CITY OF RICHMOND
Pt. Molate Community Advisory Committee
Monday, February 11, 2013 6:30 PM
Multi-Purpose Room, 440 Civic Center Plaza

AGENDA

1. Call to Order (1 min.)

2. Roll Call (1 min.)

3. Welcome and Meeting Procedures (1 min.)

Individuals who would like to address the committee on matters not listed on the agenda may do so under Open Forum. Please file a speaker's card with the note taker prior to the commencement of Open Forum. Individuals who want to comment on an individual item, please file a speaker's card before the item is called. The standard amount of time for each speaker will be three minutes.

At 8:30 PM, any items remaining on the agenda that require immediate attention may be taken out of turn, as necessary. All other items will be continued to another or the following committee meeting in order to make fair and attentive decisions. This meeting adjourns at 9:00 PM. The meeting may be extended by a majority vote of the committee.

4. Agenda Review and Adoption (2 min.)

The order in which items will be heard may be adjusted at this time. In addition, items may be removed from or placed on the Consent Calendar at this time.

5. Announcements through the Chair (5 min.)
   a. Scofield Dr/RSR Bridge Deck replacement schedule update
   b. Recommended reapplication time frame for new session of PMCAC starting in June 2013

6. Open Forum (3 minutes per person limit)

7. Presentations, Discussion & Action Items (30 min.)
   a. Presentation by University of California (UC) Berkeley Graduate School of Landscape, Architecture and Environmental Planning, Community Outreach Course Project for PMCAC. Findings and Recommendations. (15 min.) Discussion (5 min.) Q&A.
   b. Draft Outline of proposed 2011-2013 First Session Report. Garrett (5 min.) Discussion (5 min.) Q&A

8. Staff Reports (7 min.)

Following discussion of each item, the Committee may vote to make recommendations to staff or to the City Council.

   a. Security Contract for Pt. Molate - (5 min.).
   b. Committee Log for PMCAC inquiries to staff, contractors - (2 min.).
CITY OF RICHMOND
Pt. Molate Community Advisory Committee
Monday, February 11, 2013 6:30 PM
Multi-Purpose Room, 440 Civic Center Plaza

AGENDA

9. Consent Calendar (2 min.)
   Items on the consent calendar are considered matters requiring little or no discussion and will be acted upon in one motion
   a. APPROVE - PMCAC meeting minutes of January 14, 2013

10. Future Agenda Items (5 min.)

11. City Council Liaison Reports (7 min.)
    a. Report by Councilmember/Mayor McLaughlin regarding recent issues in Richmond relevant to the Advisory Committee. (5 min.)
    b. PMCAC appointment status – TBD (2 min.)

12. Chair and Sub-Committee Reports (20 min.)
    Following discussion of each item, the Committee may vote to make recommendations to staff or to the City Council.

    a. Clean-Up and Restoration (8 min.)

    b. Community Outreach (5 min.)
       • Grant Development

    c. Finance (2 min.)
       • Status: Response to Audit comments re: Pt. Molate from FY 2010-2011 Single Audit

    d. Chair (5 min.)
       • Report on January 17, 2013 Meeting with City Manager and PMCAC Delegation
       • Identification of pending schedule conflicts

13. Adjournment of PMCAC regular meeting

14. Assemblage of PMCAC Standing Sub-Committees

Scheduled Meetings

Committee Meeting - Monday, March 18, 2013, 6:30pm

This meeting is held in a building that is accessible to people with disabilities. Persons with disabilities, who require auxiliary aids of services using city facilities, services or programs or would like information of the city’s compliance with the American Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, contact: Rochelle Monk, City of Richmond (510) 620-6511 (voice).

Pt. Molate Community Advisory Committee Staff Liaison Contact: Craig K. Murray (510) 307-8140, craig_murray@ci.richmond.ca.us. Agenda and minute information on the PMCAC can be found on the City Clerk’s web location: http://ca-richmond2.civicplus.com/index.aspx?NID=2442

Additional correspondence can be directed to PtMolateCAC@gmail.com

PMCAC Repository Information is available at: https://docs.google.com/open?id=0B9WxZeb75MwWkZ2wQ1ZUSqWWhC02GE4LTgyYjEtO3QyMjQyY2FiN0Yw
Dear Stakeholders for the Interstate 580 Scofield Avenue and Western Drive Bridge Deck Replacement Project:

In November 2012 Caltrans provided an update to the City of Richmond’s Point Molate Community Advisory Committee. At that meeting, staff announced that construction should begin in January 2013, with the closure of the eastbound Interstate 580 Western Drive on-ramp to take place later in the spring. However, since that update, the contractor who was the apparent low bidder for the project did not meet Caltrans bidding requirements. The Department is currently reviewing the other bids and has not yet awarded the contract.

On January 30, 2013, Caltrans will provide a project update to the Point Richmond Neighborhood Council. In addition, an open house meeting is planned for Spring 2013 to discuss construction activities. This meeting will be held prior to the closure of the eastbound Interstate 580 Western Drive on-ramp. Start date for work will not be known until a contract has been awarded and the contractor provides the Department with a schedule.

During construction, the eastbound Western Drive on-ramp will be closed for approximately 90 days. Passenger vehicles that are 3/4 ton or less will use the existing bicycle facility that runs underneath I-580. During the hours between 5:30 a.m. and 9:30 p.m., there will be a flagger at the entrance of the bicycle facility, and a pilot vehicle will lead vehicles to eastbound I-580. The pilot vehicle will then return to the entrance to the bike facility where the flagger is stationed. Larger vehicles and trucks, however, will travel westbound across the Richmond-San Rafael bridge, exit at the San Quentin interchange, turn left at the end of the off-ramp, and turn left at the on-ramp to eastbound I-580. The detour across the bridge and back is about 9 miles long, and the extra travel time will be about 10 minutes, regardless of the time of day.

If you have any further questions, please contact the Public Information Officer, Allyn Amsk, at (510) 286-5445

Allyn Amsk
Public Information Officer
Caltrans, District 4, Office of Public Affairs
Office (510) 286-5445

Slow or Move Over for Workers--It’s the Law
From: Pamela Christian
Sent: Monday, February 04, 2013 3:03 PM
To: Diane Holmes; Craig Murray; Jeffery Shoji
Cc: Otheree Christian
Subject: Confirmation Automatic Resignation - Point Molate Community Advisory Committee - Otheree Christian
Attachments: Boards and Commission Application Blank.pdf

This email is sent on behalf of City Clerk Diane Holmes

Dear Mr. Christian:

Members of the City of Richmond’s Boards and Commissions are allowed to have three absences within a twelve-month period. Absences in excess of three in the twelve-month period is considered an automatic resignation. You have exceeded the three absence limit and, therefore, have been automatically resigned from the Point Molate Community Advisory Committee.

