

APPROVED PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, JANUARY 28, 2013

1. CONVENE: 7:04 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Board member Knox White
3. ROLL CALL: Present: President Zuppan, Vice-President Burton, Board members Henneberry (arrived at 7:45 p.m.), and Knox White.

Absent: Board Member Köster

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:

None

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None

6. CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 6-A. Zoning Administrator and Design Review Pending and Recent Actions and Decisions.

Board Member Henneberry motioned to approve the consent calendar.
Board Member Knox White seconded the motion.
Motion carried 4-0; no abstentions.

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 7-A. **Hold a Public Scoping Meeting for the Environmental Impact Report for the Alameda Point Project; Designate an Alameda Point Planning Board Sub-Committee; and Approve a Community Engagement Strategy for Alameda Point.** The applicant, the City of Alameda, is proposing to prepare and adopt zoning ordinance amendments, a Master Infrastructure Plan, a Town Center and Waterfront Precise Plan, and associated General Plan and Zoning Amendments to guide and direct the future reuse and redevelopment of Alameda Point consistent with the Community Reuse Plan and General Plan. The Planning Board will also hold a scoping session for an Environmental Impact Report evaluating the proposed amendments. Alameda Point is located on lands west of Main Street in western Alameda, California. The January 28, 2013 public hearing is an opportunity for members of the public to identify specific issues to be addressed in the plans or the EIR.

President Zuppan stated that the item will be heard in two separate comment periods, the first one being the EIR and the second being the General Plan and Zoning Amendments.

Andrew Thomas, City Planner, gave a presentation outlining the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), the conforming zoning, the Town Center and Waterfront Precise Plan, and the Master Infrastructure Plan (MIP). He stated that the City will use the Planning Board and the public hearing forum as the base to get the community together to discuss the plans for Alameda point. He also mentioned that a Planning Board sub-committee will be formed to steer the process and ensure all agencies and community groups' involvement in the process. He stated that the plan includes 1,425 housing units located throughout the project.

President Zuppan opened the public comment period for the EIR.

Doug Biggs, Alameda Point Collaborative (APC), stated that the EIR should address quality of life issues for the existing Alameda Point residents during construction such as noise and air quality. He stressed a diversity of housing types and jobs for Alameda residents.

Gary Bard, resident and member of the Golden Gate Audubon Society, questioned why the designation on the map no longer states wildlife refuge and is now mapped as federal land. He stated that there should be close interaction between the City's DEIR process and the federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process for the Department of Veteran's Affairs (VA) clinic.

Diane Lichtenstein, Housing Opportunities Make Economic Sense (HOMES), stated concern for the employment opportunities for local residents and feels that the EIR should address relocating the existing Alameda Point residents during construction. She would like to see a more flexible list of uses to consider changes over time and for the mixed use area to be more integrated. She asked what is the difference between "work-live" and "workplace" housing and there should more types of potential housing listed. A mix of uses should be encouraged to be developed, not simply permitted. She agrees that the EIR should be coordinated with the VA clinic NEPA process.

Helen Sause, HOMES, stated the project should include a mix of uses interwoven together along with trails and parks like other areas of Alameda and the streets should connect to existing neighborhoods. She stresses that an exceptional design should be provided; no "snout houses" where the garages are the most prominent features. She stated there should be a mix of housing types and residents' incomes. And a rigorous design review process should be put into place. Also community facilities like a post office, hotel, school, and the like should be included. Ms. Sause stated there should be at least 4,500 units of housing and stated concern over traffic.

William Smith, resident, stated that the traffic impacts in Oakland should be considered in the process and the plan should include more dense and multi-family housing to generate revenue to improve the infrastructure. Also because multi-family housing helps preserve the environment and preserve historic resources, and results in more transportation options like transit. He supports coordination with the VA NEPA process and questions the "loss" of the wildlife refuge on the maps.

Chuck Kapelke, resident, stated the project should include an urban forest between various neighborhoods to provide corridors for wildlife. He feels the existing condition at Alameda Point has "interesting" aesthetic qualities and he sees value in the historic buildings. He supports coordination with the VA NEPA process and questions the "loss" of the wildlife refuge on the maps.

