27th.

Granholm asked what the process would be for the interviews.

Parker suggested the process be discussed at the Feb. 7th meeting.

Dann asked about the selection process procedures.

Parker stated the process includes choosing the most qualified firm through interviews of the 3 most qualified, the selected firm then creates a scope of work and budget, and the Committee works with the firm to negotiate the scope and budget. The Committee will then make a recommendation to the City Council for selection of the preferred firm.

Diehl suggested the subcommittee meet prior to the February 7th meeting to draft interview questions and procedures.

Public Comment:

Francesco Papalia – suggests the Committee choose a date that is most convenient for the consultants and ensure the meeting can be televised.

Edward Moore – asked if the scope of work would be reviewed during waterfront committee meetings and wants to ensure the public education component is included.

6-4. Discuss follow-up to previous discussion of Instant Runoff Voting and possible report to Council with recommendations

Parker asked if the Committee is interested in writing a letter to City Council summarizing their thoughts on IRV.

Dann stated that IRV does not seem applicable to the chosen planning process - Scenario 3.

Larson does not think it is necessary to make a statement on IRV at this time, So and Granholm agree.

Parker requested the Committee be allowed a chance to provide a letter if IRV goes to the City Council at some. The Committee agrees.

Public Comment:

Preston Jordan – IRV is applicable to any of the scenarios, and can be a useful tool in selecting preferred vision for the waterfront.

Francesco Papalia – intrigued by the opportunity to cover the full range of options for the waterfront that gives the public a chance to choose preference.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

Larson objected to a comment made by Dann at the December 17th City Council meeting regarding the Committee's choice to limit the scope of the planning process, and felt Dann's comments were inappropriate.

Parker found Larson out of order.

So clarified that Dann did not speak on behalf of the Committee, and suggested the item be discussed personally.

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

8-1. Next meeting January 15 (if deemed necessary), otherwise February 7, 2008.

The Committee agreed that the January 15th meeting would not be held.

So asked that selection of a vice chair be added to the next meeting.

Diehl asked that the development of the interview process be added to the next meeting.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 pm.