

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RICHMOND CITY HALL
1401 Marina Way South, Richmond, CA
April 7, 2011
6:30 p.m.

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Charles Duncan, Chair	Sheryl Lane, Vice Chair
Jeff Lee, Secretary	Carol Teltschick-Fall
Ben Choi	Andrés Soto
Roberto Reyes	

The meeting was called to order by Chair Duncan at 6:38 p.m.

Chair Duncan led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Duncan, Vice Chair Lane; Secretary Lee; Commissioners Choi, Reyes, Soto, and Teltschick-Fall

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Richard Mitchell, Lamont Thompson, Hector Rojas, Carlos Privat, and Mary Renfro

MINUTES - None

Chair Duncan provided an overview of meeting procedures for speaker registration, public comment and public hearing functions. He said items approved by the Commission may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk by Monday, April 18, 2011, by 5:00 p.m. and as needed, announced the appeal process after each affected item.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Duncan stated the Consent Calendar consisted of items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Item 5 has been withdrawn and Item 4 is recommended as a Hold Over.

He confirmed that staff had no requests for amendments to the agenda and that Commissioners and the public had no requests for removal of items from the Consent Calendar.

Consent Calendar Items Approved:

- 1. PLN10-233: Treadway Condominiums** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a tentative parcel map to convert a 4-unit apartment building into condominiums located at 620 – 622 Golden Gate Avenue (APN: 558-251-006). MFR-1, Multi-Family Residential District. Dean & Pamela Treadway, owner; John Gutierrez, applicant. Planner: Jonelyn Whales. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

2. **PLN11-025: S&S Large Recycling Collection Facility** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a Conditional Use Permit that would allow a Large Recycling Collection Facility to collect and dispose of tires by shredding and recycling them into raw materials for construction purposes and other uses at 1015 Chesley Ave. (APN: 409-313-002). M-2, Light Industrial District. Alan Ornbawn, owner; Sebastiao Da Silva, applicant. Planner: Jonelyn Whales. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.
3. **PLN11-041: Jameson's Restaurant - Modification to existing Conditional Use Permit** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a modification of an existing Conditional Use Permit that would change the operating days and hours to seven days a week 6:00 am to 10:00 pm, and would modify the type of on-sale liquor license from a type 47 liquor, to a type 41 beer and wine at 3190 Klose Way (APN: 405-290-034). C-3, Regional District. Klose Way Partners, LLC, owner; Jameson's Restaurant, applicant. Planner: Jonelyn Whales. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.
4. **PLN10-225: Mill Residence** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a Conditional Use Permit approval that would allow the creation of a Planned Residential Group. The applicant proposes to convert the two existing residences on site to a planned Residential Group, which would allow the 450 +/- square foot beach house dwelling situated on the lower portion of the site to be expanded by 990+/- square feet, totaling 1,440 +/- square feet at 875 Ocean Ave. (APN: 558-233-011). SFR-2, Single Family Very Low Density Residential District. Don Mill, owner/applicant. Planner: Lamont Thompson. Tentative Recommendation: Hold Over to 5/5/2011.
5. **PLN10-120: Grullense#1 Taco Truck** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider initiating revocation of Conditional Use Permit No. PLN10-120 allowing operation of an existing taco truck at 12955 San Pablo Avenue (APN: 526-040-023). C-2, General Commercial District. Gonzalez Investments LLC, owner; Hector Montes, applicant. Planner: Hector Rojas. Tentative Recommendation: Withdrawn.

ACTION: It was M/S (Soto/Teltschick-Fall) to adopt the Consent Calendar consisting of Items 1, 2, 3, and 4, noting that Item 5 was withdrawn; unanimously approved.

Brown Act – Public Forum – No speakers

STUDY SESSION

6. **PLN09-137: Richmond General Plan 2030** - STUDY SESSION to receive public comments on the Economic Development, Land Use & Urban Design, Circulation, Conservation & Open Space, Growth Management, Community Health & Wellness, and Public Safety & Noise Elements of the revised Draft General Plan released on February 14, 2011. No formal action will be taken by the Commission at this meeting. Planner: Hector Rojas.

Chair Duncan said the Commission will hear about selected elements from the General Plan, will split up review and comment into two hearings, and there will be no action taken on the General Plan by the Commission tonight.

He stated that at the last meeting the Commission received a presentation and took public comment on the February 11, 2011 Draft EIR. Tonight, the Commission will receive a presentation on Element 1-Economic Development; Element 3-Land Use and Urban Design;

Element 4-Circulation; Element 7-Conservation, Natural Resources and Open Space; Element 9-Growth Management; Element 11-Community Health and Wellness; and Element 12-Public Safety and Noise. After the presentation, the Commission will receive comment from the public and will provide its own comments, as well. All speakers will have 2 minutes. The remainder of the elements will be presented at the scheduled April 21st Planning Commission meeting. In both instances, Commissioners will direct staff to make edits to the General Plan prior to the plan being considered for recommendation to the City Council. He asked that speakers preface their comments with the Element number and name in order to keep order and track comments.

Richard Mitchell, Director of Planning and Building Services, acknowledged the work of Hector Rojas and other staff members and legal department staff on the document. There has been a tremendous amount of change in the time since they began the General Plan and where they are today. They have a different political, economic, and development environment. The format of the document is vastly superior to the document they began with. The consultant did a good job of obtaining community outreach by repeatedly reaching out until the process routinely began to have 80-100 people at meeting.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the document is the first General Plan that will be on-line which provides a tremendous amount of additional capability. They are at a time now where a book like this is a rare thing; it will be on a computer and plans connect with all elements that are critical to operating a City. Staff will continue to refine the document given the fact that all cities face change. Staff does not know, given the economy, how some of the long-term objectives of this General Plan are going to be delivered, which is not unusual. Over time, Commissions, Committees and the Council will need to determine how to get to some of these outcomes, and staff is on schedule to hopefully have this in front of the Council prior to their summer recess.

Secretary Lee echoed kudos for the work of staff in the process of going from GPAC to the first and second draft being considered now. He confirmed that the first draft was primarily generated by the consultant in the GPAC process. He questioned and clarified that the GPAC committee was made up of people who were appointed by the City Council who were either Richmond residents or those who own or operate businesses in the City.