Thank you for your service and dedication on the Point Molate Community Advisory Committee. If you would like to be considered for reappointment to the Point Molate Community Advisory Committee, you may submit in writing an explanation as to the cause of the absences along with a completely signed original Boards and Commissions Application requesting reappointment. An application is attached for your convenience, and must be returned to the Office of the City Clerk, 450 Civic Center Plaza, Suite 300, Richmond, CA 94804.

Please call the City Clerk’s Office at (510) 620-6513 if you have any questions.

Regards,

Pam Christian
Deputy City Clerk
BOARD OR COMMISSION APPLICATION FORM

DATE: ____________________

Check one:  New Appointment ☐  Re-Appointment ☐

NAME OF BOARD OR COMMISSION: ________________________________

NAME: ________________________________________________________

HOME ADDRESS: ________________________________________________

ZIP CODE: ___________ HOME PHONE: __________________ WORK PHONE: __________________

OCCUPATION: _________________________________________________ EMAIL ADDRESS: __________________

HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN A RESIDENT OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND: ______________________

PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT: ________________________________________

REASONS FOR INTEREST IN APPOINTMENT:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

FRATERNAL AND/OR CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

EDUCATION:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

REFERENCES (Minimum 5 – List Name, Address, and Phone Number)

1. ________________________________________________________________
2. ________________________________________________________________
3. ________________________________________________________________
4. ________________________________________________________________
5. ________________________________________________________________

To the best of my knowledge the information provided is true and correct.

__________________________________________________  ________________________
Signature                                                                 Date

Deliver or Mail to:  City Clerk  Or Fax to: 510-620-6542
450 Civic Center Plaza  Richmond, CA 94804

For Office Use Only:  New Appointment: ☐  Reappointment: ☐  ☐ 1st  ☐ 2nd  ☐ 3rd

5.B.3
A Community Engagement Report for the Point Molate Community Advisory Committee

POINT MOLATE
HIDDEN JEWEL OF RICHMOND

Kaitlin Fitzmahan
Marisa Ideta
Gosia Okolowicz
Vanessa Wallace
Table of Contents

Introduction
  POINT MOLATE
  PROJECT GOALS

Process + Methodology
  STAKEHOLDER ASSESSMENT
  OUTREACH TOOLKIT CREATION + PILOT TEST
  SURVEY DISTRIBUTION
  PMCAC MEMBER OUTREACH TRAINING
  DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Deliverables
  INFORMATIONAL PAMPHLET
  POWERPOINT PRESENTATION
  MEETING AGENDA
  SPEAKER SCRIPT
  STAKEHOLDER MAP
  SURVEY
  FACEBOOK PAGE
  COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Survey Responses
  FAMILIARITY WITH POINT MOLATE
  USE PREFERENCES
  LOCAL EVENT INFORMATION

Stakeholder Interview + Public Meeting Findings
  STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW:
    ANDREW BUTT
  PUBLIC MEETING:
    COMMUNITIES FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT

Recommendations + Analysis of Results

Lessons Learned

Appendix
Our client, the Point Molate Community Advisory Committee (PMCAC) is a 19-member body that has legal authority to influence decisions related to the future development and use of Point Molate. The PMCAC was established in January 2011 through a resolution passed by the Richmond City Council. The central purpose of the PMCAC is to provide recommendations to elected Richmond officials and City staff on Point Molate and associated issues of environmental remediation, land use planning, and financial management. The PMCAC formed a Community Outreach Sub-Committee in order to specifically address the issue of engaging Richmond residents and encouraging them to contribute their ideas regarding Point Molate's future to the PMCAC.

The client expressed having difficulty with reaching a broadly representative cross-section of Richmond residents. The current composition of the PMCAC is heavily skewed toward residents of Richmond's shoreline neighborhoods, Point Richmond and Marina Bay. Furthermore, the Committee does not represent a very broad range of age groups, with many members falling within an older age demographic. One of the key constraints identified by the PMCAC was its lack of an operating budget.

When the client initially approached us, the Committee was short four members. These open seats were seen as an opportunity to diversify the composition of the group and incorporate a broader spectrum of viewpoints and interests into discussions of Point Molate's future. In addition to encouraging residents to apply to serve on the PMCAC, the client was concerned with engaging the community in a broader sense and identifying more effective strategies for encouraging community members to voice their ideas and visions for the future of Point Molate.

This report will present an overview of our process as well as the deliverables that emerged from the different stages of that process. It will then conclude with a set of recommendations for the PMCAC regarding how to best direct future outreach efforts.
POINT MOLATE

In order to inform the development of our community outreach tools and strategies, we had to first gain a better understanding of the physical, historical, and political context surrounding Point Molate. Owned by the City of Richmond, Point Molate consists of 1.5 miles of shoreline and 290 acres of upland open space. Situated approximately one mile north of the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge, the site includes a number of natural and cultural amenities and resources, including the 41-acre Winehaven National Register Historic District. The site also encompasses Point Molate Beach Park, which is the city's only public beach. However, the park has been closed since 2004 due to a lack of funding for maintenance activities. Only one point of access to the site exists, with access currently limited to private vehicles.

Originally inhabited by the Huchunes group of Ohlone Native Americans, Point Molate has hosted a wide range of uses over the years. A Chinese shrimp camp operated on the site during the late 19th century. In 1908, the Winehaven Winery relocated its production facilities from San Francisco to Point Molate. At the time, it held the distinction of being the largest winery in the United States until it was forced to close due to Prohibition in 1920. Point Molate served as a Naval Fuel Depot from 1942 until 1995. The U.S. Navy sold the site to the City of Richmond for one dollar in 2003 and transferred the land to the City in stages between 2003 and 2008.

In 2004, the City entered into a Land Disposition Agreement (LDA) with the developer Upstream Point Molate LLC and began negotiations to develop a resort hotel and casino complex at the site. In 2010, Richmond voters endorsed Measure U, which rejected the casino plan, and in April 2011, the Richmond City Council voted against pursuing the development of a casino at Point Molate.

The future of Point Molate is currently unclear and has yet to be decided.
PROJECT GOALS

Our project goals were structured so as to respond to the specific concerns and challenges identified by the PMCAC during our initial discussions. Our aim was to develop a set of flexible outreach strategies that would achieve the following objectives:

- Broaden the demographic representation of the PMCAC
- Inform community members about the PMCAC's mission, actions, and plans
- Encourage community members to participate in the PMCAC and voice their visions for the future of Point Molate

We hoped to broaden the demographic representation of the PMCAC with respect to as many factors possible, with a particular focus on increasing the diversity of neighborhoods and age groups represented.

