



WATERFRONT COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

**Community Center
1249 Marin Avenue
Monday, November 10, 2008 – 7:30 P.M.**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Parker called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Brian Parker Kathy Diehl Eddy So
 Bill Dann Francesco Papalia

Members Absent: Steve Granholm, Clay Larson

Staff Present: Ann Chaney

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3-1. Approve minutes from October 13, 2008 meeting (attached)

The Committee agreed to carry over approval of the minutes until the next meeting.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ed Moore asked what action the Committee would take regarding the letter he submitted. The Chair replied this would be taken up under item 6 on the agenda.

Susan Schwartz, Friends of 5 Creeks announced that the City of Berkeley is submitting a grant application for restoration of Codornices Creek.

Brian Parsley asked if the Committee would be taking up the issue of city owned land and its disposition now that Measure WW has been passed. He contacted EBRPD and would like a timeline of when EBRPD is going to take over the bulb area.

Papalia requested the language on the waterfront rules signage.

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

5-1. Presentation by Dr. Robert Abbott regarding a proposal to construct an experimental reef /eelgrass habitat south of the Albany Bulb to increase foraging opportunities for salmonid smolts (Attachment 1).

Dr. Abbott provided a presentation. The project includes construction of reefs and establishment of eelgrass to provide food product for baby salmon. The proposed site is about 200 feet from the beach because of the soft sand depth and consistency, and access is good for construction and maintenance, and eelgrass already exists. Shells would be located to help achieve the goal to restore the native oyster that serves as a food source for the baby salmon eggs. The reef/eelgrass habitat would only be visible during low tide. Funding has been received from many sources, with an initial phase of one year. It is planned to be a 3-year program.

So asked if there was a decision to continue the project beyond three years, and whether this could preclude other uses or activities. So suggested moving the area further offshore to allow for public recreation that is not limited by the location of the reefs.

Dr. Abbott replied that there might be differing decisions made by agencies at that time. The life cycle of the reef mound may not go beyond three years. Dr. Abbot will take a look at the location options and get back to the Committee.

Diehl expressed concern about the reefs being disturbed by dogs, and whether there are any negative impacts associated with introduction of the shells.

Dr. Abbott replied that the location of the reef s would be at least 150 feet offshore, which is beyond dog activities in the water. There are no concerns with placing shells, the Bay used to be full of shells. Dann expressed support for the project and stated that he likes the first site location and believes it is more accessible. Dann asked if a ferry terminal would have any effect on the habitat area.

Dr. Abbott replied that he did not think it would be an issue, but would consider it.

Parker asked what the City's role in the approval process would be.

Chaney replied that the item is informational and that the resource agencies will be the authority on the project. The area is State Park property.

Papalia read Larson's comments regarding the proposed project. Larson identified two issues with the project 1) it should require an amendment to the Eastshore State Park General plan, 2) it will minimize available recreational area – namely watercraft access.

Recommends relocating the area to the northern side of the bulb.

Papalia stated that since these are not permanent structures, this might not be a long-term obstruction to watercraft access in the future.

Chaney added that the property owner has approved the project, who is the author of the Eastshore State Park General Plan, meaning they are fully aware of the potential conflicts.

So reiterated concern with the potential permanency of the habitat, and encouraged locating it in a way that does not limit recreational uses or accessibility.

So asked about the monitoring frequency included in the project.

Dr. Abbott replied that monitoring is conducted typically once every two months, primarily December through June to coincide with salmon migration.

Diehl inquired about how many fish each reef would support.

Dr. Abbott that each reef would support one fish.

Parker asked Abbott to return to a future meeting to provide responses to So's questions. The Committee will work on a draft letter of support in the meantime.

Public Comment:

Susan Schwartz: asked why this type of restoration is becoming so popular.

Dr. Abbott replied that a lot of information was learned in Chesapeake Bay, and NOAA restoration area has been analyzing the best process for establishing oysters to encourage better habitat.

5-2. Report from Planning Review Subcommittee regarding possible topics for updating city waterfront planning documents (continued from 10/13 meeting).

The Committee agreed to continue this item to the next meeting.

5-3. Review Ferry Terminal Study Draft EIS/EIR – make recommendation to City Council for their December 15 meeting (comments due to WETA by 12/16/08) (Attachment 2; full EIS/EIR to be distributed on DVDs due to document size).