Hector Rojas gave the staff presentation, stating the purpose for tonight's meeting is for the Planning Commission to accept and provide comment on the third and current draft of Richmond's General Plan and a specific set of General Plan elements. The Planning Commission will be asked to provide comment on the remaining 8 elements of the General Plan at its upcoming April 21st meeting. Mr. Rojas outlined the scope of his presentation, milestones in the process, the Planning Commission's role in the overall adoption of the General Plan, and he reviewed State law governing the process leading to adoption of general plans and presented each element, as follows:

Economic Development Element

Mr. Rojas said goals articulated by the community include: creating an appealing place to live and work, creating quality jobs and revenue, creating an educated and skilled workforce, revitalizing the downtown, and creating mixed use commercial corridors and districts.

Key policies in this element designed to achieve these goals include: providing safe and well-maintained neighborhoods, leveraging the City's assets including its history, arts, culture, natural resources, location and infrastructure into economic development, expanding and diversifying the employment tax base, retaining and expanding employers in key sectors

including the green industry, retaining and expanding small businesses, and expanding job skills and training programs.

Land Use and Urban Design Element

Mr. Rojas stated this element is at the core of the entire General Plan because the purpose of the plan is to provide a broad framework for the long-range physical development of the community. Community goals for this element include creating an improved urban environment, creating healthy and viable neighborhoods, expanding economic opportunities, enhancing the environmental quality, balancing compatible land uses, and creating high quality and sustainable development.

To accomplish these goals, policies and actions are included that promote higher density, transit and oriented pedestrian-friendly development along key corridors, nodes and gateways. Policies also promote mixed use income housing developments, conserving, protecting and enhancing natural resources, minimizing conflicts between land uses to protect human and environmental health, promoting high quality design, planning, construction and maintenance of development and infrastructure projects.

Circulation Element

Mr. Rojas stated community goals articulated through the process include having an expanded multi-modal circulation system, creating walk able neighborhoods and complete streets, creating a safe and well-maintained circulation system, and providing for the efficient movement of goods.

Key policies in this element designed to achieve goals include creating safe, mixed use urban streets that support all modes of travel including transit, pedestrians, bicycles, and automobiles, enhancing public transit options for residents and visitors, developing a comprehensive network of multi-use trails, supporting the proposed ferry service in Marina Bay, equitably maintaining transportation facilities throughout the City, requiring development projects to provide improvements to the existing circulation infrastructure, promoting the efficient movement of goods, and promoting transportation and land management policies to reduce the reliance on automobiles.

Growth Management Element

Community goals include preserving and restoring natural habitat and bio diversity, conserving open space, improving water and air quality, and creating a healthy urban environment. Key policies of this element include protecting natural habitat and sensitive biological resources, promoting the use of native plants and tree species, protecting native trees, heritage trees, and woodlands, and requiring tree plantings in projects, restoring and daylighting urban creeks, preserving open space, and maintaining the integrity of hillsides, creeks and wetlands, preserving rural agricultural lands for crop production, grazing and farming, improving access to large, natural areas and parks, minimizing surface water runoff through storm water management practices, promoting water conservation, and modernizing wastewater facilities, promoting efficient use of energy and conservation resources in the design, construction and maintenance and operation of facilities and infrastructure, and promoting waste reduction and recycling to minimize the use of landfills.

Goals articulated by the community include coordinated land use and transportation planning, improved infrastructure and facilities. Key policies of this element include promoting walk ability and public transit by encouraging mixed use, higher density development close to community amenities, promoting efficient growth in urban areas, and protecting open space consistent with the county's urban limit line, and participating in on-going multi-jurisdictional regional transportation planning.

Community Health and Wellness

This element is one of the first in the nation and cities have already started crafting their own health elements after Richmond. This element is so important to the community that Richmond has already begun its implementation through the City's Five Year Strategic Plan. Community goals articulated by the community for this element include creating improved access to parks, recreation and open space, expanding access to healthy food and nutritional choices, providing improved access to medical services, creating a safe and convenient public transit and active circulation options, providing for a range of quality and affordable housing, improving environmental quality, and providing for Richmond to become a leader in building health communities.

Key policies of this element include a comprehensive and integrated system of parks, plazas, playgrounds, trails, and open space to meet the physical and social needs of the community, expanding recreational programs and services to meet the evolving needs of residents, expanding park and recreation opportunities in all neighborhoods and ensuring they are offered within walking distance of homes, schools, and businesses to encourage a more physically and active lifestyle, promoting availability of fresh fruits, vegetables, and quality foods, especially in underserved neighborhoods, supporting sustainable food systems that include farmers markets, urban agriculture and health food retailers. In this element are also policies supporting the expansion of public transit to neighborhood and regional medical facilities, partnering with transit agencies to provide a system of para transit for seniors and people of all abilities, promoting walking and bicycling as a safe commuting means of transportation, supporting development of housing meeting needs of a broad range of population and income groups, supporting regional policies and efforts to improve air and water quality, and working with local, state and federal agencies to clean up and reuse contaminated sites.

Public Safety and Noise Element

The four goals of this element are the risk management of naturally and human-caused disasters, providing a high level of police and fire services, providing for enhanced emergency preparedness, and providing for acceptable noise levels.

Key policies include minimizing risk from geologic, flood and other hazards, requiring safe production, transportation, and use of hazardous materials, providing a high level of police and fire service, promoting crime prevention through environmental design techniques, working with agencies to monitor and enforce noise standards, and supporting technological improvements to prevent and mitigate transportation related noise impacts on sensitive uses.

Key Changes made to the General Plan Response to Comments heard from the community, Planning Commission and City Council

Mr. Rojas summarize that the first set of changes relate directly to three of the City's shoreline areas, which include the Southern Gateway, Pt. Molate, and the North Shore areas. These

areas were all designated Planned Area Districts (PAD) in previous versions of the General Plan to allow for discretionary view of projects in these areas on a case-by-case basis.

Heard from the community, Commission and Council was that having this designation created uncertainty as to the intended vision for these areas. In response to this, designations were provided for all areas in the current draft General Plan.

In the Southern Gateway area which includes the UC Fuel Station, Zeneca, and Harbour tract parcels, the PAD designation was changed to the Business Light Industrial (BLI) designation which allows for commercial and institutional uses such as large scale research and development campuses, light industrial and office uses.

