



## **CITY MANAGER'S ORAL REPORT**

The City Manager asked the Council to add the following urgency item to the agenda: Discussion of the Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Program Grant (NTTP) and the Upcoming Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) Meeting. The need to add this item to the agenda arose subsequent to the posting of the agenda.

M/s, Chu/Lundstrom and approved 4-0 (Hillmer absent) that this issue is of an urgent nature and it arose subsequent to the posting of the agenda.

M/s, Hartzell/Lundstrom and approved 4-0 (Hillmer absent) to add this issue to the agenda.

Mayor Arlas stated this item would become Business Item #3.

The City Manager stated the auditors would be at City Hall next week to begin their review of the Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 2006/07. Staff is in the process of beginning labor negotiations with the Twin Cities Police Authority and Miscellaneous Employees. The Twin Cities Police Authority will hold a meeting on Thursday, March 29<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 p.m. Corte Madera Mayor Melissa Gill will replace Corte Madera Councilmember Jin Yang on the Authority. Staff has been busy working on consolidation and regional issues including fire consolidation and Central Marin Sanitation Agency's Strategic Plan. There were two meetings last week regarding appeals of FEMA claims from the January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006 flood. Staff has been meeting with Marin Housing Authority regarding a variety of topics related to new and existing affordable units. She will present a status report to the Council in April. Staff met with representatives from San Rafael and the Project Manager for the Cal Park Tunnel Project to review the status of the project and set some timeframes for the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Larkspur will be hosting the MCCMC meeting on Wednesday, March 28<sup>th</sup>. Discussion topics will include the Ross Valley Watershed project and disaster planning. There will be an annual meeting of the Larkspur Marina Dredging Project on Tuesday, April 3<sup>rd</sup>. The Twin Cities will be hosting an Open House at Piper Park on Saturday, March 24<sup>th</sup> in conjunction with the opening Marin Girls' Softball Season. Individuals enjoying the park would also have an opportunity to tour the Twin Cities Police Facility and view the plan for the proposed new facility.

## **COUNCILMEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS**

Councilmember Lundstrom reported property owners in the Ross Valley Watershed Assessment District received a notice on March 15<sup>th</sup> regarding the amount of the assessment. They have until May 1<sup>st</sup> to submit written or oral protests that would be heard by the County Board of Supervisors. The issue would go to a vote in the absence of a majority protest.

The voting period ends on June 15<sup>th</sup> after a 45-day voting period. Passage of the tax would require 50% of the votes cast. She asked staff to post the information/facts sheet on the City Website. She has volunteered to be part of a group explaining and giving out information about the project.

Mayor Arlas reported he, along with Councilmember Chu, attended the Greenbrae Property Owner's Association Annual Meeting and presented information on various topics. Twin Cities Police Captain Todd Cusamano made a presentation about the need for a new Police Facility. Mayor Arlas pointed out that this facility is the Emergency Operating Center (EOC) for the lower Ross Valley. Councilmember Chu stated he received a "Thank You" note from the President of the Greenbrae Property Owner's Association.

Councilmember Hartzell reported she, along with Twin Cities Police Chief Phil Green, would be hosting an Open House/Workshop on April 24<sup>th</sup> at the Recreation Department Community Room. There will be an opportunity to tour the Police Facility.

Councilmember Hartzell reported there would be an Open House regarding the Centennial Celebration on April 17<sup>th</sup> in the Council Chambers. The Steering Committee appointed Ms. Jody Coker as the Chair of the 4<sup>th</sup> of July Parade Float Committee. She is working on appointments for the Dance Chair and Birthday Chair. The next Steering Committee meeting will be April 2<sup>nd</sup>.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ms. Grace Hughes, representing the Marin Airporter, stated she had the opportunity to avail herself of the services of the Larkspur Fire Department. They had a small fire at her place of business and she commended the department for their responsiveness and professionalism.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None

## **BUSINESS ITEMS**

1. UPDATE FROM TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN (TAM)  
PRESENTED BY BILL WHITNEY

The City Manager presented the staff report.

