

APPROVED MINUTES
JOINT MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD & HISTORICAL ADVISORY BOARD
MONDAY, JUNE 14, 2021

1. CONVENE

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

This meeting was via Zoom.

2. FLAG SALUTE

Board Member Teresa Ruiz led the flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL

Historical Advisory Board: Vice-Chair Sanchez and Board Members Lau, Jones, and Wit.

Absent: Chair Thomas Saxby.

Planning Board: President Teague and Board Members Cisneros, Hom, Rothenberg, and Ruiz.

Absent: Vice President Asheshh Saheba and Board Member Ron Curtis.

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

President Teague explained how the meeting would go and that staff had four slides that would cover all of the agenda items.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Mike Van Dine addressed the Historical Advisory Board's (HAB) recent decision to approve demolishing the remaining Merchant Marine WWII buildings on the McKay Ave parcel. He talked about Chair Saxby's words about the importance to the community these buildings had and how this historic site was not appropriate for the homeless shelter and how this should go to the City Council for a vote. He also disagreed with the City Planner's interpretation of the city's municipal code on historic monuments and felt that the HAB members were led astray by staff.

Carmen Reid referred to Alameda's municipal code to remind the HAB members of their role in the community and how they should protect any structures built before 1942.

Andrew Thomas, Director of Planning, Building, and Transportation, informed the speakers that the City Council would be reviewing the recent HAB decision for the McKay Ave project. The staff would be recommending that the City Council uphold the HAB's decision to grant the Certificate of Approval.

Chris Buckley, from the Alameda Architectural Preservation Society (AAPS), thanked the staff for including written communication with the agenda items. However, some of the

written communications had attachments that had not been included. He requested that for future meetings that the attachments please be included with the written communication.

Zac Bowling thanked the HAB for their recent decision about the proposed development at the McKay property. He believed the decision was thoughtful and the HAB had considered all the facts and the true historical nature of the site. He also acknowledged that his friend Alfred Twu wrote a children's book "RHNA: The House that Makes New Friends" that explained California's housing needs and development.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

None.

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

7-A 2021-1015

Public Hearing on the Alameda General Plan Update.

Director Thomas introduced the item and gave a presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4973464&GUID=3EA90382-595E-46CF-ACB0-EC556F65D2AC&FullText=1>.

President Teague reminded both boards that this was not an action item. He then opened the public comments.

Brendan Sullivan said he was pro-building and pro-housing. He wanted the General Plan to provide a clear strategy for prioritizing locations for RHNA mandated units. He recommended Alameda Point and the Northern Waterfront as possible development sites. He also encouraged the City to get the Navy to lift the Alameda Point Housing Development Cap. He believed that upzoning historical neighborhoods should be a last resort.

Carmen Reid asked that they not increase the two-story height limit. She believed that too many height increases in historic areas would degrade the area's sense of time and place. She also believed height increases in historic areas would encourage the disruption of architectural character. She believed it was very important for Alameda to maintain its historic character because it is the main attraction for living in and visiting Alameda.

Zac Bowling mentioned an email he had submitted, he also echoed the comments made by Dylan Parson, Renewed Hope, and Bike Walk Alameda. He said since this plan spans 20 years it did a good job for the first 15 but was concerned with the nature of RHNA whether the City can actually catch up to the housing demand. He agreed with the proposed plans around Park St and the transit corridors and that the height increases

were warranted. For the Harbor Bay Club, he thought it was a moot point since it was already zoned for housing.

William Smith applauded City staff for proposing that the City of Alameda affirmatively further fair housing by allowing multi-family housing in all residential and commercial mixed-use neighborhoods. He discussed the many benefits enabled by multifamily housing in all residential neighborhoods. He asked that the Planning Board members reach across the generational divide between boomers and millennials on housing. He wanted to see Alameda affordable for the working and middle class.

Charles Johnson discussed the Harbor Bay Club and its history. The club's purpose was to provide recreational facilities to the residents of Harbor Bay Isle and it essentially replaced open spaces in the confines of each neighborhood. He believed that removing this amenity from the planned development would be inequitable to the families who had purchased homes on Harbor Bay Isle. He discussed the many benefits of having access to the club and losing this amenity would be a huge blow to the 112 families who use it.

Bill Pai, the Board President of Harbor Bay Isle, also discussed the importance of the Harbor Bay Club. Last month the CHBIOA Board unanimously passed a resolution opposing the city's Draft General Plan which if approved as is would rezone the land currently occupied by the club and shopping center to allow the construction of multifamily housing. He believed the city was already strained in dealing with its infrastructure and thought that an increase in residents and housing would further overburden the infrastructure. The CHBIOA proposed to see the club's land use changed to business and employment and encouraged the city to take advantage of Alameda Point for multifamily housing.