We strove to encourage various levels of participation and engagement in the PMCAC process—ranging from responding to a survey or attending a PMCAC meeting to applying to serve as a Committee member.

As we moved forward with developing and refining our outreach strategies, we also made sure to keep in mind the PMCAC's budgetary constraints.
When we began to develop our outreach plan for Point Molate and the PMCAC, we had grand and optimistic goals. We initially intended to facilitate a large meeting of stakeholders to gather feedback on a draft Outreach Toolkit. Furthermore, we hoped to test the Toolkit and outreach strategy by holding multiple community Focus Groups. The original plans for our outreach can be seen in our initial Process Chart.

However, we had to modify our process and methodology over the course of the project due to our late start date and the limited timeframe in which we were working. Our process ultimately included the following: a stakeholder assessment, an Outreach Toolkit, Toolkit pilot test, Survey distribution, PMCAC member outreach training, and a Community Engagement Plan.
Process + Methodology

STAKEHOLDER ASSESSMENT

To begin our process, we needed to better understand the political environment and the community’s awareness of Point Molate and the current efforts for development. Through informal and formal interviews with Richmond community members, professionals, and activists we began to develop a clear understanding of the Richmond and Point Molate stakeholders. Our primary sources for gathering information on community stakeholders came from our one-on-one interviews and the public meetings we attended. Our initial interviews were with the PMCAC members to assess the current political situation surrounding the issue of Point Molate.

From these conversations we devised an initial stakeholder map, which we quickly fleshed out from further meetings with residents and stakeholders such as Andres Soto and the Richmond Progressive Alliance. Attending meetings like that of the nonprofit Communities For a Better Environment allowed us to assess current and past political and community efforts and to learn from their successes and failures. Furthermore, the stakeholder assessment we conducted led us to conclude that specific groups of people would be helpful in engaging the community as a whole. For example, the PMCAC can benefit from making connections with faith-based organizations and schools, which have been a relatively untapped resource thus far.
Process + Methodology

OUTREACH TOOLKIT CREATION + PILOT TEST

Once we established an initial draft outreach strategy and toolkit, we were interested in gathering feedback from stakeholders and residents. Our intention was to refine the Outreach Toolkit so as to ensure it would be accessible to as many Richmond community members as possible and also appropriately educational and motivational. The intention of the Toolkit is to provide information on the history and future of Point Molate and to motivate participation in the decision-making process through involvement with the PMCAC.

In order to test our Outreach Toolkit, we interviewed community stakeholders such as long-time Richmond resident, Richmond Planning Commission member, and architect Andrew Butt. Through Butt’s feedback and advice, we further edited our Toolkit and Outreach Strategy and continued to adapt it to the Richmond community.

SURVEY DISTRIBUTION

After refining our Toolkit and Outreach Strategy, we hoped to test our outreach campaign framework (“Discover, Fall In Love, Make it Yours”). Due to time restrictions however, we were unable to hold multiple Community Focus Groups. Therefore, we decided to check the pulse of the Richmond Community through a brief survey to assess the general public’s knowledge of Point Molate and common sources of information on local events in the community, such as television, the internet, radio, newspapers, and community or religious organizations.

In order to reach a diverse cross-section of the Richmond community, we distributed intercept surveys in four different neighborhoods within Richmond. Conducting the survey allowed us to not only compile a snapshot of the community’s awareness of Point Molate but to also gain highly useful insight through informal conversations with the individuals surveyed.
Process + Methodology

PMCAC MEMBER OUTREACH TRAINING

We concluded our outreach research and Toolkit preparation by training PMCAC member Jim Hite. We met with Hite to give him an overview of our research and findings. We trained him on how to use each of the Toolkit components, including how to use the PowerPoint presentation within an outreach meeting setting and how to distribute the survey.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Lastly, we compiled our significant findings and recommendations into a Community Engagement Plan. This plan will serve as an instruction manual for the Toolkit, allowing anyone to plan and facilitate a PMCAC outreach meeting. It includes a breakdown of who to contact, where and when to connect with them, and general strategies for outreach within the City of Richmond.
At the conclusion of our community engagement and outreach process, we compiled a series of deliverables for the PMCAC in the form of an Outreach Toolkit. The Toolkit is a collection of outreach materials, which can ideally be used by any individual or group interested in promoting awareness and support for Point Molate within any outreach context. This Toolkit is intended to assist the PMCAC with their future community outreach efforts and includes the following: an informational pamphlet, PowerPoint presentation, meeting agenda, speaker script, stakeholder map, survey, Facebook page, and Community Engagement Plan.

**INFORMATIONAL PAMPHLET**

We designed an informational pamphlet that could be distributed in a wide variety of settings, including community outreach meetings. The pamphlet could also be distributed along with any surveys. This pamphlet is intended to briefly inform readers about the history and undecided future of Point Molate. Furthermore, it is designed to spark interest and hopefully garner support for the PMCAC. The design of the pamphlet incorporates the three-pronged framework of Discover, Fall in Love, Make It Yours, which is also employed throughout the PowerPoint presentation. We conceptualized this framework as a branding strategy for the PMCAC and Point Molate, with the hope of crafting a new, fresh, and aesthetic association with Point Molate.
**POWERPOINT PRESENTATION**

The PowerPoint presentation is a 14-slide show and is designed with the same Discover, Fall In Love, Make It Yours framework and aesthetic as the pamphlet. The primary purpose of the presentation is to educate viewers on the history and current situation of Point Molate. Additionally, the PowerPoint hopes to inspire viewers to become invested in the future development of Point Molate and to encourage viewers to get involved with the decision-making process and the PMCAC. As overall awareness of Point Molate increases, there will be a need to update the presentation to better reflect the level of knowledge of the Richmond community.

**MEETING AGENDA**

The Toolkit includes an Agenda template for outreach meetings. The agenda was designed to be somewhat flexible and open-ended and can be modified as needed for different types of meetings and groups. The agenda provides an outline for the sequence of events during a meeting, allowing the facilitator to structure his or her time.
Deliverables

SPEAKER SCRIPT

In order to make this Toolkit as versatile as possible, we included a Speaker Script. Someone who is less familiar with Point Molate could ideally use this script in any outreach setting. The script includes a brief overview of the history and politics of Point Molate, inspirational comments on the beauty and uniqueness of the area, and ways to participate further in the future development of Point Molate.

