

APPROVED
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ALAMEDA REUSE AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Wednesday, December 7, 2005

The meeting convened at 7:18 p.m. with Chair Johnson presiding.

2-D

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Beverly Johnson, Chair, City of Alameda (arrived at 7:37 p.m.)
Tony Daysog, Boardmember, City of Alameda
Doug DeHaan, Boardmember, City of Alameda
Frank Matarrese, Boardmember, City of Alameda
Marie Gilmore, Boardmember, City of Alameda

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

2-A. Approval of the minutes of the Special Meeting of December 16, 2004

2-B. Approval of the minutes of the Special Meeting of May 12, 2005

2-C. Approval of the minutes of the Special Meeting of June 1, 2005

Member Matarrese motioned for approval of the Consent Calendar item. The motion was seconded by Member deHaan and passed by the following voice vote: Ayes – 3; Noes – 0; Abstentions – 1 (Member Gilmore).

3. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

3-A. Presentation of Revised Alameda Point Preliminary Development Concept (PDC).

Andrew Thomas, Supervising Planner, presented the “text-only” changes made to the July 5th Draft PDC. The changes were made in response to comments heard at the July and October 2005 ARRA Board meetings. Mr. Thomas summarized the major changes and asked that the ARRA approve the changes as well as other modifications to the text, and identify final revisions in order to bring a finalized document back to the Board at its regular meeting in February 2006.

A summary of the changes included:

- clearer description of the purpose of the PDC, identifies it as a planning study and not a regulatory document without any legally binding effect.
- there is more emphasis and clarity that the plan for Alameda Point is a mixed-use plan, maintaining financial feasibility and historic preservation.
- recommending work-live ordinance.

Changes were made in the Introduction, Land Use and the Next Steps chapters emphasizing that it is the City's goal to have a sustainable environmentally sensitive development at Alameda Point. The Next Steps chapter outlines the key issues that are still going to require additional study, particularly the compromises and trade-offs. There is more description about how the non-Measure A alternative will be evaluated in the EIR process; and further exploration of maintaining historical preservation, as well as financial possibilities surrounding the historic buildings. Also included are the next steps to implementing the Transportation Strategy.

Two appendices, the Transportation Strategy (Appendix A) and the Financial Feasibility and Fiscal Neutrality (Appendix E), were also revised.

Member Gilmore allowed the several speakers to make their statements prior to the Board making their comments. The speakers discussed various PDC-related topics, including Historic Preservation concerns regarding the Big Whites and the Hangars; requests for additional buildings identified for Historic Preservation be placed on the HAB agenda/study list for February, and to request and Historic Preservation Master Plan and an Adaptive Reuse Study to be done soon, or as part of the Navy's Section 106 process. Also discussed concerns about the Seaplane Lagoon development encroachments and non-measure A alternatives. Consideration of Building 3 for the Neptune Beach Amusement Museum was discussed.

Alameda School Board representative thanked staff and the ARRA board for including the issues of school facilities in the PDC. Alternatives in Action representative discussed issues regarding the early termination of their lease and the ARRA's request of them for removal of a portable building.

Member Daysog asked what were the major changes to Appendix E (Financial Feasibility and Fiscal Neutrality). Stephen Proud, Alameda Point Project Manager, explained that there was clarity added to the language and that the financial feasibility study done for the first phase will be replicated for subsequent phases. There will be a better understanding of the financial feasibility and fiscal neutrality questions once we are clear on the development programs. Member Daysog further discussed his concern regarding the Measure A and non-Measure A options, and Phase I revenue generation. Mr. Proud explained that projections made in the document have a built-in fiscal mitigation payment which will come directly from project proceeds to offset public expenditures and public revenues that we collect. Member Daysog requested more detail and clarity on the property taxes for use on a range of services; he also requested a better understanding on the fiscal mitigation payment and operational issues.

Member deHaan addressed issues in the body of the PDC and, with the consensus of the other board members, requested several action items to be completed by staff:

1. Expand the paragraph in the Next Steps chapter to elaborate on the Historic Preservation – what the Navy is doing concurrent with us on their studies.
2. Provide more clarity on the commercial development plan for the 336,000 sq. ft. of retail and identify the commercial endeavors being pursued.
3. Provide separate analysis (off-agenda) on the HazMat clean-up, scenario of costs between single family vs. multi family, etc. for financial feasibility.
4. Regarding the timeline and series of studies to be completed on the Historic

Preservation: Emphasize the need to get information at the earliest possible date so that the information could be used in the process of developing a plan which is then ultimately evaluated in the EIR, and NOT when the final EIR comes out.

5. Appendix E - What would Phase I of Fiscal Mitigation payment be? And an explanation of why we are not contemplating municipal services fee (like Bayport)?
6. Continued emphasis that this "Preliminary" plan document is a step to a "Final" plan.

All Boardmembers accepted staff recommendation to bring back a Final version of the PDC in February 2006.

4. ORAL REPORTS

4-A. Oral report from Member Matarrese, RAB representative.

Boardmember Matarrese reported on the RAB meeting from November because he did not attend the Dec. meeting (he was attending D.A.R.E.) There was a presentation on the remediation strategies for Site 27, between Appezzato Memorial Parkway and Nelson's Marine. There were a wide range of options (9 remediation strategies), and there was a uniform recommendation and vote to advise the Navy to use the most efficient and rapid remediation strategy.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA (PUBLIC COMMENT)

Marilyn York, Barbara Bach, and Ken Robles of the Alameda Naval Air Museum spoke about their proposed 10-year lease. Chair Johnson advised that they are looking forward to receiving the lease for review but have not seen it come to the Board yet.

6. COMMUNICATIOS FROM THE GOVERNING BODY.

Boardmember Daysog requested the Board address Gail Greeley's issues regarding Home Sweet Home and moving a portable building. Member Matarrese requested an off-agenda report addressing this same issue.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting was adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Irma Glidden
ARRA Secretary

