

APPROVED MINUTES  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD  
MONDAY, APRIL 26, 2021

1. CONVENE

President Alan Teague convened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

*This meeting was via Zoom.*

2. FLAG SALUTE

3. ROLL CALL

Present: Board Members Curtis, Hom, Rothenberg, Cisneros, Ruiz, Saheba, and Teague.  
Absent: None.

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

President Teague consulted with Allen Tai, City Planner, and then clarified that the agenda order would be 7-B, 7-C, and then 7-A.

President Teague also clarified that 7-A would be a discussion on the scope of the EIR (Environmental Impact Report) and not a discussion on the General Plan.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

None.

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

**7-B 2021-860**

*Public Hearing to Consider: 1) a Draft Resolution Recommending Council adopt a Resolution Containing Findings of Local Climatic, Geological, Topographical, and Environmental Conditions as Required to Adopt Alameda Local Amendments to the 2019 California Energy Code; 2) A Draft Resolution Recommending that Council introduce an Ordinance Amending the Alameda Municipal Code by Amending 13-11 (Alameda Energy Code) of Chapter XIII, Article I (Uniform Codes Relating to Building, Housing, and Technical Codes) to Make Local Amendments to the 2019 California Energy Code; and a Recommendation that the Council rescinds Resolution 15607 Limiting Natural Gas Infrastructure for New Residential Construction on City-Owned Property.*

Danielle Mieler, Sustainability and Resilience Manager, introduced the item and gave the presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4913556&GUID=D03018E1-B78C-4DAE-8B76-1862FE538D8A&FullText=1>.

President Teague opened the board's clarifying questions.

Board Member Rona Rothenberg wanted to know why air conditioning was called out as "baseline" as opposed to other common applications in this climate which was not as intensive in air conditioning as a particular application.

Staff Member Mieler said that calling out the air conditioning was standard practice in new development. She also introduced Farhad Farahmand, a consultant, who had been advising the staff on this ordinance.

Farhad Farahmand, TRC Energy Consultant, explained the underlining reasons for the air conditioning assumption.

Board Member Hanson Hom asked for clarification that this ordinance would only apply to new structures and would not apply to ADU's if the main structure was already gas. Also, if a person were to completely remodel their kitchen (complete tear-out) he assumed this ordinance would not apply as well.

Staff Member Mieler said that was correct, this would be for completely new construction.

Board Member Ron Curtis was concerned about low-cost housing and wanted to know the total difference in utility cost from a completely electric house vs a gas-powered house.

Mr. Farahmand said unfortunately he did not have a complete answer right now. He said they were currently working on that analysis for the utilities. They were seeing it as being around seven dollars a month, couple hundred dollars a year based on surrounding utilities.

Board Member Curtis referred to the table in the presentation that showed that the electric dryer was six dollars more than a gas dryer, and the electric stove was a few more dollars a month than the gas stove.

Mr. Farahmand explained how these appliances do add increases but several other factors decrease. There was a balancing act between everything.

Board Member Curtis asked if a heat pump was more energy efficient than a furnace.

Mr. Farahmand said yes absolutely.

Board Member Curtis said good, he then reiterated his concerns about the monthly expenses for families in low-cost housing.

Staff Member Mieler added that with the addition of solar generation on the rooftops they eliminate the utility infill increase and even create some savings.

Vice President Asheshh Saheba had no questions at this time.

Board Member Xiomara Cisneros wanted to know more about how many of Alameda's citizens took advantage of the option of 100% clean energy.

Staff Member Mieler said that as of last year Alameda was providing 100% clean energy to all residents, you no longer have to opt into the clean energy program.

Board Member Cisneros asked about the outreach to developers and wanted to know what the response had been.

Staff Member Mieler said that they had two workshops with developers and there were no significant concerns. This was something that was happening in other cities already.

Andrew Thomas, Director of Planning Building and Transportation, added that the basic message from the developer's community was that they had seen this coming. They were mainly concerned about projects that were already approved or were in the middle of building permit review, many of these projects were already all-electric. He discussed how in the business community all the changes in Life Science and the exceptions granted if they need natural gas. He also discussed recent residential projects they were already all-electric.