STAKEHOLDER MAP

The Stakeholder Map identifies some of the primary individuals and organizations who have a stake in the future of Point Molate. The stakeholder map is broken up into various stakeholder categories, such as Youth, Environment, Chevron, and Faith-based. The stakeholder assessment we have provided is a first step in mapping the large and diverse population of the City of Richmond and the complex set of interests involved. Future developments in assessing Point Molate's stakeholders should be added to this map.
**Deliverables**

**SURVEY**

The survey can be used at an outreach meeting and can be distributed in person throughout Richmond and its neighboring cities. The purpose of the survey is to better understand who knows about Point Molate, what the community would hope to see at the site, and how individuals typically obtain information on upcoming local events. As the PMCAC continues to collect survey results, they can better define their outreach message and strategy. As the PMCAC’s outreach strategy evolves over time and community awareness of Point Molate increases, the survey may be altered to gather different types of information from Richmond community members.

**FACEBOOK PAGE**

We established and designed a Facebook Page in order to bolster the PMCAC and Point Molate’s online presence. The page would hopefully allow the PMCAC to reach a broader audience and also engage a younger age demographic. The page includes high-quality images and information on Point Molate. Although there are a number of existing websites that provide information on Point Molate, the information currently available online is not always up-to-date and can be difficult to access. In order to serve as an effective community engagement tool, the Facebook page would need to be updated and maintained on a regular basis by PMCAC members.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN

The Community Engagement Plan is a document designed to accompany the Outreach Toolkit. The purpose of the Plan is to inform the PMCAC on how to reach a broad audience of Richmond residents and stakeholders. The Plan includes a breakdown of influential stakeholders with considerable political clout and their connections. Furthermore, the Community Engagement Plan identifies strategic locations (churches, fairs, farmers markets, community events) which the PMCAC should target during future outreach efforts and also indicates appropriate times for conducting outreach at these locations.
We distributed intercept surveys at four locations in the City of Richmond—Easter Hill United Methodist Church, St. Cornelius Catholic Church, the Marina playground and Bay Trail, and the Hilltop Mall. We received a total of 44 survey responses. As shown below, respondents came from various Richmond neighborhoods as well as nearby cities, such as El Cerrito, Hercules, El Sobrante, and Pinole.
Survey Responses
LOCAL EVENT INFORMATION

In order to inform future outreach strategies, we asked respondents how they typically receive information on upcoming local events. The intention was to identify how to most effectively target communication efforts for future meetings and events related to Point Molate.

Newspapers (42%) were the most frequently cited source of event information, followed closely by the internet (40%) and television (35%). Of the 42 respondents, 26% obtain information on events from community or religious organizations/groups, which suggests that engaging local religious or community group leaders would likely be an effective strategy for reaching Richmond residents. Over half of the respondents indicated that they relied on multiple sources for information on local events.

Several respondents provided more specific information regarding how they find out about upcoming events. Print sources that were mentioned include the Contra Costa Times, the San Francisco Chronicle, community papers, homeowners association newsletters, and the mail. The most frequently cited television station was Channel 4, followed by Channel 14, Channel 18, and Channel 2. Along with Facebook, Tom Butt’s blog and listserv appear to be key web-based sources of information. Other political figures that were specifically mentioned include Congressman George Miller and District 1 Supervisor John Gioia.
STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW: ANDREW BUTT

Andrew Butt is an architect and lifelong Richmond resident. He has served as Chair of the Design Review Board for the City of Richmond and was appointed to the City’s Planning Commission in July 2012. His father, Tom Butt, currently serves on the Richmond City Council, and his mother was involved with the first Point Molate Advisory Group commissioned by the City during the 1980s. Andrew has many childhood memories of Point Molate and he continued to visit the park there until it closed several years ago.

We began the interview by asking Andrew to describe his experience of Point Molate. He quietly reflected and then replied:

“Quiet, phenomenal views, sheltered from the wind, seals playing in the water, wildlife…Beautiful but deteriorating”

When asked what he believed the area could be used for, Andrew commented that the best thing would be something that the general public could benefit from. He then added that any project that would generate jobs within the city would be well-received. Andrew also noted that in Richmond, there is a severe lack of sports fields and recreational amenities for a city of its size.

Andrew referenced China Camp in San Rafael as an example of what Point Molate could be. China Camp is a former Chinese shrimp-fishing village from the 1880’s, which is now a state park nestled along the shore of the San Pablo Bay. Further research revealed that this park is strikingly similar to Point Molate, as indicated in the description below:

“The road through China Camp Park is described as offering beautiful views of the waterfront, featuring extensive intertidal salt marsh, meadow, oak habitats and a variety of wildlife. Activities for the public include camping, a bike and hike site, beach access, swimming, and picnicking, horseback riding, boating, windsurfing and a museum describing early Chinese settlement. There is beach access, swimming, picnicking, horseback riding, boating and windsurfing at the park.”

Andrew believes that something like this could receive broad-based support. Unfortunately, there is little funding currently available for these types of public projects.

Indeed, one of the points that Andrew seemed to stress the most was the need to address the question of how to pay for future development at the site. As an alternative to pursuing revenue generating uses at the site, Andrew suggested that in theory Chevron might be willing to provide the funding necessary to clean up and develop the site. Given that Chevron owns the land surrounding Point Molate and strongly opposes any type of residential development at the site due to liability issues, it has an interest in promoting other types of uses.
Related to this issue of funding, Andrew suggested that the following site characteristics pose the primary challenges to future development and use of Point Molate:

1) Issue of environmental remediation and concerns regarding pollution from former Naval Fuel Depot

2) Historic, and also dilapidated, nature of the buildings

3) Proximity of the Chevron Refinery and associated liability issues

4) Constrained access (Currently, there is a dangerous bike area on the shoulder of the freeway. Plans are under way to connect the Bay Trail with Point Molate, but there is no funding to complete the project.)

In the short term, however, Andrew stated that the most significant challenge is a lawsuit that was filed by the developer Upstream Point Molate LLC against the City, which has left Point Molate in legal limbo. This lawsuit must first be resolved before any project can move forward at the site and before restrictions on public access can be relaxed. He estimates that this lawsuit will be resolved in 2013.

When asked what he thought the current level of public awareness of Point Molate is within the City, Andrew believes that most people are unaware of Point Molate, especially youth. He cites the closure of the beach park for several years as a contributing factor to low levels of awareness. He noted that unless you were going to the East Brother Lighthouse (located past Point Molate), the Rod and Gun Club, or simply to fish, one would have little reason to visit Point Molate. Andrew mentioned that although the casino plan raised awareness, Point Molate remains fairly unknown to most.

