

**CITY OF ANTIOCH  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING**

**Regular Meeting  
6:30 p.m.**

**January 26, 2004  
Third Floor Conference Room**

Chairman Holman called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. on Monday, January 26, 2004 in the Third Floor Conference Room.

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Commissioners McCaffery, Arndt, Kalafate, Agopian, Pfeiffer, Calderwood and Chairman Holman  
Staff: Economic Development Director Uriyu  
Economic Development Consultant Netter  
Minutes Clerk Debra Lawson

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**1. Public Comment**

None.

**2. Approval of Minutes: January 14, 2003**

Commissioner McCaffery requested a change on page 4, under Item No. 9, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, last line to change "January 4" to "January 14".

Chairman Holman requested that a sentence be added to page 4, under Item No. 9, third paragraph, inserting a sentence to on the fourth line to read: "That the discussion of advocacy was motivated by the Commission taking a position on the Reynolds & Brown Project."

*On motion by Commissioner McCaffery and seconded by Commissioner Pfeiffer, the Minutes of January 14, 2003 were approved with the amended changes.*

**AYES: McCaffery, Pfeiffer, Calderwood, Agopian, Arndt and Holman**

**ABSENT: Kalafate**

Commissioner Kalafate arrived at 6:40 p.m.

**3. Economic Development Commission – Advocacy Do's and Don'ts**

- Article "Ballot Measure Campaigns: Some Legal Do's and Don'ts
- Staff Comments / Commissioners' Questions

Chairman Holman provided a brief introduction of the "Legal Do's and Don'ts", per the attached article.

A discussion ensued regarding taking a stand of advocacy on the Reynold's and Brown Project. Chairman Holman felt that an article could be placed in the Antioch Ledger regarding the advocacy position of the EDC (Economic Development Commission), and that it should be approved by the City Council.

Economic Development Consultant Netter stated that per the City Attorney, the EDC would be allowed to adopt a Resolution or place an article in support of the Reynolds and Brown Project to be placed in the newspaper. He noted that this was cited on page 27 of the handout, where a local agency can go on record in support or opposition of a measure. The EDC would not be allowed to campaign, but only to state their support in this manner without the use of any public funds or City Staff. Mr. Netter also noted that each Commissioner individually could place an article in the newspaper.

Commissioner Arndt expressed a concern to voicing the EDC's position at this time, and felt it might be too soon and that it should possibly be done closer to election time. He felt that timing was crucial. The Chair wanted to ensure that the article was written in a manner of careful analysis of why the EDC would take the position of advocacy and why it would be a benefit to the City.

Commissioner Agopian felt that there was validity to invite key members of the opposition to a future EDC meeting, as well as the proponents, and felt uncomfortable in endorsing an article without first hearing both sides of the issues. He further expressed concern in stating his support to the City Council when he had not taken the time to hear from all sides involved in this issue, and felt that both sides should at least be extended an invitation to an EDC meeting.

Commissioners Calderwood brought up discussions related to the gathering of facts and felt that facts were a crucial benefit to the project. Also, it was important on how the project would relate to an Economic Development standpoint.

Commissioner McCaffery did not agree that the EDC should hear the issues, due to the fact that the project had already been approved by the City Council. She did not want to re-ignite the issue.

Commissioner Arndt felt that there was ample time at past EDC meetings where the public could have expressed their concerns against the project to the EDC, and felt that the opponents went before the Planning Commission and City Council to voice their opinions and concerns. He stated that he would not change his mind about the approval of the project, and having to hear the issues again would not change the overall project.

Commissioner Pfeiffer questioned if the EDC should revisit this issue, but felt that the EDC has already taken an advocacy stand on this issue and that it should be passed on to the Council at the appropriate time. He felt that the City Council was the governing body that should ultimately approve the Commission or a Commissioner's article that would be placed in the newspaper.

Through discussions, Economic Development Consultant Netter felt that the EDC could agendaize this item for a future EDC meeting, wherein the public would have the opportunity to come if they wish and voice their opinion on the EDC's advocacy standpoint of this issue.

Economic Development Uriyu felt that both sides should be able to voice their opinions and concerns and felt that this might soften the issue and be an advantage for the community as a whole. She felt this should be considered. Commissioner McCaffery disagreed and felt that due to the City Council and the EDC already advocating their position in favor of the project she did not want to revisit the issue.