In the Pt. Molate area, the PAD designation was changed to a collection of land use designations consisting largely of Open Space and Parks and Recreation, with some Business Light Industrial and Residential consistent with the 1997 Pt. Molate Base Re-Use Plan.

Lastly, in the North Shore area, the PAD was changed to a designation of Open Space which also allows for uses under the Parks and Recreation, except in delineated wetlands. The vision for this area would be to preserve and restore natural open space for the use of habitat and recreation. Allowable uses would include parks and recreation-supporting facilities. This change was made consistent with the overall vision voiced by the community for this area.

Other key changes made from the previous version of the plan are listed, and staff ensured it added language that existing uses in areas like Marina Bay continue to be recognized as legally conforming uses. They worked together with community groups to re-insert language that was in the first version of the plan in order to make key policies and implementing actions addressing the well-being of the community more specific. Finally, they changed the plan's Level of Service (LOS) standards to match existing standards in the County's Transportation Action Plan.

Mr. Rojas said this summarizes most of the key changes made to the previous version of the General Plan. He then said he would update the Planning Commission on next steps in the adoption process. From the highlighted row in the timeline, they are fast approaching final stages of the General Plan. Based on comments received tonight and at the next April 21st meeting, staff will make final edits to the text of the General Plan. Concurrently, the environmental consultant will be preparing the Final EIR which will include the Response to Comments received on the Draft EIR prior to the close of the comment period.

Over 30 comment letters were received on the DEIR though staff still anticipates bringing the final Draft General Plan and FEIR to the Planning Commission in June, this may change after staff and environmental consultant have had a chance to read through all comment letters. At this time, they anticipate taking this before the City Council for adoption hearings in July.

Mr. Rojas said the last item is to cover the format for providing comments on the current General Plan. Comments are being accepted and recorded tonight. Staff asks members of the public to complete the speaker card, state their full name, city of residence, and limit their remarks to 2 minutes. He said it is important to understand that comments are being limited to the General Plan only and not the EIR. Specifically, comments should focus on the General Plan elements covered tonight. Staff asks that written comments on all elements be mailed or emailed to staff by April 29, 2011. Copies of the DEIR and the proposed General Plan at the Richmond Planning Division counter, Richmond public libraries, and the City's General Plan website.

Chair Duncan asked for questions of staff prior to opening the public comment period.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall received clarification from Mr. Rojas regarding the approval process for the draft EIR on the General Plan and approval of the actual General Plan document.

Commissioner Soto questioned the degree to which staff incorporated final feedback to individuals' comments. Mr. Rojas stated staff tried to meet with specific groups to outline responses to comments, but no official notification letter was mailed out to every commenter.

Commissioner Soto stated that based on the City Council's vote on Pt. Molate and no casino, he asked whether an alternative project has been explored. Mr. Rojas noted the City will be talking to the developer on the alternative to be explored, and what is in the current General Plan is consistent with the Pt. Molate Base Re-Use Plan.

Secretary Lee questioned how the decision was made to specifically defining uses rather than leaving open the PAD designation, especially for the three change areas, as the information provided initially came from GPAC. Mr. Mitchell replied that staff reviewed meeting notes from the Planning Commission and City Council that specifically dealt with those areas. Changes were made to those areas consistent with that direction. Particularly on the south shore, it was clear the Council wanted land uses supportive of the use and proposal to bring Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory to the City. Therefore, staff believes there was strong direction to make those changes.

Commissioner Lane suggested staff forward all comment letters to the Commission in order to determine what was submitted and incorporated. Mr. Rojas said staff typically only forwards comment letters to the Commission upon request by the commenter. When staff puts together the Response to Comments document, this will be provided to the Commission, and the Commission will be able to see how staff responded.

Chair Duncan referred to the Tiscornia Estates Specific Plan which he said has been dropped. He asked if it will remain in place and reviewed for conformity to the General Plan at a later date. Mr. Rojas said given the new direction for Richmond, a new zoning ordinance will be created which will trigger staff looking at the viability of having those plans moving forward. In some cases, they will take the best parts of those specific plans and port them over to the new zoning ordinance.

Chair Duncan voiced concern with the land use designation for the North Shore. The Commission received the SSL law firm response to the DEIR and it is a thorough document and compelling. He asked if the City Attorney's office has read it, and Mr. Rojas stated those documents have been forwarded to Mary Renfro in the City Attorney's office, who will be reviewing it. He said he personally has not read all of the 30 letters received and at this point in time, the recommended direction for that specific area is as it is presented tonight. Mr. Privat added that there is no direction to be taken tonight; only simply to accept comments.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall cited the matrix and summary on the General Plan comments as very helpful and she suggested something similar be done for the EIR. She noted that Chair Duncan's question was the reason she asked about the interaction between the EIR document and tonight.

The Commission thanked Mr. Rojas and Ms. Velasco for their work. Chair Duncan opened the public comment period and confirmed with Mr. Thompson there were 23 speakers signed up to speak.

Public Comments:

Mack Casterman, East Bay Chapter, Native Plant Society, (Element 5), San Mateo, distributed the Society's comments to the Commission and also the botanical priority protection areas, two of which fall under areas directly impacted by the General Plan which are Pt. Molate and Sobrante Ridge. He asked that the two areas be investigated as outlined in the documents. He commended the policies laid out, especially Policy LU 4.1 on page 3.36 and Policy LU 4.3 on page 3.64 both of which note the importance of protecting natural habitat and sensitive biological resources. The Society endorses the General Plan's commitment to preserve the northern shoreline area with public access open space. He noted the Pt. Molate area also includes the area to be built onto which is the U.C. Fuel Station and they would like to see habitat types protected in this area.

Robert Herbst, San Rafael, said they own 8 lots in the Freethy Industrial Park in the North Shore proposed to be downzoned open space. He refuted the need or consensus for open space in this area. He noted a 2005 resolution from the Council and RDA opposing creation of more open space in the North Shore area, specifically stating there is 7,700 acres of parkland in the area already, including 3,000 acres along the shoreline and 2,300 acres in Pt. Pinole Regional Park. This change was made in response to overall vision from the community, but he attended every meeting and the GPAC voted 22-8 for development over open space. The only group that supported open space was the Citizens for East Shore Parks and the Sierra Club which were out of town, non-residents and non-land owners. No Commissioners asked for open space, and the Council's two resolutions for open space both failed.