In terms of increasing awareness of Point Molate, Andrew was convinced that bringing people out to the site would be the most effective strategy. This would mean that accessibility would somehow need to be addressed. He suggested that the PMCAC in conjunction with the City of Richmond could offer free weekend bike, boat, and hiking tours for several months. He also pointed out that the Richmond Rotary Club, which holds fundraisers in old derelict buildings, held a Halloween costume party in the Winehaven Building a few years ago. This suggests that one potential way to introduce people to Point Molate would be to allow the space to occasionally function as a venue for special events similar to the one held by the Rotary Club. Since Point Molate Beach Park is slated to reopen to the public in 2013, Andrew suggested partnering with the Parks Department to hold a festive outreach event at Point Molate to celebrate the park reopening and attract visitors to the site.
PUBLIC MEETING: COMMUNITIES FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT

We attended a public meeting sponsored by the Richmond-based nonprofit organization Communities for a Better Environment (CBE) on November 15, 2012. Over sixty individuals attended the meeting, which was held at the offices of the Richmond Progressive Alliance.

Panelists included the following Richmond stakeholders:
- Adam Boisvert, Richmond High School Instructor and Project Manager of Urban Agriculture Program
- Vivian Huang, Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN)
- Melvin Willis, Richmond Planning Commission
- John Guiardi, East Bay Express Journalist
- Jeff Ritterman, Current Vice-Mayor / Outgoing Council Member / Chief Cardiologist at Kaiser Medical Center, Richmond
- Marilyn Langolis, Candidate for Richmond City Council
- Zach Ware, Richmond Progressive Alliance

The moderator for the event was Andres Soto, a community organizer for CBE and the Richmond Progressive Alliance. PMCAC members Eduardo Martinez and Jim Hite were also present at the meeting.

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and analyze the outreach methods used to promote the “Yes on Measure N” campaign. Measure N was a City of Richmond ballot measure proposing a tax on soda, with revenue going toward funding sports programs and recreational opportunities in the City. Measure N was defeated on Nov. 6, 2012. Based on discussions of the failed ballot measure, we were able to gather information on what is necessary to run a successful outreach campaign in Richmond. We then translated these findings into strategies that could be pursued by the PMCAC in its efforts to engage the Richmond community. Key issues discussed by the panel included:

Education or lack of education is a key component early on. There was not enough education on the issue, the tax itself, who would be affected and how the benefit would trickle down. Since the general public did not understand the measure and its expected benefits, they were more inclined to vote against the tax. When you include or involve a group, or educate a group, they will take ownership of the information.

An organization’s ability to tap into the interests of others is critical. The Black Clergy was a group that strongly supported the “No on N” Campaign. Richmond Black Clergy Representatives were approached by the Beverage Companies and given incentives to “vote no” first, before the “Yes on N” camp were able to educate the group about their side of the issue. This served as a major blow to the Yes on N camp as African-Americans make up 27% of the city’s population. A recent review of the city’s elections show that the Black Clergy has a powerful influence over the Black Vote in Richmond.
Stakeholder Interview + Public Meeting Findings

The establishment and ongoing growth of a volunteer base is vital. The non-profit organization Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN) mobilized volunteers to reach out to non-English speaking residents of both Cantonese and Mandarin dialects. Translators went door-to-door, utilized phone banks, wrote editorials in local newsletters, and produced public service announcements for local television media. As a result of these outreach efforts, the 2012 voter turnout rate among the Asian/Pacific Islander community was double that of 2008, (an increase from 6% to 12%, with 75% of the voters supporting Measure N). The Asian/Pacific Islander community comprises 13.5% of the Richmond population. These efforts demonstrated that grassroots outreach is a force to be reckoned with in Richmond.

The voices of neighboring cities are powerful. It is important to find common ground among advisory groups so that they lend support to your cause as well. Richmond serves as somewhat of a hub for smaller neighboring cities, such as San Pablo, Hercules, Pinole, El Cerrito, and El Sobrante. Residents from these areas visit, patronize, attend, and support Richmond events. This ballot measure was the first of its kind in California. It was discussed how the Yes on N Campaign would plan to harness the power of neighboring cities to help support its cause and to generate growing interest in the issue. To date, at least three neighboring cities have decided to pursue ballot measures similar to Measure N in the future, and Richmond is gaining recognition as the catalyst behind these measures within the state.

It is possible to continue to develop a campaign without funds. Yes on N was a grassroots campaign that was defeated by corporations that spent thousands. If this campaign continues to educate and grow their base, the corporations will not be able to stop them. Although Measure N failed, the group plans to continue to develop events and messages that will foster ongoing engagement throughout the Richmond community. The group has decided their focus will include the promotion of a Clean Energy Economy; an idea that will be supported locally since it is associated with the creation of new jobs—a major issue in Richmond. The adoption of this Clean Energy Economy strategy has already led to the Global Tap Company ("A Clean Water Company") to install "clean water stations" in Richmond schools. This has all been achieved strictly through donations.
Recommendations + Analysis of Results

Initial work for the PMCAC should focus on bridging the gap between community-based groups and private equity to do community stabilization work in the wake of the environment and jobs crisis in Richmond. Other pressing issues of concern to residents that can be examined for key commonalities include: Youth, Safety, Clean Environment, Schools, Small Business, and Chevron. PMCAC must find solutions that align their vision with the agendas and needs of the many diverse communities within the City.

The PMCAC must make a commitment to help educate the entire city of Richmond about Point Molate. Outreach should start with key groups that have the power to spread the word about Point Molate. Effective strategies include reaching out to the Richmond Black Clergy and translating outreach toolkit materials for non-native English speakers in both the Asian and Hispanic communities, which comprise 58% of the City's population.

The PMCAC must find innovative ways to fund awareness of Point Molate in schools and neighborhoods, targeting at-risk populations that would likely benefit from using Point Molate the most. Outreaching to English-speaking Latino youth at school would be a great target group to start with. Latino youth make up 75% of the Richmond Public School district, and Latino/Hispanic as a whole represent almost 40% of the total Richmond population.

Our strategy of distributing intercept surveys at local churches on Sunday was quite effective in terms of gathering survey responses. We purposely targeted two different church congregations in different Richmond neighborhoods. It did not make much of a difference whether we stood outside or inside; we were able to find several eager participants in either case. We do not recommend that facilitators go to an indoor location, such as a mall, to conduct outreach regarding Point Molate. Our findings show that although people on their way into the mall or shopping in the mall are drawn from a wide variety of cities. However, they are the least likely to be concerned with outdoor space. Aside from churches (whose response rates were high,) intercept surveying should be targeted toward outdoor venues, public streets, parks, and transit stations. These areas tend to have a higher volume of respondents in a short period of time. Here, individuals were more willing to stop for a minute and share their ideas regarding Point Molate, even if they had never heard of the site and/or had never visited it.

PMCAC should not allow their lack of funding to keep them from moving forward and continuing to establish a base of supporters. In light of the past successes of grassroots campaigns in Richmond, PMCAC is strongly encouraged to utilize these types of tactics. This could be done by utilizing Grant Funding, Internships and Research Fellowships.