Mr. Bill Whitney, Project Manager for the TAM, stated they are working on identifying a series of multi-modal transportation improvements within the Highway 101/Greenbrae Corridor.

He invited the Council and the community to a second workshop on March 27th sponsored by TAM to help identify transportation improvements that will address the congestion in the corridor. This workshop will be held on March 27<sup>th</sup> at Redwood High School at 6:00 a.m. TAM implemented a process called “Context Sensitive Design” which is an approach that engages the community very early in the planning process. TAM has been holding a number of stakeholder interviews with groups such as the Chamber of Commerce, Golden Gate Bridge District, Marin Airporth, etc. They have been reaching out to identify the existing conditions as they begin to develop these transportation solutions. They have begun some analysis of this information and are developing some alternatives that will be presented at this second workshop. They have also had discussions with some technical partners and formed a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to help guide TAM in the process. The TAC held a meeting today that was very productive. He discussed Regional Measure 2 that raised the toll on State owned bridges from \$2.00 to \$3.00, using that \$1.00 increase to fund traffic relief project. Marin County received \$65 million from Regional Measure 2. Four projects have been identified within that program, including the Highway 101/Greenbrae Corridor project. He briefly discussed the Cal Park Hill Tunnel Rehabilitation and Multi-Use Pathway Project and the Central Marin Ferry Connection. He discussed the next steps including several more workshops, more traffic analysis, and then the environmental phase. He stated this is a data driven process.

Mr. Kai Chan, Deputy Project Manager and Lead Engineer, stated they would be presenting the traffic studies at the upcoming workshop and plan to have a series of workstations. They did some aerial flights of the freeway and have constructed a model of the existing conditions and the future needs.

Mayor Arlas opened the meeting to public comments

Ms. Grace Hughes asked for an update on the Cal Park Tunnel Project.

Mr. Whitney stated this was a complicated project that has a lot of funding sources. It is a partnership with SMART who recently agreed to a 50-50 split with the project. Federal funding for the project was in jeopardy but has been extended for 12 months. The project is at 90% design and the plans have been sent to stakeholders for comments. The MOU is complicated and was put on the back burner for a while. They are currently working on right-of-way and acquisition issues. They are hoping to put the project out to bid late this fall after the MOU is in place.

Mayor Arlas closed the meeting to public comments.

Mayor Arlas stated the Larkspur City Council has been opposed to the Cal Park Tunnel project and he was concerned that their position has not been taken into consideration.

Mr. Whitney stated the crossing of the Cal Park Hill has been discussed for decades and got a lot of life in the 1990's. Opening of the tunnel for bicycle and pedestrian uses was later determined to be feasible and desirable.

Councilmember Hillmer arrived at the meeting at 8:08 p.m.

Mayor Arlas asked about the source of the SMART funding. Mr. Whitney stated SMART was a recipient of Regional Measure 2 funds.

Mayor Arlas asked about the cost to build the pathway on the San Rafael side. Mr. Whitney discussed the limits of the project and stated he did not have the breakdown for particular components. This is a gap closure project connecting the transit center in downtown San Rafael with the Larkspur Ferry Terminal.

Councilmember Lundstrom noted the Greenbrae Corridor Project goes from Tamalpais Drive in Corte Madera up through the Greenbrae Intersection and looks at closing several on and off ramps (Lucky Drive, Fifer, Madera). The upcoming meeting is very important because it looks at the entire area including impact to the local streets. She asked Mr. Whitney to schedule preliminary discussions with the Larkspur and Corte Madera City Councils before final review by TAM.

Councilmember Chu stated the Council had concerns about security, maintenance, and other operational issues for the Cal Park Tunnel Project. In the absence of the MOU he feels these concerns are unresolved. Mr. Whitney agreed the MOU was a priority.