Conchita Perales was concerned that the city was proposing a heavy increase in development in existing residential areas while reducing or removing parking requirements. She said if the City Council failed to appeal the RHNA numbers then they would be adding more than 25,000 people to the island in the next 8 years. She didn't understand the assumption that people would not be bringing their cars, she thought the plan was downplaying the traffic situation. She thought that new development should be limited to Alameda Point and the Northern Waterfront as much as possible.

Matt Reid discussed the importance of preserving Alameda's military history. He mentioned how neighboring cities had done a great job such as the Rosie the Riveter Museum in Richmond and thought that Alameda could be doing more. He hoped in the long-term vision they could incorporate how important Alameda's role in WWII was.

Reyla Graber discussed Article 26 and how it confirmed people's love of Alameda as it is and how the Mayor herself said that Alameda would continue to support Article 26. She was confused by why the General Plan proposed to allow multifamily development in the single-family area zones. The report said it would also be eliminating single-family zones.

She thought this was an outrageous step and should not be supported by any board members.

Betsy Mathieson was encouraged to have read that historic neighborhoods would look the same in 2040 as they do now however she wanted to see the action and policies in the General Plan strengthened to see that outcome. She stated that the historic neighborhoods have significantly more dwelling units than implied by the General Plan Zoning Maps. She was pleased that the draft document recognized the need to minimize the displacement of existing residents and urged the board not to create incentives for the demolition of already dense housing stock.

Mark Vine Dine discussed architectural design that would be affected by the General Plan, and he was not surprised that photos he had sent in showing modern design plopped next to Victorians had gone missing. He believed that policies LU-26B and LU-17B threatened the character of the historic neighborhoods. These new guidelines conflicted with the city's existing design policies. He didn't see the point in replacing the city's current Design Review policy. He wanted to see these guidelines revised to see a modern design in the city's new neighborhoods.

Dolores "Dodi" Kelleher, a member of the AAPS, spoke on the issue of where it would be best to build the densest housing. AAPS believed it would be best to prioritize Alameda Point and the Northern Waterfront, especially the estuary shopping centers, as possible sites for additional housing. The AAPS wanted the city to get the Federal Government to remove the housing cap, encourage the owners of the estuary shopping centers to develop housing on their properties, and look at the traffic around the South Shore Shopping Center.

Walt Jacobs did not believe they could do what the General Plan said it would do to the whole city. He thought the most obvious area for development was the base and said the city needed to go before the Navy and renegotiate the deal with them. He saw that as the best place to build much-needed housing and they could build the infrastructure needed. He wanted the rest of the island left alone, including Harbor Bay where he lived.

Daniel Hoy, who serves on the Board of Directors for the West Alameda Business Association (WABA), touched on some of the points WABA had sent in a letter. WABA had been trying to encourage development in their business district and hoped to see the changes outlined by the General Plan come to fruition. They had been in conversations with local developers who had many concerns. They wanted to see more clarity in the Land Use Policies.

Margaret Hall was confused by the LU17-B policy, she thought this policy threw past requirements out the window and found it to be very ambiguous. She wanted to see some language from the past General Plan retained for the new one. She wanted to see an emphasis on supporting and maintaining existing buildings.

Lesa Ross discussed the book "This is Where you Belong" which was all about loving where you live through the community. She was a Harbor Bay Club member and discussed how everyone was concerned and worried about losing the club. She discussed how important the club was and how the owners were not the voice for the community. She hoped they could come to a compromise to save the club and have some of the area developed for housing.

Christopher Buckley, of AAPPS, responded to LU17-B and LU26-B which were about architectural preservation. He gave some edits to the language that would make things more clear and helpful. He suggested having more pictures and definitions of design in the General Plan document since design could be very subjective. He asked that they be careful and limited with upzoning because he believes that once you upzone it will be very difficult to downzone again.

Donna Fletcher discussed how unique Alameda was in regards to required housing with Alameda Point and how the city should be taking full advantage of the area. She hoped the city could renegotiate the terms with the Navy to remove the cap on housing. She saw this as a win/win for Alameda and to not wait another day.

President Teague closed public comments and opened board commentary.

