



WATERFRONT COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING Minutes

Community Center
1249 Marin Avenue
Monday, October 13, 2008 – 7:30 P.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

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

Staff Present: Ann Chaney

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3-1. Approve minutes from July 14, 2008 and September 22, 2008 meetings (attached)

Minutes approved as amended to July 14, 2008. Motion by Granholm, seconded by Papalia.

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. Report from Planning Review Subcommittee regarding possible topics for updating city waterfront planning documents.

Granholm noted that the Subcommittee name is a little broad and suggested Albany Waterfront Park Planning Subcommittee. Granholm and Papalia will develop something for the Committee to review at a later meeting.

5-2. Follow up with Fern Tiger Associates regarding waterfront visioning process (Note: Ms. Tiger will join the WF Committee following FTA's presentation to the Arts Committee)

Chaney noted that the reason the Committee wanted FTA to return was to allow the public to submit questions and comments. Staff did not receive any comments, FTA received three including: 1) concern over adequate consideration of cultural landscape issues, FTA is taking all concerns into consideration. 2) A suggestion of adding examples of other waterfront developments. 3) Misspellings on names in documents, and an inaccurate description of the card room that has been edited.

FTA presented to City Council, a number of good questions and comments resulted. Council seemed supportive of the process.

FTA just presented to the Arts Committee. They had several questions, one in particular was whether FTA would come back following Phase I of the project to discuss any particular items related to Committees/ Commissions.

So expressed appreciation for FTA's report, and asked for clarification on specific items.

Parker suggested staff will update the City website, including the Green Albany page.

So would like more outreach conducted to get the community aware of the visioning process.

Papalia asked how the business owners will be included in the process.

FTA replied they are researching how to best include the business community.

Public Comment:

Robert Cheasty: supports an inclusive process. Cheasty represents two stakeholder groups with members both inside and outside of Albany. The waterfront is located within a State park, many within the region take strong interest in this area. The Solano Avenue Association also has interest in this process and should be included.

Edward Moore: waterfront in Berkeley & Albany is a cultural landscape, and could be eligible to be registered as a historical resource. Wants to make sure there is a record that describes the cultural heritage. Wants the regional interest included.

Parker responded to Moore's comments and identified that FTA is including this analysis within the overall process, anything beyond that has not been supported by the Committee.

Larson asked if there is an opportunity for outside groups to contribute materials for public education. FTA replied that they are researching this item, and considering posting items on the website, with a possible link to a chat room regarding the visioning process.

5-3. 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.

Parker expressed interest to make sure there is not a limitation placed on the process by the Committee. Dann noted GGF may have intentions to build a casino, and that he would not support consideration of a casino as part of the scope.

Larson suggests the Committee not place any limit on the scope.

Parker supports considering a wide range of issues and not having any limit placed on the scope by the Committee.

Papalia supports clarifying the process and not limiting the scope or discussion throughout this planning process.

Motion by Larson: The Waterfront Committee withdraws any attempt to limit the scope of the planning process. The Committee encourages the consultant, Fern Tiger Associates, to independently determine the direction of the visioning process in response to input from the public.

Granholtm asked if the motion was specific to GGF, and suggested putting a geographic limit for the plan.

Papalia would like it to include GGF land including the land within Berkeley.

So stated he did not recall the Committee putting a limit on the scope of the project.

Larson noted that the RFQ included language that limited the scope particularly "when and if the racetrack leaves".

Chaney noted the RFQ did not have a limitation on the geographic area.

So believes it is premature to discuss this item since it is a visioning process being conducted.

Granholtm stated he would prefer having the current scope for review prior to making a decision.

Parker suggested the item be continued to next month.

Public Comment:

Fern Tiger: Scope does not refer to the specific property. The focus is GGF property, but discussion is not limited to that property.

Caryl O'Keefe: supports agenda item and clarification of scope. Prefers letting the consultant figure out what is best. Believes majority of community would not support a casino, suggests Committee identify any restrictions, including State law up front. Magna's financial condition is not the same as the racetrack operation. It owns the racetrack. Financial numbers on the racetrack identify profit, particularly since Bay Meadows closed. Suggests the property owner participate to make sure this process is worthwhile.

O'Keefe would like a park at the waterfront, the bulb can be made more accessible and safe.

Robert Cheasty stated that FTA's work has been well received to date. There are some trepidations by the park advocates, suggests everyone have faith in the process and end result to maintain an open process.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

6-1. Observations from walking tour of Waterfront Park held on September 13

Granholtm commented that the walking tour was educational, and that Patty Donald did a great job. So and Parker agreed.

6-2. Report on Coastal Clean-Up Day held on September 20

Chaney provided a report on this item indicating it was a success with over 285 volunteers.

6-3. San Francisco Estuary Habitat Restoration for Salmonids project - plans to construct mound/eelgrass system in EBRPD jurisdiction of Bay

Chaney provided a handout. The project would create habitat for salmonid smults. Dr Abbot is available to present the project to the Committee.

Diehl stated she would like to hear from Dr Abbot. Granholtm agreed.

Dr Abbot is available for the next meeting.

So asked if any local permitting will be necessary. Chaney replied she will research this item.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

7-1. Next meeting October 27, 2008 (if deemed necessary), otherwise November 10, 2008

The Committee agreed the next meeting will be held November 10, 2008.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:42 p.m.