Nancy Baer, Contra Costa Health Services (CCHS), Richmond, (Circulation (4), and Health and Wellness (11) Elements), said CCHS partnered with the City in developing elements and concepts, congratulated the City for what is one of the most comprehensive health elements in the country, and she spoke of future projects supporting health. They also supported the City in development of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and is supportive of those in terms of health for residents.

Commissioner Soto said given the various iterations, he asked if Ms. Baer was satisfied with the most current draft. Ms. Baer said they are satisfied, as it is easier to understand and less wordy while incorporating all concepts important to them.

Dan Murray, Mill Valley, said the Council made it clear that the right path to take is the one of moral high ground, and he asked that the General Plan be consistent with this ideal. He spoke regarding Element 3 and Change Area 12 where they own the majority of the land being proposed to be changed from Industrial to Open Space, and said this effect lowers the value of the property and will have the change to see the shoreline put into public ownerships which insinuates sale of their land at that reduced value, which they vehemently oppose. He spoke regarding the many incorrect statements and descriptions of their industrial land, misstatements about its development, and asked not to let environmental groups take their land.

Marilyn Hertzberg, Temple Beth Hillel Board Member, Richmond, (Element 3-Land Use), stated they have 5 acres and were designated high density residential area which allowed them an opportunity to use the land in a variety of ways. They asked to be designated as a regional

commercial use area and instead, this draft has them designated as a Public Cultural Institutional land use and does not allow them to utilize their land for the betterment of their organization and the community. She requested the Commission change this designation to either Regional Commercial Mixed Use or Medium Intensity Mixed Use for their property and the immediate neighborhood; the opening of Hilltop Greens.

Nathan Landau, AC Transit Senior Planner, Berkeley, (Element 4-Circulation) said it is important to AC Transit what the General Plans of the cities they serve are because the cities shape the conditions for their operations. He said they will submit a comment letter which will have to do with the design standards for the play spaced street classification system, which they think is a good system. There are some specific issues that make it possible, difficult or unsafe for buses to operate, and he urged the Commission to include a transit plan as an implementing plan for the General Plan to 1) develop a strategy for handling growth that the plan anticipates; 2) to complement the bicycle and pedestrian plan being developed and the goods movement plan; and 3) to make sure the City does not prematurely decide on shuttles or other transit until determining where the demand and needs are and what investments could be best.

Secretary Lee questioned if it was Mr. Landau's position that the City does not have adequate referencing to transit planning. Mr. Landau said he thinks it is good the way transit laces through the plan, but a transit plan could take the City to the next level of specificity.

Commissioner Choi said he is interested in seeing that the transit planning for Richmond's workforce that use AC Transit be developed to be able to get to job sites and work. Mr. Landau said there has been a lot of discussion of what is called the "last mile problem" of getting people from a BART station or another transit hub to their work places. There are many success stories of doing this which will be very important for Richmond, given the fact that there will be many more jobs in the City.

Joshua Genser, Richmond, (Element 3-Land Use), said he served on the GPAC and they voted overwhelmingly in support of development on the north shoreline. He said development is a good idea and banning such development and creating open space is not a good idea. He questioned what a few more acres would make to the park. The City needs to attract high quality development, bring people to Richmond and to offer them a nice place. Not all of the shoreline has to be a park and their property is an already developed subdivision divided into lots with public streets, public utilities, public drainage, and everything but buildings due to them being knocked down for the Parkway's construction. They want to bring jobs and put new buildings there and tax revenues. If the land is turned into open space, the RDA will lose the tax increment it receives now as well as the opportunity for further increment, jobs, development fees, taxes, and ultimately owners' investments which is not fair.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall questioned if Mr. Genser did the subdividing and improvements to the property that exist now, and she asked how old the improvements are. Mr. Genser said they bought it, subdivided and improved it. It was a Richmond-based developer and owner named Elmer Freethy who created it over a period of 20 years, but he was not sure when specific developments occurred.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall asked if the property requires updating and asked about the level of maintenance. Mr. Genser said the City has not maintained the streets at all. He said he cuts the weeds a couple times a year, but public improvements have not been maintained by the City. The copper has all been stolen out of the streetlights as well as streetlights, the pavement

is cracked, curbs and gutters have been overwhelmed by weeds, but rights-of-way are all there and the public areas belong to the City.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall asked for the types of job development he would like to put in the area. Mr. Genser said they would bring the kinds of jobs similar to Silicon Valley such as offices, research and development, light manufacturing, but it is hard to say what the demand will be. In 2000, light manufacturing and office uses were getting chased out of Silicon Valley, San Francisco and Berkeley by all the high tech which was paying very high rents. They were fielding proposals from very exciting companies, but before they could do anything, the dot bomb hit in November of 2000 and demand disappeared. They do not know what will come back, but they know it will. He said it is the only place where an industrial research campus could be located, as the rest of the Bay Area is full.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall questioned if restaurants or food related businesses could be considered. Mr. Genser said in taking the entire north shore of over 100 acres, there would certainly be some food related service to serve the development. He said he does not think it is likely someone will want to put a major grocery store there because there is not enough residential density. While they would not be opposed to it, it does not seem to be a likely location for it.

Secretary Lee questioned if there was a project approved by the Planning Commission for the land. Mr. Genser said during the housing boom, they designed a project for the property that was a live/work village. By making it a village where everybody was working at home but had amenities that drew people outside of their homes, they hoped to create some synergy and activity. They planned it extensively, did not make much progress with the planning department, and at one point did come to the Commission to seek a ruling that this was consistent with the mixed use definition that was permitted under the zoning ordinance. The Commission said it was consistent. They would still be happy to do that project, although they would rather do light industrial, office, and R&D types of projects.