Board Member Cisneros agreed that preparation was key. She was also interested and wanted to know more about electric transit.

President Teague asked if the calculation included both a heat pump for heating and cooling and a heat pump for hot water.

Mr. Farahmand said that was correct.

President Teague stated that the cost of heat pumps for hot water was significantly higher.

Mr. Farahmand said yes there were some cost increases depending on what model you get.

President Teague said he wanted someone to explain Exception 3 with the vegetated roof.

Mr. Farahmand said that the idea was to support a reduction in the Urban Heat Island Effect if the architect was to do so. Adding a vegetated roof was a significant consideration that needed a lot of structural work. This was about finding a balance with architectural flexibility.

President Teague asked if this would allow a reduction in the amount of solar they would have to do.

Mr. Farahmand said yes. In theory, you could install solar panels over a vegetated roof that would be up to the architect.

Board Member Teresa Ruiz wanted to know if AMP (Alameda Municipal Power) had reviewed the ordinance and if the infrastructure would be able to supply the future anticipated demand.

Staff Member Mieler said this ordinance was on a Public Utility Board Agenda for May 17th, before it goes to council. The General Manager had reviewed the ordinance and her understanding was that the utility could handle the increased demand.

President Teague opened public comment.

Ruth Abbe, from Community Action for Sustainable Alameda, wanted to give her full support for the adoption of the all-electric ordinance. The group had been giving its support to the city in its investigation of alternatives to natural gas. This plan makes sense for new buildings and new construction and the group was in full support of this measure.

Ashley Rybarczyk, an Alameda resident, an employee of KTG Architecture, and President of the Board of Director for AIA East Bay discussed the recent climate summit with President Biden and other world leaders and how this ordinance was very serendipitous and now was the time to take action against climate change. She encouraged Alameda to join all the other California communities that were already all-electric and to do its part.

Christy Cannon was very excited about this proposal. She was curious to know if there were any plans to incentivize solar panels on rooftops on commercial buildings.

Scott Shell thanked everyone for their work on this and was impressed with Alameda having 100% clean energy. He said paired with all electric buildings you will have carbon-neutral buildings, he congratulated the staff on that accomplishment. He added that he was an architect, a principal of EHDD Architecture, and had been designing all-electric buildings for 20 years and found it a very reliable, robust, and cost-effective solution for their clients. He was in full support of this ordinance.

President Teague closed public comments and opened board discussions and actions.

Board Member Rothenberg had two clarifications. On page 1 of the second resolution, she pointed out that the date should be April 26th, not the 27th. She then confirmed that they don't have to make a resolution just a recommendation.

Director Thomas concurred that they didn't need to adopt a resolution but rather just make a recommendation to the City Council.

Board Member Rothenberg said all of this work merits support and approval pending City Council consideration.

Board Member Hom said he strongly supported all three actions, he saw this as a step in the right direction. He felt that the staff report had done a great job in their analysis.

Board Member Curtis said he highly supported all three actions.

Vice President Saheba said all three actions were worthy of support and he was glad they were moving in this direction. He added that there were still some things with the Energy Code that needed to be coordinated.

Board Member Cisneros thanked everyone for their comments and was in strong support.

Board Member Ruiz said she was in support of all three recommendations but wanted to see this more refined and pushed even further. She suggested adding some incentives for future electrifying of existing homes and businesses. She also wanted to see a specific delegation for remodeled homes and flexibility around the 15% roof square footage requirement for PV systems.

President Teague thanked the staff and everyone who worked on this. He asked why the PV system was limited to 15%, why couldn't they do more?

Staff Member Mieler said the intent was not to limit it to 15%.

Mr. Farahmand said that was correct, it was a minimum of 15%.

President Teague also asked about the wording and the intent for the vegetated roof.

Mr. Farahmand agreed on a modification to the language.

President Teague asked about Ultra Pure White (reflective coating) and painting the roof with this. He wanted to know if this could be factored in.

Mr. Farahmand said that was a Cool Roof Measure, and they would need to look at the economic benefits.

President Teague asked if a vegetated roof was a Cool Roof Measure or a carbon-sequestering type method.

