

**MINUTES**  
**ALAMEDA COUNTY PARKS, RECREATION AND HISTORICAL**  
**COMMISSION**

**Thursday, June 30, 2008**  
**East Bay Regional Park District,**  
**2950 Peralta Oaks Court, Oakland, CA**  
**(Approved July 23, 2008)**

**I. Call to Order – Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 3:40 p.m. by Commissioner Allen, Chair. She noted that the Board of Supervisors will be making a decision on this project tomorrow, July 1<sup>st</sup>.

The Chair requested the status of next month's (July) Commission meeting. Staff confirmed that the regular meeting scheduled for July 3<sup>rd</sup> has been rescheduled for July 23<sup>rd</sup> at the Hayward Public Work's complex, 399 Elmhurst Street.

Commissioners Present:

Annalee Allen  
Al Minard  
James Loughran  
David Tam (arrived late)

Commissioners Excused:

Marie Cronin  
David Sadoff  
Julie Machado  
Harry Francis  
Ellen Wyrick-Parkinson  
Stephen Sanger  
MaryAnn McMillan  
Dennis Waespi

Staff Present:

Liz McElligott  
Angela Robinson-Piñon  
Nilma Singh

Guests:

Bruce Jensen, CDA Planning, Senior Planner  
Donna Linton, Asst County Administrator  
James Kachik, GSA Technical Services  
Alan Bright  
Ann Ludwig, GSA-Project Manager  
Scott Gregory, Lamphier Gregory & Associates  
Chris Pattilla, PGA Design and HALS  
Mark Hulbert, Preservation Architecture

**II. PRESENTATIONS BY THE HIGHLAND HOSPITAL ACUTE CARE TOWER**

**PROJECT TEAM** ~ Ms. Linton announced that she has chaired the Executive Steering Committee for Design and Replacement of the Acute Tower and introduced Jim Kachik, Head of GSA Technical Services Department; Alan Bright; Ann Ludwig, GSA-Project Manager; and Andrea Weddle, Deputy County Counsel. Mr. Jensen further introduced Mark Culvert, Historic Consultant; Scott Gregory, Lamphier-Gregory Associates, Environmental Consultant and Allen Bright, Project Designer.

Mr. Kachik, with a PowerPoint presentation, discussed the following: the reasons for the replacement is to meet the State seismic requirements; plan to remain open during construction; an aerial photograph noting the fully developed lot with little open space; existing site with building locations; construction schedule and phasing; EIR schedule; two inevitable impacts of the project--construction noise and removal of historical resources; mitigation measures and evaluation; location of the historical landscape; responses to

comments received for the DEIR in the FEIR; documentation of removal of any historical significant resources and proper maintenance of any remaining historical resources.

Mr. Bright showed and discussed the building design strategies including compatibility, window designs, green court yard design, simplicity of older design, and examples of different projects in other jurisdictions. The new scheme will bring the courtyard design with landscaping and green open space back.

Commissioner Minard asked for the number and location of trees to be removed. Ms. Linton replied that only three pine trees will be removed and Mr. Bright displayed the landscape plan.

Chris Pattilla, a locally-based landscape architect, Co-Chair of Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS), a new federal program created in 2000, to document significant, cultural and historical landscapes. At the request of Oakland Heritage Alliance, they have looked at the campus landscape architecture, which is one of the distinguishing qualities and amenity of the site. A HALS documentation, though not required, would be beneficial to have for the County and any efforts to seek funding to improve landscaping. In response to Commissioner Minard, she confirmed that a HALS survey is similar to HABS, housed in the Library of Congress and available to all. She distributed a flier on the local HALS chapter noting that the intention is to have information/surveys readily available on their website eventually. The three levels of inquiry are: 1) to be utilized for projects of national significance; 2) for states of regional or State levels; and 3) abbreviated/cursory list of little documentation. Commissioner Minard asked for the different cost levels. Ms. Patilla replied that this is a new program, she was not sure but perhaps a level 1 or 2 could cost approximately \$25,000. HALS documentation includes three components: photographic; historic research and narrative, and integrity evaluation; and the third is measured drawings. Topography is a key factor in design and while not part of the original plan, the Chair felt that it should be documented. Ms. Patilla explained that the emphasis of the HALS document is historic landscape that is remaining and those features not remaining would only be mentioned in the narrative.

**III. HIGHLAND HOSPITAL DISCUSSION** – *The Commission will discuss the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and other documents relevant to the improvements to take place on the Highland Hospital Campus.*