Garland Ellis, Vice President, RANC, Richmond, (Element 4-Circulation and Element 3-Land Use), said there is a land use policy regarding Level of Service based on an E and F. The county has such standards, but also must regulate highways. The City has no jurisdiction over any highways and would not be allowed to regulate them, yet the City is proposing an LOS E for the entire City's main arterials and residential streets. Most roads rated are A, B, C and occasionally a D but rarely E except for heavy congestion times and on few streets. One major reason the City wants to move in this direction is that it will take a lot of authority out of the CEQA process so that the planning department can have more leeway in allowing development to come into the City which is good and bad. He said until people spoke out about not wanting Pt. Molate development and pressed upon the CEQA issues, it was changed. If the same model is followed with all other developments, there will be less input by citizens and it will bring forth inconsistent guidelines because everything will be decided by the planning department.

Owen Martin, Richmond, (Economic Development, Land Use, and Growth Management elements) he hoped to share 32 miles of open space with mixed use businesses. There are new homes by Parkway and Gertrude, as well fill and grading by Parkway and Pittsburg, and a new community west of the Parkway by San Pablo Avenue. He hoped that with San Pablo, Macdonald, Barrett and the Parkway, the City can share in creating jobs and homes and reduce the amount of traveling.

Joan Garrett, Richmond, Citizens for Sustainable Pt. Molate, said she provided comments letters with remarks revolving around Element 3-Land Use. She believes there is a disconnect between the land use designation, specifically Pt. Molate and the San Pablo peninsula from the policies and goals for the Open Space and Economic Development Elements. She knows much of the land use is predicated on Base Re-use Plan which includes lots of uses, none of which are represented in the current map 3.15. Pieces of the plan are somewhat further ahead of what they should be, especially for Pt. Molate. She recommended to delineate what must remain open space and shoreline trail area and then delineate the rest to be determined, but make it a mission to get that determination underway fairly soon. She also noted the Pt. Molate Commission and Committees will soon be seated who will also have an impact on this.

Secretary Lee said it sounds like it may be one of the cases where events have overtaken things the City would like to do and he questioned if this is another argument for that PUD that it was to begin with. Ms. Garrett said what is great about having land use laid out is that anyone coming in as a developer has a roadmap as to what they can and cannot do. There is not a lot of disagreement in the open shoreline areas or BCDC controlled trail areas, but she suggested demarcating habitat areas maintained for open space and then leaving a grey zone to be determined.

Chair Duncan asked staff if this could potentially be a place for dual zoning; where on the same piece of land there is a designated open space zoning and PUD. Mr. Mitchell said at the General Plan level, staff has been told this is not advisable. At the zoning level, it is possible.

Ana Orozco, CBE/REDI, Oakland, said she will speak on the Health and Wellness Element and Land Use Element and applauded the City's element to build a healthy city and recognize that health is a priority in the General Plan. She referred to the air quality monitoring section and urged the Commission to adopt the strongest possible policies to establish baseline exposures, document health effects, consider cumulative impacts, and hold businesses and industrial facilities financially accountable for impacts on the environment due to air pollution exceeding legal thresholds. They support the promotion of clean and green industries, support the establishment of a healthy foods store initiatives program, and suggest identifying potential sites in neighborhoods for agriculture development.

Greg Karras, CBE, Oakland, said he will speak on Elements 3 and 9, said the General Plan needs to make Richmond an environmental justice green zone for healthier and more prosperous communities with less pollution and more jobs. It needs land use requirements ensuring that clean and green jobs are built here instead of continuing or increasing industrial emissions under pollution trading schemes that only clean up and green up elsewhere. This can be addressed in the land use and health and wellness policy elements because real health requires disparately high ongoing pollution related health impacts linked to the same industrial emission sources where the City needs GHG cuts to meet climate goals locally. The plan as proposed would facilitate ongoing or increase industrial emissions and other levels of government only plan pollution trading schemes for GHG emissions which are expected to allow continued or increased emissions from the types of sources here. Real green jobs will require huge investments which can be attracted by leveraging unique values of industrial land in Richmond to say the land cannot be used for the old, increasingly dirtier industries of past.

Commissioner Choi asked for expansion on emission credits and how that plays into this. Mr. Karras said the Energy and Climate Element has a goal of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and 80% by 2050 below that. Deep cuts are needed to avert potentially catastrophic climate impacts. Importantly, those combustion emissions also create other toxic combustion

products, such as co-pollutants, and this is what is impacting health in Richmond. Regarding climate policies, where other levels of government have any requirements on types of sources such as oil refining, port and industrial sources, the Air District regionally defers to the state for GHG emissions from the sources and are proposing a cap and trade scheme which is pollution trading. It allows any individual industrial source covered by it to decide not to reduce but potentially increase emissions by purchasing credits that will allow them to make existing or more emissions. Credits represent promises to reduce emissions elsewhere. It is statewide now and the Air Resources Board (ARB) is looking to expand it worldwide. What that would mean is continued or increased emissions in Richmond while not only averting emission reduction benefits but also allowing green building jobs locate elsewhere. The Chevron Refinery is the largest GHG emitting facility in the whole state, and the ARB's own technical advisers have said, if cap and trade is done, oil facilities will be obtaining credits. Therefore, it is more than reasonably foreseeable that this will happen if there are not strong local requirements. He noted this is important for the entire General Plan, as everything in it relates to health, green and economic development and they want the investment to clean up flowing in Richmond.

Commissioner Soto said one document received tonight is from the Council of Industries having to do with the Economic Development Element. In it, a comment is, "However, Richmond's existing concentration of heavy industries has led to public concerns regarding environmental health factors." "This statement assumes that heavy industry is the cause of environmental health issues. As a finding, the plan needs to include the information to support this." They indicate this does not include the impact of other sources on environmental health factors such as auto emissions. He asked if this is the type of statement Mr. Karras would concur with or would simply making that statement is sufficient.

Mr. Karras said he would like to review their comment first. He and CBE do not think industry is necessarily bad but fossil fuel industries are a problem in Richmond, but he thinks the comment goes to the precautionary principle. As a matter of policy, CBE believes and he urges the Commission to endorse the idea to be better safe than sorry. If they know something is toxic, they may want to prevent those exposures. CBE's most groundbreaking study is an indoor air monitoring study which found that refinery and port sources are linked to toxic coke pollutant exposures at disparately high levels, and higher than Bolinas in the air outside people's homes in Richmond. Inside homes, it is getting in and concentrating even higher. Nearly half of inside the homes they sampled during relatively low times of the year, the PM 2.5 levels were over the health standards.