Chaney provided a summary.

Parker stated the map does not show surrounding areas, and that figure 3.9 does not do a good job of adequately representing how dominant of a landscape this type of item can consume.

Public Comment:

Allan Maris: asked how comments should be made on the study, and whether they should be submitted to URS directly. He is concerned with Berkeley Marina location as a high priority. It is a confined area for vessel maneuvering, does not provide adequate room for growth in ferry service, takes parking away from existing businesses, and location has not worked in the past. Additionally traffic impacts are an issue at the Berkeley Marina site.

Dann stated the Buchanan site is constrained as there is no off ramp from I80 west, and that there is poor bike/pedestrian access to Gilman and Buchanan locations is difficult and can be dangerous.

Dredging is also an issue. The Albany City Council took action against locating the ferry site at Buchanan. Dann finds the Berkeley Marina site as the preferred site.

Chaney noted that the City is currently in process of initiating a bike path along Buchanan to connect Marin and the Bay Trail.

Papalia noted parking is an issue at each location. He has talked to many in the community that feel Albany would lose out on ability for transportation stations, such as lack of access to BART. Would like an Albany shuttle system to get to terminal that also allows for bicycles.

So expressed support for creating a ferry terminal, but concern with amount of traffic it may create, particularly at the Buchanan and Gilman sites. The benefits of the ferry service may not be justified given all of the impacts of developing a terminal. EIR did not adequately analyze traffic impacts.

Parker stated that the Committee should identify a position on alternatives. Parker would like to focus on the Buchanan and Gilman Street sites, highlighting the issues with these sites and reiterate the previous City position. Parker asked Chaney to research section 4F, and provide further information.

Parker would also like some commentary on the proposal to relocate the horse barns. Parker would like to support alternative B, which is currently identified as the environmentally preferred alternative.

Papalia stated a ferry terminal near or in Albany would benefit housing costs and would like a statement included that Albany is losing out on investment and transportation opportunities, and that Albany needs to be better served by ferry.

Chaney will draft a letter, including an attachment of technical issues for the next meeting.

Diehl abstained on the item as it may come under review by the EPA.

So stated he objects to the Gilman and Buchanan locations due to traffic and logistic access issues. The Berkeley locations are close enough for Albany to use.

5-4. Scope of Waterfront Planning Process – discussion and possible action to insure that the scope allows for the consideration of a wide range of options, including policies to guide near and medium term city actions (continued from 10/13 meeting).

Parker prepared a draft motion for the Committee to review. This action is intended to clarify that the Committee does not intend to put any limitations on the visioning process.

So asked about adding long-term actions.

Parker suggested a change to the text “total redevelopment” to “long-term development”.

Public Comment

Ruth Ganong: asked if the option of GGF continuing their operation was included.

Parker replied the Committee had not limited that option.

Ed Moore: if policies are adopted an EIR is needed. Suggests the Committee use a different term.

Allan Maris: suggested edits to the motion, and recommended taking out the time ranges.

Caryl O’Keefe: agrees with comments made by Maris. Suggests making the statement short to help make it as clear as possible. Restrictions on the process were previously made by the Committee.

Diehl moved that the draft motion be revised, seconded by Dann.

Papalia suggested a shorter statement, and the text concludes with wide and unrestricted range of options.

So made a substitute motion:

“The Waterfront Committee hereby clarifies that the intent of the City’s direction to Fern Tiger and Associates (FTA) and city staff is to develop a high level visioning plan for the future of the waterfront through a process that allows consideration of a wide range of options and that the process should not limit discussion.

Seconded by Papalia. Unanimously approved.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

- **Letter from Ed Moore dated October 29, 2008 (Attachment 3; hard copies available at meeting)**

Ed Moore asked the item to be placed on the agenda.

Parker stated FTA has previously received comments from Ed Moore and that FTA understands the request from Moore. The Committee does not want to give FTA specific direction or limitations. The Committee did not motion to agendaize this item.

- **October 2008 Natural Resources Damage Assessment (oil spill) update (Attachment 4)**

Chaney noted the update is attached, and that Alameda County is working on updating the response plan for oil spills.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

7-1. Next meeting November 24, 2008 (if deemed necessary), otherwise December 8, 2008 (8:00 p.m. following City Council Swearing In ceremonies).

The Committee agreed to meet November 24, and not meet on December 8.

8. ADJOURNMENT

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