Mr. Farahmand said it wasn't an efficiency measure but it had benefits.

**Board Member Rothenberg made a motion to recommend that the City Council adopt the resolution containing findings of Local Climatic, Geological, Topographical, and Environmental Conditions as required to adopt Alameda Local Amendments to the 2019 California Energy Code. Board Member Curtis seconded the motion and a roll call vote was taken, the motion passed 7-0.**

**Board Member Curtis made a motion to recommend that the City Council approve the all-electric ordinance with the amendments of altering the 15% for rooftop PV systems, clarifying the vegetated roof, remodeled homes would be completely excluded, and building footprints have some equivalency for compliance. Board Member Hom seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 7-0.**

### **7-C 2021-861**

*Proposed Citywide Text Amendments to the City of Alameda Zoning Ordinance (AMC Chapter 30) to Modify Public Art Requirements. Applicant: City of Alameda. Public hearing to consider proposed amendments to Alameda Municipal Code Chapter 30. The proposed amendments are exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15061(b)(3) and 15303.*

Amanda Gehrke, Development Manager with the Community Development Department, introduced this item and gave a presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4913557&GUID=D73EB5AD-77DB-4592-9002-664B3AE8EB5B&FullText=1>.

Staff Member Tai also discussed the upcoming Housing Element Update and how state law required they look at any local requirements that present governmental constraints or barriers to housing. That would be part B of this exercise.

President Teague opened the board's clarifying questions.

Board Member Rothenberg asked about the mixing of operating and capital funds and how that was being managed. She then asked about equity and the exception of establishing a lower public art requirement for affordable housing, she thought there should be equally accessible art regardless of the income of the residents.

Staff Member Gehrke said the maintenance costs that were being proposed, that fund would only be for artwork owned by the city and on city property. She explained how art was managed on public and private property.

Lois Butler, Economic Development Manager with Community Development, also commented that City departments are committed to the maintenance of the art pieces but

in extreme cases, with art that hadn't been maintained, they were asking that maintenance funds be available.

Board Member Rothenberg said that answered her question in some way but not completely.

Staff Member Butler added that regarding capital and operational, the public art fund currently was just operational, it is not considered capital monies with the City of Alameda.

Board Member Rothenberg asked if it was consistent with the General Plan to make sure art was commissioned to be available to diverse populations regardless of income.

Staff Member Butler said she understood the question. Currently, the staff and Community Development recommended they continue with the 1% in public art, down the line they may have a different recommendation for those fees.

Board Member Rothenberg pointed at page 2 of the staff report under Further Evaluation - she wanted to state for the record that they should not establish a lower public art requirement for affordable housing. Art should be equitably and commensurately available for all types of applications and should not intentionally penalize lower-cost housing or lower-income populations.

Board Member Hom asked about the maintenance and that if it was mainly for art on public property and that the ordinance was not clear about. He wanted to know more about the intent.

Staff Member Gehrke answered that the intent was that it would be used for public art on public property.

Board Member Hom said to him the language was unclear on the use of the maintenance funds. He also asked for further explanation on how different departments would be responsible for maintaining the public art.

Staff Member Butler explained that before art would be placed on public property within the city it must have a sponsor. She explained past pieces of art and how certain departments had agreed to maintain the art before it was installed.

Board Member Hom asked about a process question in the ordinance. It said that the developer needed to identify if they planned to do art or pay the in-lieu fee and show the location of the public art. It then goes on to say that the Community Development Director could change the location of the art piece but he wanted to know what would happen if the Arts Commission wants the art to stay in the original location of the Planning Approval.

Staff Member Butler said the process was they wanted the developer to decide before they get approval for their entitlements for planning. The developers can present to the Arts Commission where they want the piece to go but once it goes to the Planning Commission they cannot just arbitrarily move it. The Director of Community Development could also not arbitrarily approve a move, it would have to go back to the Arts Commission.

Board Member Hom said the language was not quite clear to him. He then asked about the requirement of having public art provided by Non-Profits and wanted to know if there were any issues around that.