Commissioner McCaffery did not want to take an advocacy position as a group, but felt that it could be done on an individual basis. She further questioned if it was appropriate, as a Commission, to even write an article addressed from the Commission or a Commissioner.

Commissioner Pfeiffer felt that a letter could be written by the Commission taking a position of advocacy on the Reynolds and Brown Project, that it then be forwarded to the Economic Development Director and City Council. Further, that the City Council be asked if they have an issue with the EDC writing this letter to be placed in the newspaper. Mr. Netter interjected and suggested that a position paper be put together by the EDC and forwarded to the Mayor and Council.

Commissioner Agopian again voiced his concern that he did not feel comfortable with taking an advocacy position in written form to the City Council, when there is opposition from the public being voiced at this point in time.

***On motion by Commissioner McCaffery and seconded by Commissioner Pfeiffer, the EDC requested that City Staff request input from the City Manager on the appropriate process in which to proceed with a possible written statement of the EDC's advocacy position on the Reynolds and Brown Project.***

***AYES: McCaffery, Pfeiffer, Kalafate, Calderwood, Arndt and Holman***

***NOES: Agopian***

Commissioner Agopian stated that he would be contacting members of the opposition on an individual basis and would return to the EDC with their comments.

**Public Comment:**

Jim Kyle, resident, stated that it was appropriate that the EDC comment tonight on the Reynolds and Brown Project, but when it came to making a decision on an upcoming ballot initiative he stated that the EDC could not take a position pro or con, per the City's election laws. He stated that this could influence voters.

Economic Development Consultant Netter responded that per the City Attorney, a local agency can go on record and support or oppose a measure. Further, while the act may be seen to advocating a single viewpoint, there is no real effort made to pursue the voters to adopt the course of action.

**4. Consideration of Outreach for a Satellite County Court Room in Antioch  
(continued for discussion)**

- **Staff follow-up**

Economic Development Director Uriyu stated that in speaking to the Capital Facilities Administrator at the county level, this is a rumor and the County has no future plans for additional facilities. She stated that in 2002, SB1732 allows for the County to transfer all facilities to the State of California. Further, she felt this was a rumor due to the fact that the Administrative Office of the Courts in San Francisco conducted a Planning Vision of Facilities for all counties statewide, and within this recommendation for Contra Costa County (in the very far future - possibly 15 years out) a new facility was recommended to be located in East County.

Economic Development Director Uriyu requested that Item Nos. 7 and 11 be heard after Item No. 5.

5. **Formal Policy on Selection of Officers for Economic Development Commission**
  - **Resolution No. 01-04 – A Resolution establishing a rotational process for the selection of officers for the Antioch Economic Development Commission**
  - **Implementation**

Economic Development Consultant Netter provided an overview of the attached draft Resolution.

*On motion by Commissioner Pfeiffer and seconded by Commissioner Calderwood, the Economic Development Commission approved Resolution No. 2004/0401 approving the Antioch Economic Development Commission establishing a policy for the rotation of Commission members into the office of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson.*

*AYES: Pfeiffer, Calderwood, McCaffery, Arndt, Kalafate, Agopian and Holman*

6. **2004-2005 Capital Improvement Budget**
  - **Memo from Steve Scudero, Capital Improvements Director**
  - **Commission**
7. **Distribution of City's Sign Ordinance**
  - **Commission Comments/Questions**
11. **City Signage and Reader Board Sign Off of Highway 4**
  - **Staff Update**
  - **Discussion**

Item Nos. 6, 7 and 11 were all discussed simultaneously.

Economic Development Consultant Netter provided the EDC with a copy of City Ordinance No. 918-C-S, "Dealing With Signs". He stated that the City currently has an ongoing concerted effort in creating a uniform sign that would professionally raise the image of the City.

Commissioner Calderwood felt that the EDC was an advisory group to the City Council and that if the City's Sign Ordinance did not meet the proper requirements, then it should be brought to the City Council's attention.