Board Member Jenn Wit thanked the public for their thoughtful commentary. She liked the idea of having a RHNA schedule of development. She believed that development should go hand in hand with transportation and getting people on and off the island as cohesively as possible. She also encouraged providing specific guidance to developers who would build in Alameda, to have them keep in mind the character of the island when designing new development.

Vice-Chair Norman Sanchez appreciated all the comments and asked if the staff had the final RHNA number.

Director Thomas said the most recent number was 5,353 and the City Council will be deciding if they would appeal that number or not.

Vice-Chair Sanchez asked about the comments concerning density bonus with relationship to building height and wanted to know what those provisions were.

Director Thomas explained how under California Law the State Density Bonus Law allowed a developer to request waivers from any development standard (height limits, set back, etc.) to physically fit the units. He gave examples of how it would work.

Vice-Chair Sanchez asked whether the projects that had been approved (Alameda Marina and Alameda Point Phase 1) have taken advantage of the density bonus.

Director Thomas said yes, most residential projects had taken advantage of the density bonus. The only way to build multifamily housing in Alameda was to get a waiver from Measure A through the Density Bonus waivers. Also, Alameda was unique since they don't allow developers to buy out of the Affordable Housing requirement.

Vice-Chair Sanchez asked about the zoning for the Harbor Bay Club and Shopping Center. He thought both of those locations were already zoned to allow housing if the owners wished to exercise that right.

Director Thomas said that was true for the Shopping Center, it was zoned C2-PD which allowed residential above ground-floor retail. For the Harbor Bay Club, which has the same zoning C2-PD, the current General Plan has it designated as "Commercial Recreation" and the new General Plan has it at "Community Commercial" to be consistent with site's existing the C-2 PD zoning.

Vice-Chair Sanchez addressed comments about encouraging more contemporary design. He agreed that historic monuments and districts should be protected but thought that diverse and eclectic architecture could make an area successful. He used the area around the UC Berkeley Campus as an example. He believed that as long as design was done thoughtfully and in areas where it was warranted modern architecture could be at home next to more historic structures in Alameda. He thought that more enforcement was needed for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) to make sure those units are made available as affordable housing. He was not opposed to trying to accommodate RHNA requirements throughout the island as opposed to trying to stack them all up in one place.

Board Member Ruiz expressed her gratitude to the staff and the public speakers. She first wanted to acknowledge the history of red-lining before discussing land-use policies. When people talked about maintaining current community character and putting multi-family zones in specific areas, she asked whether this is another form of subtle red-lining. She also supported Vice-Chair Sanchez's comment about how contemporary architectural styles can be cohesive in existing neighborhoods. She also discussed the rezoning of Harbor Bay Club and Shopping Center, she saw it as more of an infrastructure issue related to the connectivity between Bay Farm and the rest of the island. Future infrastructure planning should include upgrading or improving that connectivity.

Board Member Hanson Hom thanked the public speakers and noted that the many public comments were very thoughtful. He recognized the difficult decisions that needed to be made. He agreed that the General Plan will need to increase densities at appropriate locations, and he suggested a more granular look at where higher density would be best since a one size doesn't fit all approach will not work for all Alameda neighborhoods. He also supported looking at removing the housing unit cap at Alameda Point, but was sensitive to the issue of equity. He also acknowledged that all of Alameda would need to share in the burden of accommodating the additional housing units. He was not in favor

of a policy that would exclude certain areas from accommodating more units because that would be pitting neighborhood against neighborhood. For the Harbor Bay Club and Shopping Center, he saw nothing in the proposed General Plan classification of Community Commercial that would eliminate the ability to have a recreation center at the Harbor Bay Club as the zoning currently allowed housing. He supported revising the language in LU 26-B and 17-B, but suggested clarifying the meaning of “contemporary” since it could be interpreted many ways. He was not comfortable with allowing multi-family residential in all zoning districts including the R-1 because there are inherent differences between lower density single-family neighborhoods and those already with higher densities.

Board Member Rona Rothenberg thanked everyone for their comments, she particularly appreciated the comments made by AAPS, WABA, and Mr. Bowling. She also thought it was a very good staff report and did not take exception to any of the recommendations. She asked that staff look at the conservation, climate, and mobility sections again with equity in mind. In regards to the Harbor Bay Club, she agreed that it is an important community resource and that there should be consideration to protect the Club to ensure its longevity since it was originally established an amenity for the housing development. She also acknowledged public comments about historic character and thought the current language around historic architecture and modern architecture was appropriate.