Staff Member Gehrke explained the difference between physical art and cultural art. The requirements Non-Profits only applied to the cultural arts. Physical artists are not required to be Non-Profit.

Board Member Hom asked if for Affordable Housing Projects could one of the waivers be to the 1% Public Art Requirement, could it be eligible for a State Density Bonus waiver.

Director Thomas said that someone could request that waiver today as part of their waivers or concessions under state law. They would have to revisit this conversation about the costs of building houses in Alameda.

Board Member Hom said it sounded like a topic for a broader discussion.

Director Thomas continued by saying this issue had come up before. He discussed current projects and what the public art portion was for those projects.

Staff Member Butler added that the Public Arts Commission had voted on this twice, first to remove the cap and then recently to keep the cap removed. She said if they were going to reconsider that cap it would be great to have the Public Arts Commission and the Planning Board meet together jointly.

Director Thomas added that the plan was not to isolate public art.

Board Member Curtis clarified that the fund would be used for the acquisition (capital) or maintenance (operational).

Staff Member Gehrke said that was correct, that staff is proposing that the fund could be allowed for maintenance. She added that part of it could also go to Cultural Grants. It was used to fund or implement public art in Alameda which could have a broad range of items.

Board Member Curtis asked if Low-Cost Housing could ask for a waiver for the art fee.

Staff Member Gehrke said that right now 100% affordable housing project was exempt from the Public Art Ordinance.

Board Member Curtis gave an example of a developer who was unable to pay the public art fee and the project was in danger of not happening. What options did the developer have?

Staff Member Butler said for that example you could do a Development Agreement with the Planning Board.

Board Member Curtis asked if the Planning Board had the authority to recommend a waiver.

Director Thomas said this was a great question but this was something they would like to hold off on. He wanted to bring this conversation back at a later date to look at everything holistically.

President Teague reminded everyone to focus on the proposed changes as opposed to other areas of the ordinance.

Vice President Saheba wanted to know the percentages of projects that pay the in-lieu fee vs. on-site art.

Staff Member Gehrke said they did have that data but she did not have it at the moment. She would get him that information.

Vice President Saheba asked if this allowed for a split in allocation.

Staff Member Gehrke said they were.

Vice President Saheba asked how this fund was doing overall. Did it have enough to do the maintenance that staff believed was required?

Staff Member Gehrke said the ordinance was adopted in 2003 and in the first 12-13 years there was about \$65,000 in the fund. In the last five years, it had grown and they had been able to give out about \$350,000 a few years ago. As of now, there were \$270,000 dollars in the fund.

Director Thomas commented that it was about a 50/50 split with big projects doing on-site art and the smaller projects tend to pay the in-lieu fee.

Staff Member Gehrke was able to confirm that Director Thomas was right on with the 50/50. She added that 75% of the money goes to on-site artwork.

Board Member Cisneros wanted more clarification on the recommendation for expenditures under \$75,000 dollars.

Staff Member Butler answered that the City Manager's signing authority only goes up to \$75,000. That was why any expenditures over that amount must go to City Council. She gave examples of projects that were over and said this was just asking for a standard practice that currently happens in the city.

Board Member Ruiz wanted clarification that whatever they agreed on today it would potentially come back again for more changes as part of the Housing Element Review.

Director Thomas said no and explained they have an existing ordinance in place and the changes that were being recommended were meant to improve the implementation of that ordinance. It does not affect the amount of money they received or charge or the amount of art required of developers. He didn't see them coming back and undoing what they did tonight but instead coming back and tackling a different aspect of this ordinance.

Board Member Ruiz asked about the list of definitions and pointed out that "Art Programming" was mentioned but not defined.

President Teague pointed out where that could be found.

Board Member Ruiz then asked if green walls were considered public art.

Staff Member Butler said that was a good question. It could be, it depended on how the green wall was constructed and if there was a bona fide artist that was integrating the green wall into a piece of art.

Board Member Ruiz asked for clarification on the definition they had on artists.

Staff Member Butler said as long as they were bona fide artists and can show they were artists and not operating as architects or engineers, as long as they were functioning as artists.

Board Member Ruiz suggested clarifying this definition since it sounded to her that the opposite could be true.