Ms. Linton pointed out that to preserve the old administration building, the new construction site had to be moved away from this area and another aim was to put the new tower next to the Critical Care Building. Building the Acute Tower off of 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue does not cast shadows to the neighboring homes on 31<sup>st</sup> Street, takes away the noise issues and also protects the landscaping and the 1920 buildings. As a result of all comments received since the publication of the FEIR, some changes in the FEIR are being recommended to the BOS. The BOS action will include certification of the FEIR, adopt the Findings including the Mitigation Monitoring and Improvement Measures; and to approve the up-dated project. The proposed revisions, as outlined in the BOS letter, page 4, includes: Historic Resources Preservation Study, Design Consistency with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation; Pursue National Register of Historic Places Nomination and Limit Construction Impacts. The FEIR will be amended as outlined in Attachment A which contains the proposed revisions in response to the community concerns and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan and improvement measures. The Resolution has three Exhibits and Attachment F is responses to all comments received. Attachment A lists the following modifications: the word ‘should’ be replaced with ‘shall’, the sentence to read: “The County shall conduct a historical resources preservation study’ and this study would include a review of the campus landscape and grounds. A

historical American landscape survey (HALS) will be completed. This recommendation also formalizes the role of this Commission, to review the evaluation studies for buildings and landscape design, and to conduct community outreach within City of Oakland and Alameda County. In addition, this Commission will also review the interpretative displays, in consultation with the Arts Commission. In the event of non-availability of grant funds, the County will look into the project money. In response to the San Antonio Home Association, there will be as little night-time work as feasible and, if any, during off-peak hours and with notification.

Commissioner Minard asked if the wrought iron gate will be replaced. Ms. Linton replied that it will be part of the preservation studies and funding will be sought to restore it. Commissioner Minard noted that FEMA does provide money for retro-fitting of critical care facilities. Ms. Linton said that they were unaware of any available federal funds. Another extension of 2008 deadline extended to 2013, will be requested. Ms. Kachik confirmed that no FEMA funds are available as the hospital does not meet their criteria for funding. Commissioner Minard also expressed concern that landscaping watering will continue only after a month of no construction and asked if there will be an archeological historian during the earth moving phase. Mr. Kachik replied that all landscaping not impacted by construction will be maintained. Ms. Ludwig thought that perhaps it was part of the construction management plan dust control. Mr. Kachik said that the issue of archeological findings has been adequately addressed in the Construction Contract and pointed out that this area has been already turned over during prior construction. The Chair discussed the issue of storage of artifacts and further read the related portion on page 14 of the CDA memo. Ms. Linton noted that page 13 adding that all storage will be appropriate to avoid further damage. The Chair stated her appreciation for the inclusion of this Commission, read the third paragraph on page 15 of the FEIR Findings and suggested including Alameda County Historical Society. Ms. Linton pointed out that formalizing a role for this Commission will allow for additional outreach. The Chair also discussed the signage/plaques and stressed the importance of using a lot of visuals, the integration of historical and art.

Ms. Linton indicated that, if the Commission supports the recommendations made by the Chair (due to a lack of quorum), perhaps representation at the BOS hearing would be appropriate. Commissioner Loughran confirmed that the Commission agrees with the Chair's recommendation. Commissioner Minard also agreed adding that he was sorry to see the disappearance of historical buildings. The Chair said she would be attending tomorrow's BOS hearing.

Commissioner Minard pointed out that DEIR had two proposals, A and B, and asked why a third proposal (showing the final plan) was not included. Mr. Gregory explained that the DEIR presented two alternatives to the proposed project. In the FEIR, with slight project modifications, additional alternatives were recommended. Each alternative was considered for feasibility and none of the alternatives met with the object of the plan. The Chair noted that the change is the Satellite Building. Commissioner Minard re-iterated his concern adding that if there is a major difference between the Draft and Final EIR, then the EIR has to be re-circulated. Mr. Gregory explained that there has to be significant new information that would result in a significant environment impact that was not previously disclosed. The reconfiguration of the parking lot to a different satellite building design with parking under it was not going to generate new significant environmental impact that was not previously disclosed. In addition to the project proposed, there were three alternatives, A, B and No Project. The current project is similar to the project outlined in the DRAFT but not similar to either of the alternatives. Regarding Commissioner Minard's landscaping maintenance

concerns, he explained the Visual Improvement Measure under the Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan, page 2; and in response to the archeological monitoring, the DEIR notes the potential for archeological resources and not a recorded site in the vicinity for any human remain finds. Nevertheless, there is a training procedure for all construction personnel from a trained archeologist. Commissioner Minard re-iterated his concerns and said he would like a historical archeologist on site during earth moving. The Chair stated that she could convey this to the BOS meeting.

Commissioner Tam apologized for being late as he had been assaulted in the bus and also offered apologies on behalf of Commissioner Waespi for his absence. He noted a typo on Page 6 and recommended identification of deconstruction as a separate sub-section under b. Mitigation Measures.

The Chair suggested getting help from the State Historic Building Code for the repair of the stairs for public access. Mark Hulbert thought that State Historic Building Code was very specific and any jurisdiction is always required to use it.

At the request of Ms. McElligott, the Chair summarized the aim of the Commission: the identification of deconstruction as a separate mitigation measure from the scope of the services of the Historical Resource Consultant, the involvement of this Commission, plaques and display with public art, appreciate the working with Arts Commission, a historical archeologist be on site during earth moving, and in support of the certification of the FEIR and the inclusion of the HALS and HABS.

Commissioner Tam asked for clarification on the alternative project. Mr. Gregory explained that there were two alternatives, A and B and the public support was for both, saving the auditorium and the wings. This is the most feasible, cost effective and less impact.

**V. ADJOURNMENT:** There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:50 pm.