



**WATERFRONT COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES**

City Council Chambers
Tuesday, April 15, 2008 – 7:30 P.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Parker at 7:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

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

Staff Present: Jeff Bond

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3-1. Approve minutes from February 27, 2008 and March 31, 2008 meetings (attached)

Minutes approved, with amendments noted for March 31 meeting.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

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

5-1. Discussion with City Attorney Robert Zweben regarding CEQA and the Waterfront Visioning process, and Committee interaction with Consultant

Zweben reviewed CEQA regulations 15262. At the end of the visioning process completion, the city then needs to decide what to do with that work product. If it the outcome of the visioning process is something formally adopted, as a particular plan then environmental analysis such as CEQA would be required at that time.

Parker noted that the visioning process would result in a product that could then initiate a specific plan. At that time environmental analysis would then be necessary. Zweben concurred, noting that the Committee would be making recommendations to City Council regarding next steps following the visioning process.

Parker asked about appropriate interactions between the consultant and Committee members and/or a subcommittee, outside of normal meetings.

Zweben replied that the Brown Act would limit serial meetings. A subcommittee would need to be developed for a single purpose and a limited duration. If a subcommittee were created to interact with consultant, it would need to be considered a body that would require Brown Act compliance, as the subcommittee would have an ongoing duty. The consultant should take the leadership role on the project. Individual Committee members should not give directions to the consultant, and all discussions/input from the Committee should be provided at regular public meetings to the entire Committee.

Larson agreed all contact with the consultant should be conducted at public meetings.

Public Comment

Edward Moore: believes a planning study is a good idea and that the study can be structured as a tiered EIR that includes historical, cultural and aesthetic issues.

Mara Duncan: inquired about transparency, and what determines whether an email communication is public record. Zweben replied that most email communications from Committee members would be public record.

Allan Maris: inquired about how staff fits into process. Parker replied the consultant should work closely with staff.

Brian Parsley: asked if the subcommittee is finished and does not think another subcommittee should be formed as it does not provide for a transparent process. If a subcommittee is formed then interactions should be via public meetings.

Caryl O'Keefe: concerned about transparency of process and recommends an explicit policy regarding Committee/consultant interactions to help add credibility to the process.

5-2. Recommend City Council approval of Scope of Work and budget from Fern Tiger Associates, for the Waterfront Visioning process (http://www.albanyca.org/gov/WtntPlng0706_present.html)

Fern Tiger Associates (FTA) provided an overview of changes to the scope based on the Committee's comments. FTA intends to provide periodic updates to the Committee, and formal presentations throughout the process after project milestones or findings.

Granholm noted that the planning aspect should include opportunities and constraints analysis. Larson agrees.

Parker asked about the interviews FTA would be holding with the public, and whether interview questions and interviewees would be open to the public. FTA stated they would ask permission for interview detail to be made public. So agrees this information is important.

Parker asked for detail on technical sub consultants.

FTA noted sub consultants would be identified during the process as technical needs were identified.

Public Comment:

Maureen Crowley: concerned with budget increase.

Howard McNenny: important to coordinate with agencies that have jurisdiction at the waterfront.

Sidney Matson: concerned with budget, prefers concrete results.

Trevor Grayling: concerned with budget, suggests process be grounded in resource analysis and reality.

Norman LaForce: Magna Entertainment is struggling financially. Cited example of Gateway development project.

Mara Duncan: encouraged by the opportunity for a public planning process, concerned with budget.

Ed Fields: concerned with budget, recommends reducing scale of project.

Caryl O'Keefe: encourages including landowner in process, concerned with budget. Recommends attempting to find common ground, and prefers public identification of those interviewed by FTA.

Allan Maris: agrees with concerns expressed regarding budget.

Brian Parsley: agrees with concerns expressed regarding budget, important to include landowner.

Edward Moore: urges for early build in of phased EIR during visioning process.

Parker asked for clarification regarding the interviews that would be conducted by FTA.

FTA noted the interviews are intended to gather information from a community cross section. FTA would also identify educational needs regarding the waterfront. FTA will identify a way to document outcomes from interviews to ensure process transparency.

Parker asked about ability to interact with the property owner. FTA replied that they have already begun talking with the property owner.

Dann motioned the Committee approve the scope of work and budget, with agreed changes, and recommend City Council approve the scope of work and budget at its April 21 meeting. Seconded by Diehl. In favor: Dann, Diehl, Granholm, Parker, So. Opposed: Larson, Papalia.

5-3. Discuss possible change in future Committee meeting schedule to 4th Mondays due to pending move to Community Center (2nd Mondays could be reserved on an as needed basis)

The Committee voted unanimously to change the meeting date to the 4th Monday of each month.

5-4. Consideration of a Resolution in appreciation of former Committee Member Jerri Holan

The Committee provided edits to the draft. Staff will confirm the consecutive years Holan served on the Committee. The resolution was approved as amended, motioned by Parker, seconded by Granholm.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

Papalia provided a written statement to the Committee regarding his action related to the Post-Oil Spill Restoration item at the March 31, 2008 meeting, and requested this item be included as part of the April 15, 2008 meeting minutes.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

7-1. Next meeting May 1, 2008.

Larson asked for a staff report regarding emergency access and response to emergencies at the Bulb.

So raised issue with a quotation Papalia made in a news article. Parker asked that the item be discussed after the meeting as it was not on the agenda.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.