



WATERFRONT COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING Minutes

**Community Center
1249 Marin Avenue
Monday, February 9, 2009 – 7:30 P.M.**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Diehl at 7:35 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
Others Present: Fern Tiger Associates

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3-1. Approve minutes from January 26, 2009 meeting (attached)

Approval of minutes continued to the March 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. Remarks by Chair

Diehl expressed thanks to the Committee for allowing her to become chair. Diehl asked Chaney whether a traveling microphone was available for the audience.

Chaney confirmed a traveling microphone is not available at the site.

Diehl noted she would also call a break during the meeting if desired.

5-2. Utilize the Waterfront Visioning public engagement process for outreach on values and visions beyond the waterfront for General Plan Update purposes – Fern Tiger Associates (Attachment 1)

Chaney provided an overview. The City is in need of updating the General Plan. The waterfront visioning process offers an opportunity for unique participatory engagement process to elicit comments on broader issues, while also making sure to not dilute the importance of the waterfront visioning process. Fern Tiger has indicated that they would be capable of conducting both processes, with an hour and a half dedicated to waterfront visioning, and then an extra half hour dedicated to more broad scale visioning related to the General Plan. Staff will be taking the item to Planning & Zoning tomorrow and would like to take the item to City Council on Monday. The cost for the general planning component would be approximately \$45,000.

So supports the idea, but wants to make sure the waterfront visioning process is not compromised, how the planning processes will be differentiated, and would like to know how that will be accomplished.

Fern stated that including both topics would provide a deeper context for the workshops and the waterfront visioning. Additionally it will enable a better understanding of the General Plan related to the waterfront. The outreach publication FTA is developing would also be expanded to include a few pages on the General Plan.

Parker asked about funding for the General Plan. Chaney replied there is a limited amount of funding from the last budget of approximately \$50,000. Additional funding will be required as the planning process will extend a couple of years and require environmental review.

Papalia expressed concern with stretching the workshops to two hours, and thinks multiple focuses could be overwhelming to the public.

FTA replied that this discussion would be generating values and visions related to the city's future as opposed to general plan specifics, and that the opportunity would also bring greater context to the waterfront.

Larson agreed planning for the general plan could dilute the waterfront visioning process, and that the timing is too short.

Granholtm expressed support for combining the two to generate values and visions related to the city. Dann expressed concern for the short timing, and thinks combining the two could be challenging. Diehl noted the waterfront scenario is a contentious issue, and suggested FTA be sensitive when transitioning between the discussion of the general plan and the waterfront visioning process. Diehl expressed general support for combining the two, particularly if money could be saved.

Public Comment:

Trevor Grayling believed the sessions were set as 2 hours. Agrees adding general plan could dilute the process.

FTA replied they were scheduling 1.5 hours initially. Also, visioning for the city should be the focus as opposed to particular general plan topics.

Allan Maris expressed support for combining the two, focusing on the components relative to the waterfront.

Brian Parsley prefers not to dilute the waterfront visioning process. If money is remaining after the waterfront visioning process it should go to the general fund given the extreme financial times.

Howard McNenny expressed concern for visioning in general and prefers detailed planning to determine outcomes.

Jean Safford was concerned that the vision for the waterfront was going to be looked at without a vision for the city as a whole. Thinks it is important to have the larger context.

Caryl O'Keefe supports the concept and including the broad context. Asked about the survey and thinks it could give additional responses.

Parker motioned the Committee recommend to City Council that the waterfront visioning process be modified to include citywide values and visioning to support the upcoming general plan with the understanding that the discussion would be limited to a 30 minute element of the first meeting and that adequate funds will be remaining in the project account to cover incidental expenses and that the waterfront committee remains the guiding body for this effort.

Seconded by Granholtm.

In favor: Dann, Diehl, Granholtm, Parker, Papalia, So. Opposed: Larson.

5-3. Measure WW information and project list (Attachment 2)

Chaney provided a summary. Funds are allocated based on population. The City will receive \$771,000 and up to 20 years to use the funds. The funds are non-competitive. The City will need to enter into an agreement with the District to become eligible to receive the funds. The goal is to identify a list of projects and obtain funding in 2010. City Council has identified the Park and Recreation Commission as the lead regarding Measure WW, and the Waterfront Committee is to identify projects related to the waterfront and submit them to the Park and Recreation Commission. The Council also asked that the Waterfront Committee identify projects that may also be eligible for competitive grant funds. Dann asked if any bonds had been issued. Chaney replied that the projects are received then bonds are issued.

Granholtm asked whether there is supposed to be coordination between Park and Recreation Commission and the Waterfront Committee. Chaney replied that the Waterfront Committee should provide a presentation to the Park and Recreation Commission, and then combined the suggestions would go to City Council.

Larson suggested the Park and Recreation Master Plan document be utilized, and suggested other possible projects. Larson asked if funding must be used on city-owned property.

Papalia noted the cove area of the waterfront would be a good area to improve. He did a survey of visitors recently and found that basic amenities would help make the area more usable.

Parker agrees with Papalia.

So wants to know if there are any restrictions on how the funds are used, and asked whether Park and Recreation Commission will actually include the Committee's list.

Diehl suggested a process be developed, and as a first step of the process project ideas be gathered in a table format. A subcommittee could be developed to generate a list for discussion at the next Committee meeting.

Parker stated the Park and Recreation Master Plan includes a number of improvements, and this funding will be difficult to obtain. Parker suggested focusing on a couple of projects to make them competitive.

Public Comment:

Caryl O'Keefe suggested that the Committee talk with Park and Recreation Commission to see if they have a particular process, criteria or format that the Committee might also want to use.

Also, prioritize the list of projects with funding amounts, and focus on particular projects to be competitive.

Allan Maris encourages the Committee to begin planning to get proposals ready for the \$27 Million in competitive funding.

Diehl motioned that a subcommittee be formed to develop a process for selecting projects to present to the Park and Recreation Commission and City Council, and that projects be submitted to Chaney between now and the next meeting to be developed into a table format.

Seconded by Papalia. Unanimously approved.

Granholt, Papalia and Larson expressed interest in the subcommittee.

The subcommittee will meet in February and return back to the Committee in March.

Parker motioned that Granholt and Papalia serve as the other two members of the subcommittee.

Seconded by Dann. All in favor, Larson abstained.

Granholt, Papalia and Diehl will serve on the subcommittee.

5-4. Report on Park and Recreation Commission upcoming review of City policies regarding dogs in public parks (Attachment 3)

Chaney provided a summary. The Park and Recreation Commission will be reviewing city policies. Until the mid 1990's the City had an animal control officer that enforced leash laws. City of Berkeley Animal Control now patrols the area and the new policy is that dogs are controlled by voice. Several meetings will be held regarding dogs in parks.

Papalia stated two examples of dog issues by aggressive dogs at the waterfront that served to deter people from using the waterfront. It is an important issue for all parks, and will be attending the next Park and Recreation meeting to hear more about it.

So asked whether the dog issue at the waterfront will be discussed within the Park and Recreation process. Chaney replied they would focus on parks.

Chaney will provide the minutes from the last Park and Recreation meeting. Chaney will speak with Park and Recreation staff regarding dogs at the waterfront.

Larson noted that dog leash laws are not enforced on the East Bay Regional Park District property areas at the waterfront.

Papalia will provide a report at the next Committee meeting regarding the Park and Recreation discussion.

Public Comment:

Caryl O'Keefe encourages the Committee to get involved in this issue as it impacts the usability of the waterfront.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

7-1. Next meeting February 23 if deemed necessary, otherwise March 9, 2009.

Larson asked for an update on the burrowing owl habitat.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.