The PMCAC should look beyond the City of Richmond and try to engage residents of neighboring municipalities such as El Sobrante, El Cerrito, Pinole, San Pablo, and Hercules. Residents of these cities frequent Richmond often for work, transit, recreation, worship, and shopping.

In order to implement a successful outreach and media campaign, PMCAC must develop a volunteer base and train its supporters to continually work toward raising awareness of Point Molate. Based on our limited sample
size, the survey responses we received suggest that a considerable portion of Richmond residents have no prior knowledge of Point Molate. Only 55% of respondents had heard of the site. We recommend that multilingual grassroots media campaigns and other outreach methods (door-to-door, editorials, local PSAs, community tabling at festivals and events) be utilized until survey responses indicate that at least 90-95% of Richmond residents are aware of Point Molate.

Once established, a robust volunteer base should serve in the following capacities:

- Speakers bureau and representatives at community meetings
- Information tabling during community events, festivals, parks and recreation events, and before or after church services
- Tour guides for tours held on either a regular basis or for special outreach events such as a visioning festival (Point Molate Caretaker Willie Agnew could potentially train and/or lead volunteers)
- Grant searches; Grant writing, Internships, and Courses fostering independent research through the University of California, Berkeley’s Center for Community Innovation and San Francisco State’s Center for Civic Engagement

The PMCAC must remember that the goal is to keep Point Molate on the forefront of everyone’s agenda.
Lessons Learned

Our primary challenge was simply time. We greatly underestimated the time it would take to coordinate, at best, even one meeting with all of our identified stakeholders present. It proved to be virtually impossible to synchronize schedules with individuals who already have highly active lifestyles plus either civic duties or other community activities to attend to.

For the sake of time, we were forced to rethink our initial strategy. Individual stakeholder interviews and intercept surveys were the result. Although this process involved a little extra footwork, we realized that speaking with stakeholders and residents individually rather than in a group setting was perhaps a more effective way to gather information related to Point Molate. Stakeholders and survey respondents seemed eager to share their opinions and could speak freely without worry of interruption from an opposing side.

Through our use of individual interviewing and intercept surveying, we were not only successful in reaching a diverse mix of people, in terms of ethnicity and age, but geographically we managed to cover most areas of Richmond. (Information was also captured from residents of the neighboring cities of Hercules, Pinole, San Pablo, and El Cerrito).

More importantly, we were able to address one of the main challenges of the PMCAC, whose wish was to fill their four vacant seats with residents from communities not currently represented among their current members. Our outreach efforts generated not only interest, but also identification of two residents as potential Committee members from the East Shore and East Richmond Heights neighborhoods.

Ultimately, we learned to accept that community engagement is an iterative process. Steps taken may at times have to be retracked. We learned that flexibility is paramount and that facilitators must always be ready and willing to shift their focus and approach at any given time within the process. When attempting to engage community members, what we as coordinators think will work, often times will not. There are many different approaches to community outreach and each can prove to be useful when employed within the appropriate context.

Those conducting research studies must take the time to listen and understand the needs of the client, listen to the voices of those they wish to engage, and then determine what type of engagement process is most appropriate. This was our lesson. At first, we were so consumed with the process of trying to find out what the Richmond community wanted at Point Molate that we missed the fact that the majority of Richmond residents had never been to the site or even heard of what Point Molate was. Our assigned task immediately shifted from a traditional outreach plan to an educational one.

We hope our findings will provide an opportunity for the PMCAC to engage in ongoing discussions with the people of Richmond, as well as inspire these same residents to work alongside the PMCAC with policymakers, businesses, City leaders and community organizations to devise a cohesive, sustainable, and equitable plan to make “Point Molate Their Own.”
Point Molate Survey

We are UC Berkeley graduate students conducting a study on how familiar Richmond residents are with Point Molate and what they would like to see there. We would also like to gain a better understanding of how residents get information on upcoming local events.

1. Do you live in Richmond?  □ Yes  □ No
   If yes, what neighborhood of Richmond do you live in? _____________________________
   If no, what city or area do you live in? _____________________________

2. Have you heard of Point Molate?  □ Yes  □ No

3. Have you ever visited Point Molate?  □ Yes  □ No

4. If so, what did you do there? ____________________________________________________________

5. In your opinion, which types of uses would be best for Point Molate?
   □ Cultural facilities  □ Commercial development
   □ Recreational areas  □ Other: _____________________________
   □ Open space

6. Do you have any concerns regarding the future development and use of Point Molate?
   _____________________________________________________________________________

7. How do you get information on upcoming events in Richmond? (check all that apply)
   □ Internet  □ Community or religious organization/group
   □ Newspaper  □ Family or friends
   □ Television  □ Other: _____________________________
   □ Radio

8. Which websites, newspapers, television/radio stations, or other sources of event information do you use regularly?
   _____________________________________________________________________________

A few last questions to help us evaluate the survey:

Gender:  □ Male  □ Female

How old are you?
   □ Under 12 years
   □ 13-17 years
   □ 18-34 years
   □ 35-64 years
   □ 65 years and over

How would you describe yourself? (check all that apply)
   □ White/Caucasian  □ Asian/Pacific Islander
   □ Black/African-American  □ Native American
   □ Hispanic/Latino  □ Other
Proposed Outline: PMCAC First Session Summary Report

For 6/2011 through 5/2013

Section 1: Introduction –
Define reason and scope of report

Section 2: Executive Summary –
Provide summation of key recommendations/issues

Section 3: Background –
Describe briefly raison d'être for PMCAC, transition from RAB, and key mission

Section 4: State of Pt. Molate upon beginning of PMCAC First Session –
Describe briefly status of:

- Remediation of the IR Sites
- Escrow fund balance
- Land Use Status
- Property Improvement and Management

Section 5: Remediation Progress –
Describe in bulleted format the remediation milestones achieved during the PMCAC First Session:

- Water Board Task Compliance under the 2008 Order
  - List of plans and monitoring status documents produced/submitted
- Regulatory Closures
  - List of closures (USTs) achieved during First Session
- Remediation Actions
  - List of remediation activities undertaken during First Session with estimated time to full remediation compliance
- Outstanding Issues
  - List of unresolved issues
- Estimated time to complete remediation
  - Brief description of anticipated time to complete all required remediation and achievement of full regulatory closure based on available status and data.
Section 6: Finances –

Provide matrix showing escrow fund expenditures by category

Provide table or matrix showing General Fund expenditures by category

Describe briefly likelihood of completing all remediation with remaining funds and any risks

Section 7: Land Use Status

Describe in bulletized points milestones in Land Use Designation and proposed uses for Pt. Molate

- Listing of activities and current status under General Plan
- Describe basis of general reference model for Pt. Molate Reuse
- Describe updated use scenarios
  - KKMR presentation
  - Amended Bay Plan Model: BCDC
- Describe impact of litigation on pursuing use scenarios and redevelopment

Recommendations

Section 8: Property Improvement & Management

Describe in bulletized points milestones in property improvement and management, i.e.