Larry Tong, East Bay Regional Park District, stated that the East Bay Regional Park District owns the Bay Trail within the AP project site, along with other facilities south of West Hornet Avenue. EBRPD looks forward to working with the City and participating in the plan.

Laura Thomas, Renewed Hope, reiterated that the plan should provide more housing, a minimum of 4,500 units stating that the development will depend on housing because the employment aspect is uncertain. She stated that multifamily housing generates less greenhouse gases than single-family units and the streets should be narrow with more bikeways, transit, and parks.

Jon Spangler, resident, stated the EIR must evaluate hazardous materials because Alameda Point is a Superfund site. He agrees that the plan should have more housing and while he supports the 4,500 units others have suggested, he could live with 3,000 to 3,500 units if carbon emissions are shown to be lower. He is concerned that the Navy's cleanup of Alameda Point is not good enough as the members of the Alameda Point Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) have mentioned, and with regards to future parks and housing people need the ability to garden in the ground and not in pots. Pursuant to Assembly Bill 32, Alameda Point should reduce the City's carbon footprint. He believes the development should meet LEED standards, as per the Calthorpe Plan which should be an alternative in the EIR. The City will have to find other sources of funding to provide Bus Rapid Transit to Fruitvale BART and downtown Oakland. He supports coordination with the VA NEPA process and questions the "loss" of the wildlife refuge on the maps. The EIR should address environmental justice issues raised previously.

George Humphreys, Reuse Advisory Board (RAB), stated the sea level rise will be 5 feet by the year 2100, and beyond that are recurring large storms, such as the winter 1861-62 during which storms lasted from December into February. He believes that Alameda Point developers should be required to raise the land by 5 feet to account for sea level rise. He questioned building high-density development in a flood-prone area like Alameda Point. He stated that there is contamination in the Seaplane Lagoon and also radioactive contamination underground in Building 5 and a plume of groundwater contamination in Area 25, Coast Guard North. Also in the Town Center, the Navy is only cleaning up the area to industrial standards, which will take 15 years.

Susan Galleymore, RAB, stated the EIR should address the effects of contamination on residents, visitors, and employees at Alameda Point and there should be an analysis of the interaction of multiple contaminants acting together. She mentioned NASA's Environmental Issues Management Plan for the former Moffett Field.

Lois Pryor, resident, agreed with past speakers regarding the housing and the plan should

include a mixed-use development and workforce housing.

Dale Smith, RAB, stated that the RAB members should be included on the stakeholders list for the Alameda Point project. She stated that the large contamination plume adjacent to Seaplane Lagoon precludes any construction there, even for employment uses, according to EPA standards. Also she believes it's not necessary to retain all buildings in the historic district as there are many non-contributory buildings that could be demolished without major impacts.

President Zuppan closed the public comment period for the EIR.

President Zuppan asked why the designation on the map no longer states wildlife refuge and is now mapped as federal land.

Jennifer Ott, Chief Operating Officer, Alameda Point, stated that the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Navy are preparing a NEPA document for the proposed VA clinic. Work on this project has been ongoing for several years, but the VA finally obtained a favorable Biological Opinion from USFWS in August 2012, and the project is now moving forward again and it will involve a transfer of some federal land from the Navy to the VA for an outpatient clinic and columbarium. Ms. Ott said the VA and Navy will conduct public outreach, but no dates have been set. Also the Navy was originally going to transfer the land to USFWS for a formal wildlife refuge, but that plan fell through which is why the current maps identify "federal lands" rather than "wildlife refuge"; although the City remains supportive of a refuge, there is no formal plan to create one. She did mention however, much of the federal land around the old runways, where least tern live, will remain undeveloped.

Board member Knox White stated that he wants an analysis of the fiscal feasibility of the Alameda Point plan and the EIR should do this in connection with the Plans & Policies analysis, since it is a policy of the City that redevelopment of Alameda Point should be economically viable. Also regarding EIR alternatives, he mentioned the Wilson, Roberts, and Todd (WRT) Station Area Plan and should be an evaluation done regarding concentrating most housing near the Seaplane Lagoon, with some but less in the Residential Area, so that some land currently proposed for housing could be open space.