## 2. REPORT FROM TOM BRADNER, LARKSPUR'S REPRESENTATIVE ON THE MOSQUITO/VECTOR BOARD

Mr. Tom Bradner discussed some of the mosquito borne illnesses that affect both humans and other animals and the establishment of these districts many years ago. He stated there were two human cases of West Nile Virus last year. Both individuals recovered. None of the birds tested this year have been infected. He stated last year was a fairly mild year for the virus and he thought it was due to the weather pattern. He commended the staff at the district for their work and professionalism, in particular the lab in Cotati.

Mayor Arlas opened the meeting to public comment.

There were no comments. Mayor Arlas closed the meeting to public comments.

Councilmember Hillmer stated there was a drainage ravine at Redwood High School that has a somewhat constricted flow and mucky water during most of the year. He was concerned that this could be a breeding ground for mosquitoes.

Mr. Bradner stated the charter of the district is to control vector borne diseases and they stand ready to assist any public health agency. The County Health Department would check on the water quality. The district checks the area for mosquitoes on a regular basis.

Mayor Arlas asked if mosquitoes could inhabit brackish water. Mr. Bradner stated “yes” and briefly discussed the Salt Marsh Mosquito.

The Council thanked Mr. Bradner for his service to the community.

### 3. DISCUSSION OF THE NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION GRANT AND THE UPCOMING TAM MEETING

Councilmember Lundstrom stated Marin County received a Federal grant in the amount of \$20 million for a Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Program. It is intended to get people out of cars and to walk and use bicycles for transportation. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was set up which held a number of public workshops. The projects would go to the Board of Supervisors for approval on April 17<sup>th</sup>. She helped initiate a process that allowed City representatives to review projects before they went to the Board of Supervisors. The intent was to balance out special interest groups. Preliminary recommendations were changed to include the recognition of multi-use pathways vs. bikeways and an allocation of more funds for pedestrian paths, lanes, and stairways. They are also advocating the creation of an educational program to “Share the Path”. They are recommending more geographic equity to urban areas, particularly the East/West corridor. The Towns of Fairfax and San Anselmo are upset because there was only one project proposed for their jurisdiction. She asked the Council to support a resolution that would recognize the communities in the East/West corridor.

Mayor Arlas opened the meeting to public comments.

There were no comments. Mayor Arlas closed the meeting to public comments.

Councilmember Hillmer asked if the resolution included a statement that this was being done out of support for the other cities in the Ross Valley.

Mayor Arlas proposed the following revised wording: “The Larkspur City Council requests that equal consideration be given to requests for more multi-use pathways and in particular the requests by the Town Councils of Fairfax and San Anselmo”.

Councilmember Lundstrom stated the issue was not necessarily multi-use paths.

Mayor Arlas stated the Marin County Bicycle Coalition is only concerned with North/South connections and the other jurisdictions should have equal

considerations. Councilmember Lundstrom stated the cities of Larkspur and Ross were satisfied.

Councilmember Chu stated the term “equitable consideration” should be used and if they use the same criteria used in Measure A then that should happen.

Councilmember Lundstrom stated they did not argue for equity overall because West Marin is not getting anything. They are emphasizing the urbanized corridor and there is only so much money to go around. The project must demonstrate that it gets people out of cars.

Councilmember Hillmer stated the intention was to show support for the Towns of San Anselmo and Fairfax and the resolution should state that their needs are more important than the tunnel study at this point in time. He suggested the term “priority consideration”

M/s, Hartzell/Hillmer and approved 5-0 to approve the resolution with the language suggested by Councilmember Hillmer.

The City Manager asked if the Council wanted an official number assigned to this resolution so it becomes a part of the City’s document history. Mayor Arlas stated “yes”.

The Council took a 10-minute break at 8:40 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 8:50 p.m.

#### 4. UPDATE ON THE PARKS/MAINTENANCE FACILITY IN PIPER PARK

The City Manager presented the staff report.

