

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

**CITY OF SAN RAMON
OPEN SPACE TASK FORCE**

December 10, 2012
Regular Meeting

Approved February 11, 2013

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIENCE

3. ROLL CALL

Present:

Chair David Ernest, Vice Chair Dominique Yancey; Donna Kerger; Phil O'Loane;
Dennis Viers and John Youngblood

Staff:

Jeff Gault, Maintenance Operations Division Manager; Shinei Tsukamoto, Assistant Planner;
Robin Bartlett, Engineering Division Manager, and Cristi Toman, Recording Secretary

Absent:

William Meine

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

5. CONSENT ITEMS

None

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

6.1 Summary of Actions from September 10, 2012 Meeting

Summary of Actions from the September 10, 2012 meeting were approved with no changes by
Ms. Kerger; Ms. Yancey seconded the motion; motion passed with no opposition.

45 **7. TASK FORCE BUSINESS**

46
47 **7.1 Re-cap of September 26, 2012 Policy Committee Meeting**

48
49 Mr. Gault summarized the September 26, 2012 Policy Committee meeting. Mr. Gault stated that
50 the Open Space Task Force Committee brought forward the amended bylaws and stated that at
51 the conclusion there was conflict as to what the responsibilities and duties of the Open Space
52 Task Force and stated that the Policy Committee was divided on recommending the changes that
53 were brought forward.

54
55 Mr. Gault stated that the Review of Proposed Changes to the Open Space Task Force and By-
56 Laws was presented to the Parks Commission on October 10, 2012 and that the Parks
57 Commission decided to table the proposed changes until the Open Space Task Force completed
58 the work they were charged with. Mr. Gault stated that once the Open Space Task Force
59 completes the work they were charged with, the Task Force would go before the City Council
60 with a presentation on their accomplishments and ask for further direction.

61
62 Ms. Kerger asked who from the Open Space Task Force committee attended the Policy
63 Committee. Mr. Gault stated Mr. Ernest and Mr. Meine attended the Policy Committee meeting.

64
65 Mr. Ernest stated the Open Space Task Force was originally set up as an advisory committee but
66 over time became a task force, and it is the pleasure of the City Council if they would like to
67 have an ongoing advisory committee of the Parks Commission.

68
69 Mr. Viers asked if the entire City Council is on the Policy Committee. Mr. O'Loane stated that
70 the entire City Council is not on the Policy Committee.

71
72 Mr. O'Loane stated that early on in the discussion was a debate about whether the Open Space
73 Task Force had the authority to recommend that a piece of property within the city limits be
74 recommended as a target for preservation, and Councilmember Hudson expressed rejection
75 which started the debate. Mr. O'Loane stated that the meeting was contentious and stated that he
76 understood some of the difficulty in figuring out the committee's charge. Mr. O'Loane stated
77 that the Policy Committee serves as a sounding board for ideas for staff.

78
79 Ms. Kerger stated that now is not any different than what was experienced at the beginning when
80 it was an advisory board and that they are still trying to get the parameters and vision of what it
81 was.

82
83 Ms. Kerger commended Chair Ernest for his efforts and stated the more information the Open
84 Space Task Force committee could receive, the more the Open Space Task Force committee
85 could make sound decision as to what the goal and the focus of the Open Space Task Force is.

86
87 Ms. Yancey stated that the Parks Commission motioned to table the item and that motion was
88 seconded and approved by the Commission.

89
90 Mr. Youngblood stated that at the conclusion of the September 10, 2012 Open Space Task Force

91 meeting, the members recommended specific changes that would make the Open Space Task
92 Force committee operate better in conjunction with what they thought their charge was and that
93 he expected some questions to come back. Mr. Ernest stated that all of the recommendations
94 from that September 10, 2012 Open Space Task Force committee meeting were presented to the
95 Parks Commission, and stated that at the end of the discussion there was a motion to table the
96 item. Mr. Ernest stated this was too soon at the Parks Commission level because they do not
97 know what the end result was going to be of the recommendations to the Parks Commission and
98 its final recommendation to City Council. After the Open Space Task Force committee has the
99 end result, the Parks Commission would be in a position to know if the Open Space Task Force
100 committee should be an advisory committee or a task force.

101
102 Mr. Ernest stated that Mr. Meine's comment was read into the October 10, 2012 Parks
103 Commission minutes and suggested the Open Space Task Force should be terminated, and a new
104 ongoing citizen property development committee should be recommended consisting of seven
105 members. There should be a discussion which of those two approaches the Open Space Task
106 Force committee would bring forth to City Council when they bring it back to the Parks
107 Commission. Mr. Ernest stated that he would hope to have the results of this meeting at the
108 January Parks Commission meeting.

109
110 Ms. Yancey stated that it is premature to say what would be on the January Parks Commission
111 agenda. Ms. Yancey stated that at this point the change in the bylaws is not in front of the Parks
112 Commission.

113
114 Mr. O'Loane asked what the Parks Commission authority is. Mr. Gault stated that the Parks
115 Commission would consider a recommendation by the Open Space Task Force and the Parks
116 Commission would make a recommendation to City Council, and City Council would decide
117 whether or not this group is done or not.