Vice President Burton stated that the plan needs to look at different types of housing agreeing that higher density housing will have less traffic and environmental impacts. He also stated that the City needs to find out the minimum density necessary to support transit at Alameda Point.

President Zuppan stated that the EIR should address "heat islands" and "wind tunnels"; also, light pollution from street lighting, and effects on both humans and wildlife.

Mr. Thomas stated that the EIR does not evaluate fiscal issues. The Plans and Policies analysis does evaluate consistency with every City policy. Regarding transit, the City cannot depend on regional transportation funding and the redevelopment of Alameda Point

assumes that there will be a funding requirement to support transit, similar to what is done currently at Alameda Landing, where the fee is \$300 per dwelling unit per year.

Board member Henneberry stated that a lot of work has been done and believes a lot of work still needs to be done.

Ms. Ott stated that there are a lot of questions about how the infrastructure and the project will be paid for. She also stated that the current reuse plan requires no payment to the Navy for the conveyance of the land but adding additional housing would trigger a financial penalty that the City must pay to the Navy for all market-rate units in excess of the 1,425 units in the Reuse Plan.

President Zuppan opened the public comment period for the General Plan and Zoning Amendments..

Erin Fisher, current resident of Alameda Point stated that the Port of Oakland's containers frequently make loud noise when being dropped and that should be considered in planning for new residents. She is concerned about displacement of existing residents.

Elizabeth Krase Greene, resident stated that the Historic buildings are located "all over" AP, not just in the historic district. Some buildings can be adaptively reused. The color scheme on the maps should be less opaque so it's possible to identify buildings and streets beneath the colors. Also she would like to see the Bachelor Officers Quarters (BOQ) renovated and used as a hotel or senior housing.

Karen Bey, resident, stated she would like to see more mixed-use development on Main Street and believes more housing is necessary to help pay for the infrastructure. She also would not like to see any large "super stores" on the property.

Jon Spangler, resident, wants to know when the Government will hold hearings regarding the NEPA process.

Chuck Kapelke, resident, would like to see the development a model for sustainability. He stated that the Community Engagement Plan needs to have material in understandable English to ensure that people can understand what is going on. He suggested the City set up an interactive web blog to track the discussion amongst community members.

President Zuppan closed the public comment period for the General Plan and Zoning Amendments.

Board member Henneberry stated that he believes the homes currently on the property should be retained and also agrees that large format stores be prohibited.

Board member Knox White stated that he is concerned that a lot of the Planning Board prior zoning discussions are not being incorporated in the current document. He would like to see the Navy step up and complete the conveyance of land. He also would like the City Council to be engaged in the project prior to the end of the process.

Vice President Burton suggested that staff meet with reporters and do op-ed letters to keep the community engaged and informed.

President Zuppan stated that the City needs to look at the entire project as a whole. She added additional groups to the stakeholders list and suggested that staff meet with the tenants at Marina Village to ask what works and what doesn't work.

The motion was made by Board member Knox White to continue the meeting past 10:30 p.m. Seconded by Board member Henneberry. Approved 4-0

Mr. Thomas reviewed the next steps.

Ms. Ott stated that she would like to revise the Vision Statement as a first step.

The motion was made by Board member Knox White to approve the Vision Ad Hoc committee. Seconded by Board member Henneberry. Approved 4-0

President Zuppan appointed the following members to the Vision Ad Hoc committee: President Zuppan, Vice President Burton, and Board member Henneberry.

8. MINUTES:

Minutes of September 10, 2012-Continued due to lack of quorum.

Minutes of October 22, 2012-Approved as amended.

Minutes of December 10, 2012 (Pending)

Minutes of January 15, 2013 (Pending)

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Written Report

None.

9-A. Future Agendas

Andrew Thomas, City Planner, provided an overview of upcoming projects.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

13. ADJOURNMENT: 10:40 p.m.