Mr. Eric Glass, architect, discussed the four Options: #2, #2A, #2B, and #3. He stated the first three are slight variations on a basic theme. All of the #2 Options are based on elevating the tennis courts and putting the Public Works/Corporation Yard functions below. They also include a berm that wraps around the raised portion of the tennis courts (east and south side) to try and reduce the apparent height of the structure. The difference is whether or not there is a materials storage yard outside, inside, or not on the site. Option #3 takes a different approach and looks a lot like the former Option #1 temporary solution. They have taken what was formerly a temporary option and created a permanent option in essentially the same footprint. The tennis courts remain untouched. The main difference between the temporary and permanent scheme is the accommodation of the programmatic requirements. The footprint of the building structure is an upside down “T” and is slightly larger than the temporary scheme. It is located in the strip of land to the south of the tennis courts and north of the planned Police parking area.

They expanded the area to accommodate the Public Works/Engineering offices. They plan to keep the building as low as possible and use material similar to the proposed Police Facility. There would be a fence around the yard to conceal the activities.

Councilmember Lundstrom referred to Option #3 and stated the public would need to walk approximately 100 feet to the lobby of the building. Councilmember Lundstrom stated the previous Option #2 provided public parking that was more “public friendly”. Mr. Glass agreed that this was not an ideal situation. Councilmember Lundstrom asked if the building could be accessed from the Police Facility. Mr. Glass pointed out the secured Police parking and stated there was an opportunity to access the building through the space between the shops and carports. They were trying to create a situation that would have the least impact on the usable park area as possible.

Councilmember Hillmer stated the design was very creative but he had the same concerns as Councilmember Lundstrom and added it was a question of whether those offices serve the public better in that location or another location.

Councilmember Chu asked about the possibility of shared parking with the Police Facility. He asked if they could flip the Police non-secured parking with the Police visitors parking and use that as shared parking. Mr. Glass stated the Police non-secured and visitors parking were interchangeable. The vehicle carport was strictly for Parks Maintenance vehicles.

The City Manager stated the entrance to the park will be reconfigured and there were a series of parallel parking spaces along the road between the Police non-secure parking and the Piper Park public parking lot. There may be a way to have a secondary entrance to the building that crosses the shops and storage areas. Mayor Arlas stated that was a big liability issue.

Mayor Arlas stated this was a conceptual plan that was far from being finalized. He did not want the Council to work on a redesign but rather decide on which option was preferable.

Councilmember Hartzell asked if the buildings would be placed on pilings. Mr. Glass stated “no” and added the soils report was being updated. They are pursuing a “mat slab” with some extended interior and exterior perimeter footings for the two-story Police Facility. He envisions the same type of foundation system for this proposal.

Mayor Arlas opened the meeting to public comments.

Ms. Sandy Blauvelt, Chair of the Parks and Recreation Commission, stated Option #1 was agreed upon twice by the City Council. She stated Option #2 was costly, dangerous, and out of scale for Larkspur and especially the park.

Option #3 calls for a 6,000 square foot building which is extravagant. The proposed site currently has a 1,400 square foot modular building that is used by the Police Department. The Public Works maintenance crew currently resides in a 700 square foot building. There are two outstanding issues that need to be addressed: 1) the location of the materials storage area, 2) the location of the Public Works/Engineering Department Administrative offices. The Commission thinks there are ways to minimize the materials storage area since are other entities in the area that could share space. The Commission feels strongly that the engineering aspects of the Public Works Department should be located at City Hall and not in the park. Locating the Engineering Department in the park erodes parkland. The Engineering Department could be located in a modular building elsewhere in downtown Larkspur or they could lease some space. The Commission has steadfastly supported the new Police Facility. She would like to see this issue finalized.

Ms. Robin Moller, Cedar Avenue, stated she was very impressed with the plans for the new Police Facility. However, she felt the site plan was a bit odd and she was not happy with those uses at the entrance to the park. It would make more sense to locate these buildings at a more remote location. She agreed that the Engineering Department should be located in downtown office space and not in the park. Removing the Engineering Department from the plan allows for the opportunity to do something different.