Board Member Alvin Lau noted there is a housing crisis in California and the need to build more housing, and he acknowledged the public comments about fears and concerns about over-development and loss of historical character. He asked about future transportation plans as new development would bring about more traffic and wanted to know the status of the City and BART’s efforts for an Alameda BART station.

Director Thomas discussed how the General Plan addressed many challenges facing Alameda over the next 20 years, such as transportation and climate change. He believed this General Plan took into account and planned for everyone’s needs. He then discussed the new bus line planned that would cross all of Alameda. He explained that the City was in regular conversations with BART about a future BART station in Alameda. However, Director Thomas also noted that this is a very long-term project.

Board Member Lynn Jones appreciated everyone’s comments and seconded Board Member Wit’s comment about making Alameda a destination and a city to be proud of. She echoed the comments about preserving the beauty and essence of Alameda and didn’t want to neglect the history of the island. She asked staff for an explanation of the status of the Navy cap.

Director Thomas said they had had conversations with the Navy about increasing or removing the cap. To eliminate the cap or significantly change the cap would require much higher levels of authority within the Navy than the staff level discussions that had been taking place. He discussed other ways the staff had reached out to help such as including

regional agencies Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to help push the issue.

Board Member Xiomara Cisneros said she was not a fan of using the word “character” as a major theme because she believed it conflicted with equity. She discussed her values in preservation that included protecting communities that had a history of displacement and how preservation could be used in an exclusionary way. She suggested changing the word “character” to “balance” and gave suggestions of other wording that would be more comprehensive. She agreed with the staff recommendation in multi-family policy LU2 to broaden multifamily residential uses to all residential areas including single-family zones. She also highlighted the need for equitable distribution when it came to housing.

President Teague thanked all of the community for their feedback and for staff’s effort responding to all the comments. For the historical preservation aspects, he thought the current language went too far and yet not far enough. He believed that the historical properties in Alameda needed more protection than the current Historic Preservation Ordinance provided, and that varying levels of protection should be based on the ratings on the Study List. He agreed there needed to be incentives for restoring and protecting historic properties such as those offered under the Mills Act. He reiterated that the General Plan should provide general policy guidance while the Zoning Code is the primary vehicle for implementation, and therefore discussion of specific densities need to be part of the Zoning Code and not the General Plan.

President Teague closed Board discussion of the item and adjourned the joint meeting with the Historical Advisory Board. He invited the Historical Advisory Board Members to stay for the rest of the meeting if they wanted to.

7-B 2021-1017

Recommendation that City Council adopt a Resolution of Intent to Prepare a Housing Element Update for the Period 2023-2031 that Maximizes the Use of City-Owned Land at Alameda Point and Encinal Terminals and Rezones Certain Sites and Districts to Permit Multifamily Housing and Residential Densities of at least 30 units Per Acre and to find that City Charter Article 26 is Preempted and Unenforceable due to Conflicts with State Housing Law; and Recommendation on Submittal of Appeal of Draft RHNA Allocation.

Staff Report and attachments can be found at

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4973465&GUID=C41BEE7D-B599-4BC9-A353-84060633BAC7&FullText=1>.

Board Member Ruiz recused herself from this agenda item.

Board Member Hom wanted clarification about which sections of the resolution were “in part conflict” after seeing many public comments about this issue.

Director Thomas explained state law and how Article 26 conflicted with state law. He then explained how and why the City of Alameda had worked around Article 26 with multi-family (MF) overlays during the last Housing Element Update to comply with state law and what that meant going forward with the RHNA numbers.

Board Member Rothenberg asked about Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft's recent statement in a newspaper on Article 26 and wanted to know if it was entirely preempted and unenforceable under state law or just preempted in part.

Director Thomas said he had not spoken to the Mayor since that article came out and was unable to discuss her thoughts. He reminded the board that they would be taking this resolution to the City Council on July 6th and they would be able to wordsmith it in a way that makes them comfortable. He discussed how this was an evolving issue and that Alameda would need to deal with this issue for the foreseeable future. He did add that the consequences of not having a Housing Element and not getting it certified by the State in the next 18 months were severe. There is no question that Alameda will have to do apply MF overlays in its zoning in order to meet its RHNA.

Board Member Cisneros asked if staff still believed that MF overlays were still the right strategy even if it could conflict with the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) provision.

Director Thomas said they were affirmatively working to ensure they addressed the inequities that had played out over the years, they have to that as part of the Housing Element. He believed the City needs to address the prohibition on multi-family housing in all the zoning districts and neighborhoods.

President Teague asked how Alameda was doing at meeting the existing affordable unit RHNA and wanted to know if someone could today request MF overlay.