Staff Member Butler said that even if this ordinance was amended the commission still wouldn't have the authority to give out money but they could approve it. The City Manager would still have to sign an agreement.

President Teague said the goal then was to get the approval for small amounts of funds to be approved by someone other than the City Council to improve the turnaround time.

Staff Member Butler said that was correct.

President Teague said he was a little confused by the staff report and the presentation where it was required for developers to state their intent to either install or contribute but then in the ordinance they had to say exactly where they were going to install. He wanted to know what the intent was.

Staff Member Gehrke said the intention was to allow some flexibility around when they declared and by requiring them to identify a location early in the process it was a way to encourage them to decide what their plans are early in the process.

Staff Member Tai added that the intention was to make the developer think about public art early in the process and they could incorporate the art into the architecture or to reserve a place on the site plan so that it is not an afterthought.

President Teague opened public comments.

Adam Gillitt, Chairperson of the Alameda Public Art Commission, wanted to give his support to these ordinance changes. He discussed that currently the public art fund had no source of funding other than contributions from developers. Since 2007 just under half of 28 developers had chosen on-site art with other developers choosing to contribute to the fund. The recent influx in the fund had allowed the commission to create programs to disperse grants to artists while also being able to approve many projects. He discussed how they weighed many issues when they created these amendments, one being they reviewed their fee structure. He ended by saying their goal was to continue to support Alameda's community of artists and hoped the Planning Board supported these amendments to the Public Art Ordinance.

President Teague closed the public comments and opened board discussions.

Board Member Rothenberg agreed with President Teague that while the staff report was good it didn't tell the whole story of what they were trying to achieve. The intent had merit and she believed the changes as explained should have an overall benefit to the city. She also believed that the staff report belied that the ordinance revisions as indicated by the underlining text did something she didn't read in the report. She said there should be another bullet since there were two delegations of authority to the Community Development Director. She pointed out these examples and added that with delegations it needed to be as clear as possible. She believed that the proposals appeared to have merit subject to subsequent comments.

Board Member Hom thought the amendments were good. He had only one suggestion, he thought it would be good to clarify in section 30-98.10 that the Alameda Public Art Fund was only to be used for public art located on public property. He understood there could be exceptions.

Board Member Curtis said he could support 90% of this amendment. The part that gave him trouble was the first part that required the developer to declare their intentions to install the artwork and where they will install it onsite. He thought the rest of the amendments provided fiscal responsibility and flexibility on where the funding was going. He was concerned from the developer's standpoint and saw this as a distraction for the developer during the planning stage. He discussed how the developers had to juggle many things including overall costs. He said he would not support the part of the amendment about having developers declare at the onset but the rest he thought was great.

Vice President Saheba discussed the philosophical importance of art in the community and how it should enhance the environment it was in. He addressed Board Member Curtis's concern about declaring early and said it needed to be integral and shouldn't be an afterthought. He said there should be flexibility created for Affordable Housing and Landscape Art, they should be open to different ways of enhancing the environment. He said overall he supported these amendments but as they got closer to the Housing Element some other creative ideas needed to come about to reach the ultimate intent.

Board Member Cisneros also had concerns with making developers declare early when they were unsure of the future of their project. She was curious to know what the response and feedback had been from the developer community. She agreed there needed to be more flexibility added that other than that reservation she was generally supportive.

Board Member Ruiz said in general she supported the proposed amendments. While she did appreciate Board Member Curtis's comments and concerns for the Development Community, if you want a thoughtful and well-designed community in projects you would want to think about public art from the get-go and incorporate it as part of the overall project. She echoed Board Member Cisneros's comment about building in more flexibility that would allow the developers to change course later on if budget becomes an issue. She recommended adding green walls or living walls as part of classified public art. She spoke candidly about landscape architects who specialize in living walls who would do a better job than someone considered an artist. She did not want anything to limit the ability to create a better environment for the community. She wanted allocation to be clarified so a developer could do some onsite art and then the rest could go to the general fund. She also wanted the Art Commission to revisit the definitions for both the art and the artist.

