

Councilmember Daysog quoted former Councilmember Doug deHaan: “make sure to keep an eye on the out years;” Council should not just looking at FY 2016-17, but the years beyond.

Mayor Spencer inquired whether Council can see 5 year projections or preferably 10 to 15 year projections.

The City Manager responded 5 years is typically as far out as a city goes because of the volatility of the economy.

Councilmember Oddie stated that he would like to make sure there is not a false narrative that the City is running a deficit; in the first year of the 2 year cycle, the City is not running a deficit and has more revenue than expenses; the City’s fund balance has increased; the City needs to look long term about how positions will be funded.

Mayor Spencer stated that she agrees; the City needs to look long term; the City has contracts that are long term and needs to look at liabilities that go beyond 2 years; in the future, she would like to see two actions brought in separate parts to allow two motions; she will not be supporting the single motion.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he will support the motion because the positive revenue allows the City to get to the end of the fiscal year, which provided the ability to deal with immediate needs like the funding for rent stabilization; he will also support the motion because Council is giving authority to fill vacant positions, not add positions.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated the State increased minimum wage to \$15 an hour; it is difficult to live off of \$15 an hour; Council should not begrudge the part time workers making minimum wage.

On the call for the original question, the motion carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: Councilmembers Daysog, Ezzy Ashcraft, Matarrese and Oddie – 4. Noes: Mayor Spencer – 1.

(16-191) Recommendation to Authorize the Mayor to Send a Letter Encouraging the Owner to Comply with the Rent Review Advisory Committee (RRAC) Recommendations. Withdrawn.

(16-192) Provide Direction to Staff Regarding General Plan Policies, Municipal Code Requirements and Potential Amendments to the General Plan and Municipal Code to address Development Sites with Mixed Use (MX) Zoning.

The City Planner gave a Power Point presentation.

Stated staff report Exhibit 3, the Alameda Marina Master Plan, needs changes; staff needs clarify the guidelines for preparing the master plan; the paragraph referencing

multi-family residential uses should be removed from the document; there is not enough land at the marina to preserve the existing maritime business and build houses; a shuttle crossing at the marina is not practical; she supports the changes proposed by Save Alameda's Working Waterfront (SAWW): Dorothy Freeman, Alameda.

Stated her business is exploring all options to remain in Alameda; one main objective is to maintain as many jobs as possible; they will continue to work with the City, the tenants and the community to fulfill their obligations under the tidelands lease, including the infrastructure improvements the marina desperately needs: Sabrina Svendsen, Svendsen's Boat Works.

Stated that he looks forward to continuing to work with the City, the tenants and the community on developing a master plan for Alameda Marina that serves Alamedans; the plan will consider multi-family housing types to address Alameda's housing shortage and preserve and enhance jobs, including traffic mitigation; Sean Murphy, Bay West Development and Alameda Marina.

Provided a handout; stated that he hopes to preserve Alameda's unique, craftsperson, maritime employment; there used to be four boatyards, now Svendsen's and half of Alameda Marina are the only places people can go get boats fixed in the City: Tomas Charon, SAWW.

Stated that she is a business owner in the Alameda Marina; she appreciates Council looking at the issue and the value of the maritime jobs; there are a lot of interactions between the business owners in the area: Liz Taylor, Alameda.

Stated the uses in the estuary have changed; there is an opportunity for commercial development and a need for housing developments; invited people to attend the Alameda Home Team panel discussions of the issues; suggested Council consider the opportunity to work with Oakland: Helen Sause, Alameda Home Team.

Stated that he is concerned with housing being built in the Alameda Marina because of the trucks and tractors delivering items to his business; there is no parking in the area; inquired if the tractors will have the ability to turn with the bike lanes being added; stated a lot of people do business at 6:00 a.m., which will bother residents if housing is built: Brendan Sullivan Serinana, Alameda Marina.

Stated SAWW wants commercial, industrial, a little bit of retail and if there has to be housing, that it be work/live housing; dry storage cannot go away in the location; parking is very hard to find; she is concerned that the historic buildings not be overlooked and harmed: Nancy Hird, SAWW.

Expressed surprise that a renter on the Rent Review Advisory Committee appeared speaking against affordable housing; stated he moved to Alameda because of the maritime focus in the community; he hopes the sailing community and the maritime community can work with the developer to preserve as much of the community as

possible for the City and the region; Alameda needs work force housing; housing is not at odds with preserving maritime jobs at the site: Brian McGuire, Alameda.

Stated that he supports affordable housing; housing pays for infrastructure that Alameda needs; encouraged the City to move forward on developing plenty of affordable housing: Doyle Saylor, Renewed Hope.

Stated bringing housing to the Alameda Marina would solidify the maritime tradition in Alameda and enhance economic viability; the recreational activities and jobs at the maritime need to be preserved; adding housing will not detract from the marina; more people living by the waterfront will get more people to go sailing and have boats; the money from the housing will support infrastructure: Laura Thomas, Renewed Hope.

Stated the northern waterfront is a great asset; it is important to continue to create an environment to attract jobs; encouraged the Council to develop the northern waterfront and look at this project as a tremendous opportunity for growth: Karen Bey, Alameda.