118

119

120 **8. TASK FORCE BUSINESS**

121

122 **8.1 East Bay Regional Park District Meeting – Report on EBRPD “Master Plan 123 2012”**

124

125 Mr. Viers summarized the East Bay Regional Park District Meeting. Mr. Viers stated the East
126 Bay Regional Park District conducted two surveys, a telephone survey and an online survey, and
127 stated that East Bay Regional Park District asked a number of questions regarding the parks.
128 Mr. Viers stated that after receiving input from the Public, Park Advisory Committee and staff
129 the following priority issues were chosen by the Board to be addressed in this update of the
130 Master Plan:

131

132

133

134

135

136

- Providing a variety of “Trails for all”
- Leading the movement for Healthy Parks Healthy People
- Affirming the role and identity of the Regional Parks
- Balancing funding priorities, meeting expectations and sound fiscal practices
- Supporting the shift to Green communities
- Developing productive partnership

- Responding to changes in demographics
- Creating conservation and management standards for cultural and historic resources

8.2 Update by Task Force Sub Committee –Property Profile

Mr. Viers stated that the Open Space Inventory Matrix key matches the property ID on the In Order of Total Property Value Per Acre. The document entitled In Order of Total Property Value Per Acre is color-coded by property value, and the color codes match the map entitled Open Space Ownership With Property Values. The Open Space Inventory Matrix column H entitled Regional Trail Connection Potential by EBRPD matches the key on the map entitled East Bay Regional Park District Existing and Potential Parklands and Trails which are not owned by the East Bay Regional Park District.

Ms. Yancey stated once the master plan of the East Bay Regional Park is complete, the committee would want to overlay what their trail designs are for the future. Mr. Tsukumoto concurred.

Ms. Yancey stated that the committee could make a potential recommendation and that this could be something that East Bay Regional Park District would potentially want to purchase because it would be a trail connector. Mr. Tsukumoto concurred.

Ms. Kerger stated that by stopping at the city line that the Alameda side by Castro Valley could impact San Ramon was a concern. Ms. Kerger stated that Wiedemann and possibly Gelderman have property that is on the other side of the hill. Ms. Kerger suggested putting a line item that there are a certain number of acres in Alameda County. Ms. Kerger stated the Open Space Task Force committee should to be aware of what is totally around the city and was concerned if the committee was sunset that they could lose the information. Mr. Ernest stated that there are a lot more things out there that need to be looked at and the committee cannot think about what might possibly happen because things will never get done otherwise.

Mr. O’Loane suggested in conjunction with East Bay Regional Park District to get the Wiedemanns’ to agree to a conservation easement and that if the Wiedemanns’ donated their easement, they would receive a tax benefit.

Ms. Yancey stated that the charge of the Open Space Task Force is to make recommendations so that the City Council could take a look at what they should work with and commended Mr. Viers, Mr. Youngblood, and Mr. Tsukumoto for their work.

8.3 Potential Acquisition Opportunities/Mechanisms for Preservation

Mr. Bartlett summarized the handout entitled Methods for Open Space Preservation and Associated Funding dated December 10, 2012, and summarized the list he put together regarding a variety of methods to preserving the open space and sources of funding to facilitate open space preservation.

183 Mr. O’Loane asked if the developer had the conservation easement or does the Geologic Hazard
184 and Abatement Districts (“GHAD”) own the property. Mr. Bartlett stated that (“GHAD”) owns
185 the property but sitting on top of the property are three different conservation easements and the
186 conservation easements require money in order to operate.

187
188 Ms. Yancey asked of all the different acquisitions if there was anything that anybody does not
189 see on the list. Mr. Viers suggested reviewing the minutes of Seth Adams.

190
191 Mr. O’Loane stated that if the City decided to partner with other organizations, there are two
192 partnering pieces, leveraging in shared costs and leveraging in approval rights or acting as a
193 facilitator.

194
195 Ms. Yancey asked if under Sources of Funding to Facilitate Open Space Preservation if an
196 additional bullet point should be added to say City partners with these organizations.

197 Mr. O’Loane concurred and added seeking them to act as a facilitator or partner and also to
198 obtain essentially leverage.

200 **8.4 Wrap Up – Action Items**

201
202 Mr. Ernest commended the report and work from Mr. Viers, Mr. Youngblood and
203 Mr. Tsukamoto, and stated that the documents they created support the charge of the Open Space
204 Task Force committee. Mr. Ernest suggested presenting this report to the Parks Commission and
205 requests their feedback and to see if the Parks Commission would recommend this report be
206 presented to the City Council as an interim report and to ask the City Council how they would
207 like the Open Space Task Force committee to proceed.

208
209 Ms. Yancey stated that one of the things that the Open Space Task Force committee had asked
210 staff to do was to contact any additional organizations to see if they wanted to submit any
211 properties to be part of the matrix. Ms. Yancey stated that other organizations may not want to
212 present something if they were in negotiations. Ms. Yancey stated that if that has not been done
213 that an approach should be to at least contact Save Mt. Diablo to see what properties they suggest
214 before the committee makes their recommendation to the Parks Commission and City Council if
215 there are any properties you think may be new to add to the matrix.

216
217 Mr. Ernest stated that he would like to see the task force get all of the information requested and
218 suggested a subcommittee to work with Mr. Gault. Mr. Gault suggested sending out letters to
219 evaluate responses received and telephone calls to see if there are other properties.

220
221 Ms. Kerger suggested special districts because sometimes they get rid of their properties.
222 Mr. Ernest stated a goal for January would be to contact interested groups or people interested so
223 the task force committee could review the list and decide what to do.

224 **9. ADJOURNMENT**

225
226
227 The meeting adjourned at 6:43 p.m.
228 Submitted by Cristi Toman, Recording Secretary