Commissioner Soto said Richmond also has freeways crossing throughout the City. He asked if there are any reliable data that speak to proportionality of pollutants and their source of origin in the greater community. Mr. Karras said when looking across the country, the total mass of pollutants emitted from tailpipes is greater and part of the problem here. They are proposing solutions to address this, but in Richmond, less than 10% of the emissions in Richmond are from transportation sources which include the port, trucks, freeways, and trains. About 90% are from commercial and industrial uses.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall said she has seen some of CBE's reports and research they are engaged in, which are very thorough and interesting. She wondered if any of the information from CBE was included in the Technical Advisory Committee for the General Plan and whether or not Mr. Karras would be willing to share this information if it had not been.

Mr. Karras said they would absolutely like to share it. He said he personally was not involved in the TAC process. Other CBE staff and community members were. He kept asking about the big

gorilla in the room and the industrial sources, and he was told this was raised repeatedly and it was not addressed. The Commission already has dealt with this in a small way with the Chevron Tanks project, but it did not seem to get anywhere early on, and this is probably why it is a big issue now, and he suggested asking people who were at TAC meetings.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall said if CBE had policies to suggest, she asked to provide a comment letter which would be considered. Mr. Karras said he has heard recently that they should do this, and he said they have had some discussions with staff and they have an informal agreement to talk in more detail. They were hoping to do this and trade ideas on how the language could be made very specific before commenting. Commissioner Teltschick-Fall said she liked the idea of establishing a green zone. While we cannot get very specific in the General Plan, the policy can be tightened up and she suggested language and ideas be provided.

Don Felt, Tiscornia Estates Homeowners, Richmond, said he is speaking on Element 3 and appreciates Commissioner Duncan's advice that the language rescinding the Tiscornia Estates Specific Plan be deleted from the General Plan and also Mr. Rojas' statement that it will be worked into the basic program later on. However, he called attention to the fact that the specific plan includes an EIR with mitigations for creation of open space which will require CEQA compliance. Also, it would seem appropriate that maps contained in the General Plan reflect the open space included in the Tiscornia Estates Specific Plan. Not to do this would invite confusion and make it unclear to people who are thinking of doing something there that this is, in fact, open space. Lastly, they also applauded the values reflected in the General Plan.

Reverend Kenneth Davis, CBE/REDI, Richmond, said they appreciate the plain language that prioritizes the transit and street improvements for all residents which commits the City to advocate on the regional and federal level for transit funding to improve service, close lifeline service gaps, and restore services lost to budget cuts. He asked the Commission to review the lack of AC Transit services for senior citizens of North Richmond.

Secretary Lee asked Reverend Davis to submit something in writing outlining his requests, to which Reverend Davis agreed he would do. Chair Duncan noted that an AC Transit representative was present tonight and confirmed Reverend Davis did not speak with him. He said AC Transit has cut bus and para-transit services, many seniors do not have cars, and 85% of people in North Richmond are without jobs as well, which they will address with AC Transit.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall noted that Mr. Landau from AC Transit suggested a specific transit study would better assess needs in real areas of the City, and she encouraged Reverend Davis to submit something in writing to the City and comments could be incorporated.

Maria Alegria, REDI, Faith Works, Pinole, said she would speak on priorities of circulation, transportation, economic development, housing, health and wellness, land use and energy and climate elements. They have worked with staff since 2005 and want to ensure the General Plan embodies the values of social equity, which she briefly described. They are encouraged with changes made to the document to date and its response to public input. She looks forward to commenting on the Land Use Element as soon as the legal deficiencies are addressed and said they will be submitting a letter by the April 29, 2011 deadline.

Antonio Medrano, FaithWorks, San Pablo, spoke of social equity benefits of jobs and job training for local residents and youth, those having high barriers, and cooperative use of

community facilities which the City already does, like the pool, schools, and multi-purpose rooms.

Nita, REDI/LIP, spoke for David Meza, REDI, ACCE, Richmond, (Element 3-Land Use) who wants to relay that social equity and equitable land use speaks on the community's needs. He is excited that the element calls for a complete inventory of vacant and un-utilized sites that affect economic and social vitality of neighborhoods. He also recognized the need for public safety amenities such as street lighting, neighborhood watch, walk and bike police patrols, and others. She asked where the General Plan places responsibility for inclusionary zoning, inclusionary housing incentives, existing housing restoration and the City's homeless land and land trust. The programs have been under the umbrella of the Department of Housing which is presently part of Community Development but the Health Element puts them under the Housing Authority, and she asked for clarification of their responsibility.

Chair Duncan questioned the existence of an inventory by the Planning Division for abandoned and rental properties, stating that when he was on the DRB, he remembered of list of infill properties that were candidates for pre-approved designs. Mr. Rojas said staff does have a GIS layer which catalogs what the City has currently, but the policy speaks to re-doing and maintaining that inventory and not creating it from scratch.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall said she recently saw an inventory that FaithWorks had of foreclosures. She also knows the City made the news by working towards an abatement program for blight in neighborhoods being cause by it and having the funding provided by banks who have now taken over ownership of the homes. She wondered if any of that activity could address the concerns of the speaker. Mr. Rojas said the policies in the General Plan support those types of actions; however, there is not a specific implementing action that states the City shall maintain such an inventory. The Draft Housing Element includes this as implementing action, but those elements moving to the City Council do not.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall questioned if maps could be merged or checked against one another. Mr. Rojas said staff would be happy to meet with FaithWorks to merge all information together gathered by all groups.

Richard Neidhardt, Richmond, commended the City for the shoreline protection included in the plan which will bring great recreational areas as well as some economic benefit. He does support development in certain areas like what Mr. Genser described, but it also points to a weakness in the shoreline protection which is included. He thinks the plan needs a stronger recognition of the inevitability sea level rises. He did not think development and open space were mutually exclusive and they can be done together, which he would like pursued vigorously.

Brian Grumwald, Oakland, said he is a planning consultant and principal author of the Richmond Shoreline Strategic Plan representing Don Carr who owns 20 acres in the North Shorelines. He asked the Commission how they would like it if they invested all of their money into a property zoned industrial and had a history of being industrial and then have it down zoned to open space that allowed virtually no economic use. This is essentially the proposal for Change Area 12. Contrary to what Mr. Mitchell stated, it provides no play book for any other use. It is a draconian designation, and considering the fact that the City has invested millions of dollars to build a signal at the intersection of the property, contrary to the General Plan, the property has no biological issues except for some isolated wetlands. He echoed comments from other speakers and said it is one of two areas in the City suitable for large scale campus development. He said this area would be better for the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

for which they put in an application for because it could accommodate a 3,000 foot long building without blocking views.