Economic Development Director Uriyu stated that per Agenda Item No. 11, in terms of the signage, she suggested that the EDC recommend to the City Council an entry sign program incorporated with a possible architectural plan. She felt this would clean up the gateways and add value to the identification of the City.

In responding to Chairman Holman, Mr. Netter stated that the status of the "New City Logo" program was being handled through the City Manager's office. Chairman Holman suggested that the change of the City Logo and the possible development of an entry sign program be coupled together.

Mr. Netter distributed a handout entitled "Outdoor Advertising Permit Requirements" along with a map for "Possible Sites for Freeway Visible Sign" for the Commission's review. He further referenced the attached letter for Item No. 6 from Mr. Scudero, Capital Improvements Director regarding projects that would be important to the City. Mr. Netter recommended that the EDC compile a recommendation to include the entry sign program and/or a reader board sign on Highway 4, in addition to the other suggestions listed within the memo.

In terms of the Capital Improvements Program, Economic Development Director Uriyu noted that there was a timeframe in which this should be put together, and suggested that the EDC not incorporate the reader board and the entry signs together, in that they are two different issues and should be considered separately.

Mr. Netter suggested that this item be reagendaized for prioritization, along with estimated costs and locations for the entry signs.

Commissioner McCaffery suggested that the past minutes be reviewed of what was presented through the RDA process, wherein Chairman Holman made this request to Staff. Commissioner Calderwood interjected a request that this list be made available to the EDC prior to the meeting for the Commission's review.

#### **8. Antioch Press – Local Advertising Campaign**

Economic Development Director Uriyu requested that this item be deferred to a future meeting.

*On motion by Commissioner Calderwood and seconded by Commissioner Agopian, Item No. 8 was deferred to the meeting of February 9.*

*AYES: Calderwood, Agopian, Arndt, Pfeiffer, Kalafate, and Holman*

*NOES: McCaffery*

#### **9. "White Paper" - Schedule**

- **Staff Comments**

Economic Development Consultant Netter felt that the ultimate goal of this "White Paper" would be to use this as a document that the EDC could be passed on through the City Manager's office and then eventually to a joint meeting with the City Council to set a tone as to where the EDC is going with certain recommendations. He requested this document be finalized in the near future with the specific criteria and suggested Staff and Chairman Holman review these issues before the end of February.

It was the consensus of the Economic Development Commission that this item move forward with two Staff members and the Chair targeted to bring it back to the EDC in February. It then be forwarded first to the City Manager's Office, and then to the City Council for approval.

#### **10. Web Site – Commission Input**

- **Improvements**
- **Update**
- **Modifications**

Economic Development Director Uriyu stated that she was looking to the Commission for advocacy on this issue, and requested various members of the Commission to pole the Commission as a whole with a list of recommendations that would improve the

City's website. Commissioner Calderwood and Chairman Holman volunteered to preview other websites and take on the related tasks.

**12. Communications Distribution**

- **New Business Licenses issued for the Month of December, 2003**
- **Downturn and Recovery: Restoring Prosperity – Bay Area Economic Profile, January 2004**

Chairman Holman spoke to the handout, as attached in the Commission's packet.

**13. Business Visitation Program Introduction**

- **EDC Involvement**

Economic Development Director Uriyu requested that each Commissioner offer their time for an interview with various businesses and noted that she would supply an outline to each Commissioner at the next meeting.

**14. Comments**

- **Public**

None.

- **Commission**

Commissioner Calderwood reported that she had attended an ARB (Antioch Rivertown Business Association) and felt that the City should communicate with this association on a continual basis to ensure that communication lines are kept open regarding projects and other various ongoing issues.

Chairman Holman spoke to an earlier distributed memo to the Commission regarding the Rivertown Art Center and the Lynn House Gallery. He expressed concern to it being closed on Sundays.

- **Staff**

Economic Development Director Uriyu reported that the tree lights would be coming soon to the downtown area.

Economic Development Consultant Netter reported that the EDC meetings in February would be held on the 9 and 23.

**Adjournment**

***With there being no further business, the Economic Development Commission adjourned to the next scheduled meeting on February 9, 2004.***

***AYES: McCaffery, Calderwood, Agopian, Pfeiffer, Kalafate, Arndt and Holman***

Respectfully Submitted,

Debra Lawson  
Minutes Clerk