- Shoring project for Bldgs 6 and 1 and estimated life span of improvements
- Power plant issues
- Packaged Ground Water Treatment Plant Issues
- Beach Park planned improvements
- Trail Implementation Status
- Security

Describe in bulletized points issues related to project and property management

- Invoice vetting process
- Infrastructure oversight
- Contractor management

Recommendations

Section 9: PMCAC First Term Scorecard

Describe sub-committee structure

Describe membership changes

Outreach

Proposed Outline: PMCAC First Term Session Summary Report
Provide matrix of achievement vs. goals by subject

**Section 10: Recommended Goals for PMCAC Second Term**

Committee size and bylaws update

Property Management recommendations

Develop recommended structure for ongoing property improvement and property marketing and development

- Management structure
- Funding recommendations

Property Marketing recommendations

Remediation Goals

EIR Oversight

Outreach and Education
January 4, 2013

Captain Anthony Williams
Southern District Commander
Richmond Police Department
Richmond, Ca. 94806

During the month of December, 2012, DP Security, LLC maintained a 24/7 security posture at the Point Molate site. The deployment of security at Point Molate, consist of the following site requirements.

1. To monitor from a **Mobile Position** the lower portion of the region to include the shoreline and the perimeter fencing. Also monitor all activities within the Point Molate region to include visitors and contractors during normal business hours.

2. DP Security also deploys a **Roving Patrol** throughout the upper ridge area of Point Molate, monitoring and checking the status of various fixed assets owned by the City of Richmond, positioned throughout the upper section. During all hours DP Security will utilizes a “deggy” notification system which tracks the movement of all security personnel assigned to assure that the security expectations are being fulfilled.

3. Document contractor and visitor entry with prior approval by Redevelopment Agency representatives.

Captain Williams, the following is the compiled information relating to activity at the Point Molate site during the month of December, 2012.

**Primary Personnel Assigned:** Perimeter Patrols: R. Duncan, J. Rideau
A. Reed
Rovers: R. Singleton, C. Ojeh
Relief: W. Demillion, O. Fordjar

D.P. Security personnel initiated 2033 security checks within the upper ridge line and lower shoreline areas of Point Molate during the month of December, 2012. There were two significant incidents reported by security during the month.

**December 23, 2012, 0700hrs,** Security during rounds noted that the combination lock at gate #6 was malfunctioning. This issue will be reported again to Mr. Agknew.

**December 30, 2012, 1700hrs,** Security during rounds on Western Drive located a Toyota License **[redacted]** charcoal in color near gate #23, the vehicle was unoccupied and secured. At the conclusion of the initial rounds, security noted that the vehicle had left the area. No further incidents reported.
Contractors Contacted BY DP Security during the month of December, 2012.

Cascade Drilling – 14 contacts
Vironex – 14 contacts
Harris Electric – 18 contacts
Terra Phase – 17 contacts
D&H Landscaping – 10 contacts
L.S.A. Associates – 10 contacts
Aerotech – 4 contacts
Gregg Drilling – 2 contacts
Arrow Inc – 1 contact
New Image Landscaping – 1 contact
Cresco Tools – 1 contact
Richmond Camera Club – 1 contact
Contra Costa County inspector – 1 contact

Administrative Action Taken:
No action taken this month.

Site Environmental Concerns:
None noted for this reporting period.

Sincerely,

Michael Davenport, Owner/President
Captain Anthony Williams  
Southern District Commander  
Richmond Police Department  
Richmond, Ca. 94806

During the month of January, 2013, DP Security, LLC maintained a 24/7 security posture at the Point Molate site. The deployment of security at Point Molate, consist of the following site requirements.

1. To monitor from a **Mobile Position** the lower portion of the region to include the shoreline and the perimeter fencing. Also monitor all activities within the Point Molate region to include visitors and contractors during normal business hours.

2. DP Security also deploys a **Roving Patrol** throughout the upper ridge area of Point Molate, monitoring and checking the status of various fixed assets owned by the City of Richmond, positioned throughout the upper section. During all hours DP Security will utilizes a “deally” notification system which tracks the movement of all security personnel assigned to assure that the security expectations are being fulfilled.

3. Document contractor and visitor entry with prior approval by Redevelopment Agency representatives.

Captain Williams, the following is the compiled information relating to activity at the Point Molate site during the month of January, 2013.

**Primary Personnel Assigned:**  
Perimeter Patrols: R. Duncan, J. Rideau  
A. Reed  
Rovers: R. Singleton, C. Ojeh  
Relief: W. Demillion, O. Fordjar

D.P. Security personnel initiated 2024 security checks within the upper ridge line and lower shoreline areas of Point Molate during the month of January, 2013. There was one significant incident reported by security during the month.

**January 24, 2013, 0900hrs,** Security while on patrol was contacted by designated Caretaker Willie Agnew, concerning a broken lock at building #69. A check of the building door lock confirmed the damage to the door lock. No suspects were noted in the immediate area.

Vironex – 1 contact
Harris Electric – 4 contacts
Terra Phase – 13 contacts
D&H Landscaping – 11 contacts
Richmond Camera Club – 1 contact
Richmond P.D. – 1 contact (Training Session Held in Area)

Administrative Action Taken:
No action taken this month.

Site Environmental Concerns:
None noted for this reporting period.

Sincerely,

Michael Davenport, Owner/President
City of Richmond
Contract Amendment

Department: Public Works
Project Manager: Yader Bermudez
Project Manager E-mail: yader_bermudez@ci.richmond.ca.us
Project Manager Phone No: (510) 231-3011
P.R. No: Vendor No: 1681
P.O./Contract No: 2298

Description of Services:
Provide security services at Point Molate

Amendment No. 1 modifies the: (2nd or subsequent amendments attach Amendment History page)
☑ Term, Payment Limit and Service Plan
□ Payment Limit and Service Plan
□ Term and Service Plan

The parties to this Contract Amendment do mutually agree and promise as follows:

1. Parties. The parties to this Contract Amendment are the City of Richmond, California, a municipal corporation (City), and the following named Contractor:

   DP Security, LLC
   Company Name:
   Street Address: P.O. Box Station A
   City, State, Zip Code: Richmond, CA 94808
   Contact Person: Michael Davenport
   Telephone: (510) 237-9320
   Email: mdavenport397@aol.com
   Business License No: 40005704 / Expiration Date: December 31, 2012

   ☑ A California limited liability corporation
   ☐ general partnership, ☐ limited partnership, ☐ individual, ☐ non-profit corporation,
   ☐ individual dba as [specify: ]

2. Purpose. This Contract Amendment is being entered into to amend the Contract between City and Contractor which was approved by the City Council of the City of Richmond or executed by the City Manager on May 17, 2011, which original term commenced on July 1, 2011 and terminates June 30, 2012 with an original contract payment limit of $253,330.56. Said contract shall hereinafter be referred to as the "Original Contract" and is incorporated herein by reference.