President Teague thanked everyone for their work on this. He brought up section 30-98.6 which discussed findings, he wanted to know what stage was the Final Approval of the Development Project Application.

Director Thomas said he interpreted that as part of the Planning Entitlement, for most projects end with the Planning Board. He added that a Development Agreement never goes alone. He went on to say that the board had raised some very interesting considerations but that his experience with developers was that it was a good idea to force developers to think about the art early on.

President Teague said he could support a plan that where deciding early would not be a permanent decision. Before the design stage have developers issue a statement of what they plan to do and then as part of the Design Review Approval they must make the binding commitment. He would support something like this over the 30-98.6A clause. He also gave his thoughts on the grant program, maintenance fund, and the authorization of expenses.

Board Member Curtis wanted to be clear on how the ordinance is now, the developer was on the hook for paying the funds or doing the art themselves. He also liked the point about flexibility. He was concerned that the more inflexible it was in regards to what developers had to do early the more it would cost the developer to change the plans. He saw their job was to make things easier for developers while also protecting the citizens of Alameda.

Vice President Saheba noted the Del Monte project and how the City's process had been flexible to accommodate all the changes to that project over time. He believes the amendments should maintain flexibility.

Director Thomas said that does happen a lot with projects. His question was if a developer changes their mind in the building permit process, would it need to go back to the Planning Board to approve that change or could it just go back to the Art Commission.

Staff Member Butler interjected that it would go to the Director.

Director Thomas asked did the Planning Board want that authority or are they comfortable letting the Art Commission make the final decision.

Vice President Saheba noted that that would be similar to past projects where developer initiated changes required that they had to come back to the Planning Board.

Staff Member Butler said for those examples it would be part of the Conditions of Approval that it would have to come back because the PAC (Public Art Commission) wouldn't know about that.

Director Thomas said they would have to handle it on a case-by-case basis as with all other projects.

Board Member Curtis wanted to about the Right of Appeal.

Director Thomas broke down the different scenarios and why they would need to be handled differently.

Staff Member Butler added that currently if the developers don't agree with PAC they can appeal to the City Council.

Director Thomas said he had completely rethought this issue. He discussed how changes to plans are handled and they do come back to the Planning Board in some way.

Staff Member Butler described that the intent was not to delegate the authority of the PAC to the Planning Board but to have thoughtful planning of art. She suggested revisiting this part of the ordinance.

President Teague concurred that this did sound like it was part of the Design Review of a project.

Board Member Ruiz suggested striking out a sentence that would better define the intent. She thought that since it was the Director's discretion it would show up under Recent Actions and Decisions for Planning Board Meetings.

Director Thomas clarified that he was not the Director this would come back to, it would be the Director of the Community Development Department which is where the art program sits. He added what makes this awkward is that you have the Planning Board approving something and then a different group with the power to amend it.

Board Member Hom said it would be the minimum to have the developer say if they were doing onsite art or to pay the in-lieu fee. He also thought the PAC should be delegated the primary responsibility for reviewing and approving the art, not the Planning Board. He then discussed when exceptions should be allowed and where they can still have the flexibility for the developer.

Board Member Cisneros wondered if the developer had to declare the location of the art, she thought that having a general declaration of either providing onsite art or paying the in-lieu fee should be enough.

President Teague agreed that the planning stage was the appropriate time to identify an appropriate location for public art since they had not broken ground and it was early in the process.

President Teague asked the staff if they should modify these amendments now or did they want to bring this item back.

Vice President Saheba commented that the Planning Board would review everything from plant species being planted to every aspect of the design during the entitlement period so why not also be specific around the art. He still wanted the PAC to weigh in and that way whatever was recommended to the Planning Board would be through their lens.

Board Member Curtis thought they had reached a reasonable compromise by having the specificity be done at the Final Design Review and Approval. He thought this would give developers and boards enough time to resolve any outstanding issues. He also agreed

with Vice President Saheba that developers had to be specific about everything else and that they can also be specific about the proposed art.

Director Thomas said it would be part of the Design Review Approval for the project. He then discussed the process and when the staff could bring something back to the Planning Board. They would not be approving the art because that would still be with the PAC.