Chair Duncan questioned how the site should be designated in terms of land use relative to the General Plan. Mr. Grumwald said the site should be designated the same as the sub-areas in the South Shoreline; Business Light Industrial mix. He also said it would not frustrate the opportunities for Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory to come to the site which this current General Plan does.

Chair Duncan questioned provisions for open space. Mr. Grumwald said there are hundreds of acres of open space surrounding the area and as part of a campus development plan, he thinks internal open space would be useful to the public as well and add value, as well as bring in values of the shoreline into the depths of some of the parcels, which are quite remote from the shoreline. He said there truly are opportunities where open space can serve multiple purposes.

Commissioner Soto said in thinking about this and hearing comments and information, a big issue for him is the gun range next door. He knows there is a land berm between the property in question and the gun range. He can now visit places in the flatlands of Richmond, Pt. Pinole Park, Parchester and other outlining areas, especially on Saturdays, and he questioned challenges should the campus be built out for occupancy.

Mr. Grumwald said the berm attenuates the noise significantly and they would propose to extend the berm on the east side of Goodrick opposite the gun club. But, the types of industrial, business and offices uses envisioned for are planned and those buildings can have a type of glazing to attenuate noise. Therefore, when inside the building, there will be no noise impacts from the railroad or the gun club.

Laura Tab, Richmond, President of Temple Beth Hillel, said they are currently designated as high density residential. During the TAC process, they requested that the Temple's land and commercial development to the east across from Central Avenue be designated Regional Commercial Mixed Use and the GPAC and consultant agreed. However, in the latest draft, the land is designated Public, Cultural and Institutional, which does not recognize the highest and best use of the land in the long run. The entire area off Hilltop Drive from the freeway off-ramp could be a vital commercial hub and they have long sought opportunities to develop the land to complement the Temple's functions, generate income and benefit the community. The designation as Public, Cultural and Institutional would deprive the Temple of those possibilities. She asked that the Temple and adjacent properties be re-designated to Regional Commercial Mixed Use or to Medium Intensity Mixed Use Gateway and/or Community Node.

Secretary Lee questioned the rationale for the area getting changed. Mr. Rojas said he was not a part of the initial General Plan process, but he assumes that the consultant took the existing use and designated that land to be consistent with the existing use. Secretary Lee questioned if it was possible that the part that is actually the religious institution be broken off and then let the other 4.5 acres go back to some other zoning. Mr. Rojas said this is possible, and staff would need to look at impacts of the adjacent properties.

Commissioner Soto said he was part of the GPAC and as he recalled, there was a suggestion to change the designation and there was no particular objection or discussion from anybody on the GPAC at that time and it was included as a matter of course.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall asked where the designation came from and what was behind it. She commented also that the map for Pt. Molate does not include this designation, where all of the historic buildings and cultural history needs to be protected. Mr. Rojas said there are various public resources throughout the City and in those cases, they do not have Public Institutional designations, but given comments received, the area might be better suited to be left entirely open space or adding another designation, which he thinks should be discussed. Mr. Mitchell agreed that staff will need to review it and make adjustments as necessary; he believes there were situations where one designation would go on a parcel.

Chair Duncan noted also that this was a National Register District, as well.

Paul Minault, Allied Propane, voiced inaudible remarks from the audience.

Chair Duncan thanked all speakers for their comments, asked that they be submitted in writing to the Planning Department to April 29, 2011. He asked for Commission member comments.

Commissioner Choi reiterated that the process was comprehensive and a good study session.

Vice Chair Lane thanked the public for their input and encouraged those who provided comments to provide them in writing. She acknowledged staff's work on the General Plan, voiced appreciation in seeing changes in this plan made based on comments from the September 2009 plan. She said she would submit her formal comments in writing but noted the following verbal comments:

1. Any reduction in air quality and monitoring would be deplorable and she asked that this not be diminished. The City should work with other jurisdictional agencies to the best of their ability on incorporating air quality impacts into the Air Quality policy.
2. She supported Nancy Baer's comments regarding the equitable distribution of parks and recreation facilities and inclusion of language concerning new developments and their role in meeting parks requirements.
3. Regarding H1.5 and H1.G regarding joint use agreements' action measures, she felt it read more like a general policy and she suggested strengthening this language to read more like an action, and suggested similar language from the City Manager's Office in how they are looking at joint agreements.
4. Regarding HW2.3; Quality of Restaurant Food, she suggested corresponding action measures should be strengthened and more language added as to how to go about doing this, such as posting food nutrients.
5. Regarding the Economic Development Element, 1.C, the Façade Improvement Programs, she asked to add one bullet to explore how energy efficient retrofits could be included in the program and in working with businesses.
6. Regarding ED1.D; Community Facility's Assessment, she said comments were received from the audience. Understanding that tracking and assessment is done, a prioritization should also be done based on need and stated specifically.
7. Regarding ED2.A; Small Business Support Program, she said there were certain geographic areas and she asked if the Cutting Boulevard Corridor area was considered in that area. If not, she asked that the program support businesses in that area.
8. Regarding Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, she asked to include considering circumstances where developers pay in-lieu fees instead of constructing affordable units on-site, which is not contained in the language.

9. Regarding Sustainable Urban Agriculture Assessment, there were a lot of bullets listed, and she asked to include a bullet about the evaluation of land for contamination.