Ms. Judy Ardsarooney, Corte Madera resident, stated she agreed with the comments that have been made. She asked the Council to keep the tennis courts where they are. She stated it would be very difficult to play tennis on a "rooftop". She stated a Corporation Yard does not belong in a park and was concerned about the conflict with Hall Middle School and the park itself. She stated this was a very important decision and it should not be rushed.

Ms. Helen Heitkamp, Elm Avenue, stated she had some concerns. She supported the new Police Facility but was concerned that the proposal for a permanent Corporation Yard and the cost of this additional structure could cast a dark cloud on funding for the Police Facility. The only option worth considering was Option #3 but the scale was overly ambitious. She stated the location was fine but the floor plan could be scaled down in a number of ways. She stated the Public Works/Engineering Department has always been a part of City Hall and it relates to the other permitting departments that are located in City Hall. She agreed with the suggestion to lease space or build a structure in the downtown area.

Mayor Arlas asked staff when the Public Works/Engineering Department moved out of City Hall. The City Manager stated about five years ago.

Ms. Sallyanne Wilson, Walnut Avenue, suggested that this type of issue be placed on the agenda as a Public Hearing and not a Business Item.

She stated the Public Works/Engineering offices are not necessarily best served by being at this site. Many other jurisdictions divide their Corporation Yards and Public Works/Engineering functions. This proposal was not discussed in the Larkspur 2050 Plan and she stated it was too costly.

Mr. Dick Wall, member of the Parks and Recreation Commission, stated this is the premier park in Larkspur and they need to cherish and protect the parklands. He asked at what point in time do they decide to protect what is left in the open space and not erode it any further, even if it is more costly to do something else.

Mayor Arlas closed the meeting to public comments.

Councilmember Hillmer asked about the possibility of building a 1,400 square foot structure at the City-owned property at the base of the Arch Street Stairs. The City Manager stated it would be possible but that property is fairly steeply sloped. She was not sure if a temporary structure would be acceptable from a Zoning standpoint.

Councilmember Lundstrom had questions about the removal of the Public Works/Engineering offices from the proposal and how the resulting structure would compare to the current maintenance facility. Mr. Glass stated removing the Engineering office would eliminate about 2,625 square feet, leaving a balance of about 3,360 square feet. Councilmember Hillmer stated the current Corporation Yard trailer/office is about 700 square feet. Councilmember Lundstrom stated that facility does not meet current standards. Mr. Glass stated it also does not meet the current needs for space.

Councilmember Chu stated the scale of the proposal was a bit large. He would like to know what areas could be reduced and still make it functional, such as the break room, meeting rooms, the size of the sleeping quarters, etc. Mr. Glass stated Councilmember Chu has identified some areas that could be fine-tuned. Mayor Arlas stated he did not want to design the proposal tonight.

Mayor Arlas asked the Public Works Director about the interaction between the three aspects of the department- Engineering, Public Works, and the Corporation Yard. The Public Works Director stated separating the Engineering Department was certainly possible but there was a lot of communication and interaction between the three aspects. The Department provides a wide range of services for the community. He stated this proposal was a vision for the future of Larkspur.

Councilmember Hillmer referred to the floor plan and the inconvenient access for the public and asked whether the Engineering Department would be better suited in a more public location.

The Public Works Director stated this facility would be an asset to the City and could be used by the Recreation Department if the Engineering Department returns to City Hall. There is a lot that could be done to make the facility more accessible to the public.

Mayor Arlas stated there were two issues: 1) whether or not to find another location for the Public Works/Engineering Department, 2) determine the location of the Corporation Yard.

Councilmember Chu stated he appreciated the comments made by the Parks and Recreation Commissioners since they are the stewards of the parkland. He has had a tough time with this issue and what would be the effective reduction in parkland space. The Corporation Yard should remain in the park and he would like to see as much of a reduction in the proposed footprint as possible, even if that means a splitting of the Engineering Department. He did not want the Engineering Department to have less space but he would like staff to look at other options. He noted the potential for a Community Facility on the Niven property could mean there would be available space at City Hall. He could support the splitting off of the Engineering Department.