Board Member Ruiz asked if the Community Development Director's role would be struck out in this iteration.

Director Thomas said it would.

Staff Member Butler said if they were talking about location then the PAC was fine with that. She then said they could add that it be the Planning Director who it would go back to.

Board Member Hom and Director Thomas said it depended on the conditions.

Staff Member Butler and Director Thomas discussed the language in the provision about moving the location of the on-site art and what wording was unnecessary and what the role of the Director needed to be.

President Teague suggested striking a part to cause the process to fall in line with how other changes are handled.

Board Member Hom agreed and said letting the regular process to govern made sense. He was in favor of simplifying and deleting parts of the wording.

Staff Member Butler was concerned that with the new iteration it would not come back to the PAC at all.

After much discussion, it was decided to continue this item to the next meeting to revise the language.

Board Member Curtis wanted the language to give the most flexibility to the board to get things done quickly.

Board Member Hom wanted language that made it clear that money in the in-lieu fund was meant for maintenance for public art on public property.

Staff Member Butler also said they would clarify the language around the City Manager's expense limit.

**Board Member Hom made a motion to continue this item until the next meeting. Board Member Ruiz seconded and a roll call vote was taken. The motion passed 7-0.**

**7-A 2021-859**

*Public Hearing on the Alameda General Plan Update and the Scope of Environmental Impact Report.*

Director Thomas introduced this item. The staff report and attachments can be found at <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4913555&GUID=CA000393-667A-4AB4-9EDD-FC4CDD807FD7&FullText=1>.

President Teague opened the board's clarifying questions and public comments.

There were no public speakers.

President Teague closed public comments and opened board discussions.

Director Thomas said that the staff report that they were preparing for May 10th would have a lot of the same information.

**8. MINUTES**

**8-A 2021-858**

*Draft Meeting Minutes – March 8, 2021*

Board Member Curtis wanted to change his statement on page 6, it should say "stated" and not "addressed" and then on page 10 in his comment there should be a "not" in front of not having a master plan should "not" affect the city.

Board Member Hom said for item 7-B he clarified that his question should be "for properties with potential Density Bonus Units, could these units be counted in the RHNA". Then in the response from Director Thomas, it should be HCD. He also clarified his questions about lighting and that it had questions about Marina parking.

**Board Member Hom made a motion to approve the minutes with these corrections. Board Member Cisneros seconded the motion and a roll call vote was taken. The minutes passed 7-0.**

**9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**

**9-A 2021-856**

*Planning, Building and Transportation Department Recent Actions and Decisions*

Recent actions and decisions can be found at

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4913552&GUID=B1FF7DA4-9168-4AE7-A7B2-AA34EF75F603&FullText=1>.

Board Member Rothenberg wanted to pull for a review item **PLN20-0541 - Variance/Design Review - 910 Centennial Avenue.**

Staff Member Tai said that would be scheduled for a later meeting.

#### **9-B 2021-857**

*Oral Report - Future Public Meetings and Upcoming Planning, Building and Transportation Department Projects*

Staff Member Tai said that the next meeting on May 10, 2021 would be a joint meeting with the Transportation Commission, with a few items just for the Planning Board including the Public Art Ordinance. Then the following meeting on May 24, 2021 would include the study session on the Parking Ordinance Update.

Staff Member Gehrke asked that the Public Art Ordinance be pushed to the May 24th meeting due to both herself and Staff Member Butler being on vacation during the May 10th meeting.

President Teague said at the May 10th meeting they would ask to continue the item to May 24, 2021.

#### **10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

#### **11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS**

President Teague said he would be absent the second half of May so Vice President Saheba would be leading that meeting.

Board Member Cisneros wanted to if the next meeting would be an appropriate time to address her questions for the General Plan since she was coming in as a board member after previous meetings.

Staff Member Tai said the next meeting would be a workshop for the second draft of the General Plan and that it would be an appropriate time. He also said she was welcome to email staff any questions or comments.

President Teague asked Board Members Hom and Cisneros about providing dates and times for the subcommittee to meet.

Board Members Hom and Cisneros responded they had communicated with the staff.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Teague adjourned the meeting at 10:08 p.m.