Director Thomas answered they were behind and it raises an interesting question if they were in compliance with State Law today.

President Teague asked if it was necessary to state in the Draft Resolution the part about Article 26, believing that the resolution would be sufficient even if they omitted the reference to it.

Director Thomas said he didn't think it was absolutely necessary, but he wondered if leaving it out of the resolution still made sense given Article 26 is the key issue.

President Teague further asked if the resolution was saying the City would designate zoning to permit multi-family housing at densities of at least 30 units as necessary to comply with state law, as they had done in the past.

Director Thomas said that was correct, as it would be basically what the City had done in the 2012 Housing Element but now more expansive.

President Teague closed the board's questions and opened public comment.

Zac Bowling said it was imperative that Alameda have an honest discussion about the likelihood of development and discussed his work with a housing advocacy group. He discussed how Article 26 violated State Law verbatim and how important it was to move forward. He gave his thoughts on upzoning and how doing MF overlays made sense. He also pointed out how redlining maps line up with affluent neighborhoods and high opportunity neighborhoods and how excluding certain neighborhoods from development would not be equitable.

Carmen Reid, of the Alameda Citizen Taskforce (ACT), did not believe Alameda has the correct infrastructure to support more housing development at the densities proposed. She also did not believe that adding more housing would guarantee more affordable housing, and she thought that city staff was pushing an unrealistic agenda. She shared ACT's version of the resolution that she believed had better wording.

Katherine Allen was shocked by the amount of protection for Article 26 and found it to be a discriminatory article in the City Charter. She said that she had lived in Alameda for 7 years and was shocked by how little housing development there was in the middle of a housing crisis. She had trouble understanding how not having MF overlays in certain neighborhoods wasn't considered redlining. She also echoed many of Mr. Bowling's comments.

Drew Dara-Abrams voiced his support for Alameda to make this good faith effort to make its RHNA numbers. He was curious about reaching supermajority votes with this city council. He also thought the proposed level of densities for Park Street and Webster Street were low compared to many successful Bay Area business districts. He also pointed out that his R1 neighborhood wasn't mentioned and urged the board to give his neighborhood options so they could play their part.

Christopher Buckley, from AAPS, thought the staff report was very informative and well written. He offered different wording around Article 26 in the resolution that AAPS had suggested and what their concerns were. He also wanted the General Plan to give more information on Density Bonus Law.

Lesla Ross wanted to point out that Harbor Bay was not made up of entirely single-family homes. She was not against multi-family homes, and she was a single mom who was struggling and made sacrifices to be a part of the Harbor Bay Club. She believed it was prejudice to assume that 94502 was full of rich families who didn't want equity.

Matt Reid called out a few concerns unique to Alameda and he encouraged the City to appeal the RHNA numbers. He pointed out that infrastructure was different since Alameda was an island and there were limited ways on and off the island. Alameda's earthquake risks were higher than neighboring cities. He called out sea-level rise and emerging groundwater that brought up contaminants to the surface that sea walls do not prevent. He believed that Alameda has exceptional reasons to push back on the RHNA numbers.

William Smith encouraged the board to stick with the current wording of the resolution. He then pointed out that there had not been a successful appeal of the RHNA number yet and saw an appeal as a waste of city staff's time and taxpayer money. He added that the RHNA methodology explicitly ruled out consideration of natural hazards since every city had its own share of constraints and hazards.

Ruth Abbe discussed the diversity of housing stock in older neighborhoods and how she was in the process of putting in an ADU. She added there were also parcels in her neighborhood that could accommodate another house or more units and they were currently prohibited from doing that. She supported the idea of equitable and diverse housing stock across the island and that it didn't make sense to concentrate all the new development in one area.

President Teague closed public comments and asked if there was any area in Alameda that prohibited ADUs.

Director Thomas said that ADUs were permitted in all residential and mixed-use districts.

President Teague opened the board's discussion and potential action. He reminded the board that they would need a unanimous action to move this forward since they only had four board members present.

Board Member Hom referred to two paragraphs in the resolution and said the second part was mainly factual but the first part which explicitly called out Article 26 was the critical one. He saw it as a nebulous distinction they were trying to make. He suggested simplifying the first part and gave a suggestion for revised wording.

Board Member Rothenberg said if the intent was to be explicit about Article 26 then she would support the resolution as it was written. She pointed out how the staff said it was prepared to file an appeal but had given enough reasons why it wouldn't be successful. She added if it wasn't going to be successful then they should save proverbial green stamps.