Councilmember Hartzell stated she adamantly encouraged splitting off the Engineering Department.

Councilmember Lundstrom stated she could support splitting off the Engineering Department and felt those functions work best with the other City Hall functions (building, planning, administration). There are uncertainties about what will happen in the City Hall complex. She would like a reexamination of the allocation of square footage in the proposal.

Councilmember Hillmer stated he has struggled with this issue and he would like to have a place for the Engineering Department to go before he could order them to be split off. He did not want to set them adrift and he could not support the split at this time. He wanted the relationships between the Corporation Yard and the staff more direct and the entrance for Public Works reworked for better access. When they find a place for the Engineering Department they can then split them off.

Mayor Arlas agreed with Councilmember Hillmer and stated it was unconscionable to just bet that there will be a place in the downtown to send the Engineering Department. The proposed strip of land has never been used for parkland. This is a very creative proposal and it would be wrong to split off the Engineering Department.

M/s, Chu/Lundstrom and approved 3-2 (Mayor Arlas and Councilmember Hillmer voted no) to direct the City Manager to seek alternative space, other than Piper Park, for the Public Works/Engineering Department offices.

Mayor Arlas asked for comments on Option #3.

Councilmember Hartzell stated she was concerned that they never considered finding another location for the Corporation Yard. She stated they have never talked about the square footage wants vs. needs of the Corporation Yard. She was concerned they were being given an “either/or” scenario and she would like to examine other options. She is choosing none of the above.

Councilmember Lundstrom stated examining efficiency and making refinements was the part of the next step. The area to the west of the tennis courts is currently used for parking and not park space.

Mayor Arlas stated Options #2, #2A, and #2B should be eliminated since they have directed staff to look for another location for the Engineering Department.

Councilmember Hillmer stated he would support Option #3 subject to the modifications described in the previous vote and his previous comments.

Councilmember Chu supported Option #3 with whatever modified design the architect comes up with.

Mayor Arlas supported Option #3 in terms of location and a smaller footprint with the understanding there will be a modified design.

Councilmember Lundstrom stated Councilmember Hartzell’s comments regarding reexamination should be considered. Mayor Arlas stated he was confident that the City Manager would look towards efficiency.

M/s, Hillmer/Chu and approved 5-0 to select Option #3, consistent with the previous vote and comments regarding efficiency and looking to minimize impacts to the park.

Councilmember Hartzell stated she voted to support Option #3 because at the last meeting they committed to allowing a permanent facility in the park for a minimal amount. She reiterated the desire to find alternatives for some the space that is occupying the open space. She stated construction costs now run about \$1,000 per square foot and 100 square feet here or there represents a real savings to the voters. Councilmember Chu agreed.

Mayor Arlas thanked everyone for his or her comments.

## **ADJOURN MEETING TO CLOSED SESSION**

The City Council and the City Manager adjourned to closed session at 10:31 p.m. to discuss the following items:

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL- EXISTING LITIGATION  
(Government Code Section 54956.9) McLeran Properties, LLC vs. City of Larkspur (Marin County Superior Court action number CV- 050529)

CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR- Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8  
Property: 200 Acacia Avenue, Larkspur, A.P. #20-254-08, 10  
Negotiating Parties: Darren Leclair, Property Owner, A.P. #021-175-29  
Jean A. Bonander, City of Larkspur Negotiating Agent  
Discussion: Terms, Price or Both

**ADJOURN MEETING OUT OF CLOSED SESSION AND NOTE ANY REPORTABLE ACTION TAKEN**

The Mayor adjourned to open session at 10:56 p.m. and indicated that the Council had taken no reportable action.

**ADJOURN MEETING**

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 10:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Toni DeFrancis  
Recording Secretary