Stated that she supports the MX approach; the Alameda Marina is a primary resource for boaters; boaters are not allowed to use the marina currently and are being turned away; suggested maintaining the marina as it is and properly utilizing the property: Maggie Sabovich, Pacific Inter-Club Yacht Association/Recreational Boaters of California.

Thanked the Council for committing to the northern waterfront; stated \$30 million is needed for infrastructure and fixing up the wharf; Tim Lewis Communities (TLC) has held tours to get public input on the master plan; urged Council to embrace the General Plan policies that exist and allow TLC to create the most of the mixed-use with the commitment to the public waterfront access which is mandated for the northern waterfront site: Mike O'Hara, TLC.

Stated that he moved to Alameda for its charm and surrounding water; he sails small boats out of the marina; without the marina, there will be little left of Alameda's maritime heritage: Brian Schumacher, Alameda.

Stated that he and his friends have a lot of boats in the marina; urged Council to keep the marina alive; invited people to attend the Island Yacht Club open house on May 28th: Paul Mueller, Oakland.

Stated Alameda Marina is a unique community and there is nothing like it; dry storage is hard to find; the marina is a regional resource, not just for Alameda: Alan Hebert, Menlo Park.

Stated the 84 businesses at the Alameda Marina represent about 200 workers: Gretchen Lipow, Alameda Citizens Taskforce.

Mayor Spencer called a recess at 10:10 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 10:20 p.m.

Vice Mayor Matarrese stated there are three MX zones that are vastly different; it is important to maintain jobs and create new jobs; he would like staff review the SAWW guideline edits; the language needs to be stronger: “maintain the jobs” not “encourage jobs;” there should be heavy discussion on what kind of jobs will be created; Alameda Marina is an industrial site; he does not want residents coming to Council regarding the tractors or businesses starting at 6:00 a.m.; the deed restriction is an excellent idea; the interface between residential and commercial has to be considered; work/live units might provide the market rate income the developer needs to provide affordable housing or infrastructure; the goal for Alameda Marina is to take advantage of the many mariners and preserve and develop maritime businesses; he would like the Planning Board to consider the jobs that are being delivered; as the City goes through each site application, numbers are allocated towards the regional housing needs.

Councilmember Oddie stated that he is concerned when people say there is a surplus of housing; there is not a surplus in housing, there is a shortage; encouraged people to look at the Legislative Analyst Office Report discussing California’s high housing costs; read part of the summary of MX Zoning that states there is flexibility; stated the guidelines are a little premature right now; adopting guidelines when there has not been a full community discussion is premature; encouraged SAWW and Renewed Hope to continue to be involved in the process and work with the developer; stated he values preserving, protecting, maintaining and expanding the existing and new maritime economy; a lot of docks, wharfs and infrastructures in Alameda is deteriorating and needs fixing; he would like to see the City raise money for repairs; housing and development and traffic will always be an issue; the City needs to step up and address the housing issues.

Councilmember Ezzy Ashcraft stated local issues should not be looked at one at a time in a vacuum; there is a need to preserve the working waterfront and the maritime uses; it is possible to preserve the working waterfront on a smaller footprint and restore the uses; Alameda needs housing and any housing added takes pressure off the City’s current limited supply; the fees that developers pay in California are the highest in the nation and the City expects a lot from developers; she does not feel the rules should be changed in the middle of the process; suggested staying the course; stated that she feels the City can receive good projects out of the plan the way the regulations are now fashioned.

Councilmember Daysog stated his vision is for the northern waterfront area to be aligned well with the Citywide Transit Plan; he would like residents and other stakeholders to work things out; if he does not like a project, he will not vote for it; his vision for the area is: a viable working waterfront area; he would like to know that whatever is done will result in real usage of alternative modes of transit; he would like to see variety in the area; he is accountable to the citizens of Alameda and is confident the end result will be something people will be proud of.

Mayor Spencer stated that she has concerns when Council is asked to put something in writing and vote on an issue; it is important to give feedback as soon as possible to give the developers an opportunity to hear from the City; her priority is to the shortage of affordable housing and work force housing; there is not a shortage of market rate, high end housing; the City needs developers that can build housing that people in the middle can afford; she would like the City to look at live-aboard housing; she has heard people cannot find a space to live-aboard; live-aboard should count as housing; she feels work/live should count as housing because the City is trying to offer jobs that are mid-level and high-level so people can have a job in town and live here; supporting the remaining working waterfront is critical; Alameda is one of the few areas that has a working waterfront; questioned how the City can protect the jobs and the maritime; stated historical buildings are an important part of Alameda; she would like the building height to allow residents to see the water; when residential is placed right next to commercial, the City gets complaints; the project has to make sense.

(16-193) Mayor Spencer stated a motion is needed to continue past 11:00 p.m.

Councilmember Daysog moved approval [of continuing past 11:00 p.m.].

Mayor Spencer seconded the motion, which FAILED by the following voice vote: Ayes: Councilmember Daysog and Mayor Spencer – 2. Noes: Councilmembers Ezzy Ashcraft, Matarrese and Oddie – 3, which did not allow discussion of the agenda item to be completed.

CITY MANAGER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA

None.

COUNCIL REFERRALS

None.

COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no motion to continue at 11:00 p.m., Mayor Spencer adjourned the meeting