President Teague wanted more input from legal staff on a legal argument to support the first part of the resolution. He recommended dropping references to Article 26 in the first paragraph and keep the four bullet items. He was also comfortable adding a 5th bullet item about not recommending Council not appeal the RHNA numbers. He added that

when he and his fellow board members joined this board they swore an oath to protect the City Charter as much as he had issues with Article 26.

Board Member Rothenberg asked about the legal bindings of the resolution with and without the references to Article 26 suggested by President Teague to be struck.

President Teague said it would be a different message altogether and once it went to City Council they would have more room to work in. He added that this was just a recommendation and he believed that with the proposed edits the resolution had a better chance of being approved by the City Council.

Board Member Cisneros summarized her understanding of the intent of the original wording and noted that keeping the language would bring the issue of Article 26 to the forefront.

President Teague and Board Member Hom exchanged comments on the suggested wording. Board Member Hom asked how important it was to mention Article 26 in the resolution.

Director Thomas explained that this is ultimately the Planning Board's resolution and understood that how the board was conflicted with the issue.

President Teague made a motion to approve the Draft Resolution to the City Council with the following modifications. In the title remove everything after "and finds that the City Charter", also strike everything in the "therefore" paragraph, and in the "be it" paragraph strike the word "further". Then in the 2nd bullet add the wording "contrary to the City Charter Article 26 as necessary to comply with State Law". Board Member Rothenberg seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 4-0 with Vice President Saheba and Board Member Curtis absent and Board Member Ruiz abstained.

7-C 2021-1018

Public Hearing to Receive Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan Update.

President Teague opened public comments.

There were no public comments.

President Teague closed public comments and opened the board's discussion.

Board Member Ruiz asked if only one of the two volumes were available for review since she had only received one. She wanted to know if there was still time to make comments.

Director Thomas said that both volumes were available and they would be receiving comments on the EIR until June 25th. All of it would be coming back to the board before they had to take an action.

Board Member Ruiz had questions concerning Air Quality impacts associated with the construction activities in new development. She wanted to make sure that the EIR specifically addressed construction activities as a short-term impact and not a long-term impact.

Director Thomas agreed and said that was the case in the draft document.

Board Member Ruiz asked for clarification on why with Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduced and the Transportation section still considered it a significant impact.

Director Thomas explained it was a confusing situation and it relates to how the state established a threshold of significance. For every project and plan, the threshold is to achieve 15% reduction below the regional average. He added that it was employment trips/work trips (everyone leaving in the morning) that put the VMT over 15%.

Board Member Hom asked if it should be clarified that this was a Program EIR and that future development projects would tier off of it.

Director Thomas said that was a good suggestion and they would make that clear.

Board Member Cisneros commented on how some of these goals seemed challenging to enforce.

Director Thomas explained more about what the VMT analysis had shown and how staff would be focusing on larger policy goals. He discussed items that would move them in the right direction for the environment.

Board Member Hom asked about comments concerning sea level rise and groundwater and asked to what level the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) required addressing with those issues.

Director Thomas said the EIR did address flooding issues and hydrology impacts but the EIR did not spend much time addressing the changing climate and its effect on projects.

President Teague believed the EIR was very well written and that he appreciated all the comments from the board. He was interested to see what changes caused by the pandemic will change transportation patterns overall.

8. MINUTES

8-A 2021-1011

Board Member Rothenberg had a correction for agenda item 7-B, Ms. Ashley Rebarchek's title should be Board of Directors AIA - East Bay and Mr. Scott Shell's title should be Principal of the HDD. Then on Item 7-C, she clarified that her question was whether the matter was consistent with the General Plan.

Board Member Hom made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Board Member Cisneros seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 5-0 with Vice President Saheba and Board Member Curtis absent.

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

9-A 2021-1008

Planning, Building and Transportation Department Recent Actions and Decisions

Actions and decisions can be found at

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4973461&GUID=4AB69938-4F96-4E08-8A6C-EF52EDEC2F14&FullText=1>.

Board Member Ruiz asked to pull 53 Killybegs Road, PLN21-0095, (Action Date 6-7-21) for a review.

9-B 2021-1009

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

Staff Member Tai announced that at the next meeting there would be a hearing on a call for review for 910 Centennial, a design review for the Tavern Building on Webster and Atlantic, and a study session on the Parking Ordinance revisions.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Board Member Ruiz asked that at the beginning of the Public Comments for President Teague to kindly remind speakers to refrain from making personal attacks on city staff and board members.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Teague adjourned the meeting at 11:01 p.m.