Secretary Lee asked that his comments be reflected in the minutes, noting that he would not be submitting them in writing, as follows:

1. He thinks it is important to work with Nathan Landau and develop a transit plan or explain what is in place already in terms of transit in the General Plan. He was sensitive to Don Fell's comment about the open space mapping for the Tiscornia Estates Specific Plan.
2. He referred to the North Richmond AC Transit request, and asked that this be addressed in discussions.
3. He asked that the consultant and staff sort out the Temple Beth-El property.
4. He asked to keep infill development as a priority.
5. He supports Joan Garrett's comments about freeing up Pt. Molate and opportunities there, and suggested this go back to PUD and not to try and force things onto it. It would allow for some flexibility.
6. Regarding the North Shore, it seems like the GPAC was Richmond based and appointed individuals and stakeholders, and they said 22-6 to leave it as a PUD and then in listening to speakers, 1/3 of speakers were from out of town expressing their personal interest in what the City should do with these properties. For a variety of reasons, he thinks this should go back into a PUD or at least something not so restrictive as what is proposed. He read a portion of a letter from the City Manager to the University of California stating that the letter serves to express the City's strong support for the Richmond Parkway Research Campus as a candidate site for the Lawrence Berkeley National Labs.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall said there seems to be a lot of confusion and legal issues about the North Shore property which should be sorted out. She was on the GPAC and recognized all City staff work that went into the document. They spoke at one point about having a land use category for shoreline property because everybody agreed shorelines were very important, and it seems like this category exists in the document. She thinks the category could help a lot in managing shoreline resources and also help define what shoreline is, as there has been some talk about whether the North Richmond property is, in fact, shoreline or not.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall said she also would like to discuss ideas raised by CBE and pollution control and monitoring standards, and not only should the policy say to monitor and control, but to actually improve air quality. She sees Richmond could actually become worse with the idea of emission credits, and it would be smart to establish Richmond as a green zone and work towards that. A healthy population needs good jobs and if the City has an emerging identity with green jobs and zones, the City could use it in a way to improve its air quality and environment, as well as economic standing. She suggested language to promote new taxes bases for the future to improve the City's health and economy. Land use and growth management dovetail into this as well, as much of the City's lands are zoned industrial, and she hoped to aim for smart growth.

Lastly, regarding SB 375, Commissioner Teltschick-Fall said she was not sure conformance needs to be written into the General Plan and suggested conforming when setting green zones or making this work across Elements better than what the City is already doing.

Commissioner Soto said the process is very educational for both the Commission and community and puts into focus important issues that have faced the community for generations. He hoped to see Richmond in a new light—to be on the cutting edge of using its land, water, air, communities, and this means there will be compromises along the way. He hoped the deliberations and information received at this meeting will be respected and considered by the Council.

Commissioner Reyes thanked City staff and those who have worked with the Planning staff for awhile. He came to the meeting hoping there was something in the plan about transportation and public transit for the Richmond workforce and having someone from AC Transit was helpful for him. He thinks this plays into the growth management piece. He heard a lot about health, welfare and environment, hoped how the City's transportation system gets people to where they need to go, and felt the most compelling argument he heard came from CBE representatives who asked to take industrial pollution and address it, embrace it, and not just be the victim. He also hoped that some ideas about what types of jobs can come with the plan can come forward as a result and asked that the public take the opportunity to access documents.

Chair Duncan said as he read through the response to the DEIR, he was stunned by a very well-reasoned and rational argument against the land use designation proposed in the General Plan. He is not 100% convinced that the north shore open space designation accurately represents the public process. He was left with the impression that development of some kind is a distinct possibility there. He understands completely that the General Plan is a visioning document and this area must be given a designation; however, what bothers him is that this starts to be a stepping off point for an actual rezoning of a site that will reflect that vision. At that point, it becomes a de facto eminent domain and to him this sets a precedent that should not start in the City. Whether one thinks this should be open space or not, he thinks personally that open space and development can and should co-exist on this site and the consortium of owners have adequately proved this through the Bay Shore development. To summarily take this swing sets a terrible precedent in the City and is not a way to think about changing land use.

Chair Duncan said he would support comments of Mr. Grunwald which pulls the rug out from under them and peel off people's rights after they have made a substantial investment. He would advocate either zoning be light industrial or making it a planned development area, as well as for Pt. Molate. He urged the City Attorney's office to review the document submitted by the owners.

Mr. Privat said the document will be reviewed by the City Attorney's office, and he thinks the characterization that the plan contemplates just open space is incorrect. The designation was parks and recreation which is something less. Chair Duncan disagreed and said it still has the same net effect to the owners of the property. Mr. Privat said he was confident in stating that the City Attorney's office has looked at this specifically and believes it would not constitute a taking, but he has not reviewed the letter and analyzed the issues specifically. Chair Duncan urged staff to look closely at Pt. Molate and North Shore.

Chair Duncan commented that the second round of review for the Commission would be on April 17, 2011. He thanked staff for their extraordinary work and thinks the plan is a very ambitious document.

COMMISSION BUSINESS

7. Reports of Officers, Commissioners and Staff

Commissioner Soto commented that he attended last night's City Council meeting and spoke in favor of the no vote for the casino. He was elated at the results.

Commissioner Teltschick-Fall said she also attended the City Council meeting and stayed until the vote, and she too was pleased with the vote. She said she looks forward to a land use for that area that does that site justice. Secondly, in the Commission's talks about mobile vendors, she heard a radio show about policies, initiatives and cooperatives for mobile food vendors in San Francisco. She took notes and will share them with fellow Commissioners but also encouraged the Commission to listen to the MP3 file to get some ideas. She would like to see stronger health language policies and food ordinances and said that with some work, the City could satisfy everybody and do something that would benefit small business as well as the health aspect.

Mr. Rojas announced an upcoming community workshop set up for outdoor vendor ordinance. Staff developed an outreach process consistent of four public workshops prior to developing the ordinance and is having the first workshop April 20th. He asked Commissioner Teltschick-Fall to forward the information via email.

Secretary Lee said one of the earlier versions of the draft General Plan had a restriction on formula restaurants and this goes back to comments about what the community wanted. He thinks these could potentially be banned in C-1 neighborhood districts. He has also been contacted by a company who is doing a West Contra Costa Transit Action Plan and agreed to forward contact information to staff about him possibly providing a future presentation to the Commission.

Commissioner Reyes said he also attended the City Council meeting and one thing that struck him is that an official from San Pablo spoke and said 2/3 of revenues from the City came from the City. Commissioner Soto added that the 2/3 is a flat rate of \$12 million annually but that the Town Center is not benefitting from the economic spin off from the casino operation.

Mr. Privat corrected his comments for the record, stating that the Parks and Recreation designation for the North Shore was something less than open space, but it is something more than open space.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.