3. Original Contract Provisions. The parties hereto agree to continue to abide by those terms and conditions of the Original Contract, and any amendments thereto, which are unaffected by this Contract Amendment.
4. **Amendment Provisions.** This Contract Amendment is subject to the Amendment Provisions attached hereto, which are incorporated herein by reference, and which control over any conflicting provisions of the Original Contract, or any amendment thereto.

5. **City of Richmond Business License Active Status Maintained.** Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 7.04.030, the Contractor must maintain its City of Richmond business license for this Contract Amendment to be deemed to be in effect.

6. **Insurance Coverage Updated and Maintained.** Pursuant to the Original Contract, the Contractor shall provide the City with updated insurance certificates, and the Contractor shall maintain insurance coverage, for this Contract Amendment to be deemed to be in effect.

7. **Signatures.** These signatures attest the parties' agreement hereto:

**CITY OF RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA**

a municipal corporation

By __________________________

Title: Mayor

I hereby certify that the Original Contract and this Amendment have been approved by the City Council or executed by the City Manager.  

By __________________________

Title: Deputy City Clerk

**CONTRACTOR:**  

DP Security, LLC

(*The Corporation Chairperson of the Board, President or Vice-President should sign on the line below.*)

By __________________________

Title: President

(*The Corporation Chief Financial Officer, Secretary or Assistant Secretary should sign on the line below.*)

By: __________________________

Title: __________________________

(Note: Pursuant to California Corporations Code Section 313, if Contractor is a corporation or nonprofit organization, this Contract (1) should be signed by the Chairperson of the Board, President or Vice-President and the Chief Financial Officer, Secretary or Assistant Secretary; (2) should have both signatures conform to designated representative groups pursuant to Corporations Code Section 313.

List of Attachments:

1. Amendment Provisions
2. Updated Insurance Certificates
AMENDMENT PROVISIONS (TERM, PAYMENT LIMIT AND SERVICE PLAN)

1. Paragraph 2 (Term) of the Original Contract is hereby amended to extend the Contract term. Paragraph 2 of the Original Contract is amended to read as follows:

"2. Term. The effective date of this Contract is

July 1, 2011

(Insert original contract commencement date)

and it terminates

June 30, 2013

(Insert new contract termination date)

unless sooner terminated as provided herein."

2. Paragraph 3 (Payment Limit) of the Original Contract is hereby amended to increase the payment limit by $253,331.00. Paragraph 3 of the Original Contract is amended to read as follows:

"3. Payment Limit. City's total payments to Contractor under this Contract shall not exceed $506,661.56 including expenses."

"The City of Richmond shall not pay for services that exceed the Contract Payment Limit without the prior written approval of the City Manager if the total Contract amount does not exceed $10,000 or without the prior approval of the City Council if the total Contract amount is over $10,000."

3. The Service Plan (Exhibit A) of the Original Contract is hereby amended to include the following tasks and/or services:

Same
AMENDMENT PROVISIONS (SERVICE PLAN)  
(CONTRACTOR'S OBLIGATION'S)

The Service Plan (Exhibit A) of the Original Contract is hereby amended to include the following tasks and/or services:

Same
Contract Amendment between the City of Richmond and
DP Security, LLC

Amendment No. ____________________________ P.O./Contract No. ___________

1

AMENDMENT PROVISIONS (AMENDMENT HISTORY)

The first Contract Amendment was approved by City Council of the City of Richmond or executed by the City Manager on____________________ for one or more of the following provisions (check those that apply):

☑ Increased contract payment limit by $ 253,331.00 for a payment limit not to exceed $ 506,661.56 ____________________________.
☑ Term Amendment (insert new termination date): 06/30/2013 ____________________________
☐ Service Plan

The second Contract Amendment was approved by City Council of the City of Richmond or executed by the City Manager on____________________ for one or more of the following provisions (check those that apply):

☐ Increased contract payment limit by $ ______________________ for a payment limit not to exceed $ 506,661.56 ____________________________.
☐ Term Amendment (insert new termination date): ____________________________
☐ Service Plan

The third Contract Amendment was approved by City Council of the City of Richmond or executed by the City Manager on____________________ for one or more of the following provisions (check those that apply):

☐ Increased contract payment limit by $ ______________________ for a payment limit not to exceed $ 506,661.56 ____________________________.
☐ Term Amendment (insert new termination date): ____________________________
☐ Service Plan

The fourth Contract Amendment was approved by City Council of the City of Richmond or executed by the City Manager on____________________ for one or more of the following provisions (check those that apply):

☐ Increased contract payment limit by $ ______________________ for a payment limit not to exceed $ 506,661.56 ____________________________.
☐ Term Amendment (insert new termination date): ____________________________
☐ Service Plan

The fifth Contract Amendment was approved by City Council of the City of Richmond or executed by the City Manager on____________________ for one or more of the following provisions (check those that apply):

☐ Increased contract payment limit by $ ______________________ for a payment limit not to exceed $ 506,661.56 ____________________________.
☐ Term Amendment (insert new termination date): ____________________________
☐ Service Plan
Scope of Services:

Contractor will furnish all necessary personnel/labor, uniforms, equipment and supervision to provide unarmed security services for the Point Molate facility within the City of Richmond. This security deployment will involve a single assignment for each area during specified periods throughout the week. The City may request, when needed, additional security or consulting services.

Contractor will provide a uniformed, unarmed security guard as outlined in this contract for security at the Former Pt Molate Naval Fuel Depot 24 hours a day including Saturdays and Sundays, and holidays.

Contractor will assign one unarmed security guard for the two areas (Hillside Area/east of Eastern Drive and the Shoreline Area/west of Western Drive). The Security Guard should report in at the Caretakers Office in Bldg 123 at start/end of each shift and coordinate with City personnel for any necessary assistance during each shift.

2.1 Using 24-hour a day unarmed, uniformed guard, Security personnel will physically patrol buildings/areas, once per hour, with three shifts of eight hours per shift (i.e. 0700-1500, 1500-2300, 2300-0700): Two areas of coverage will be included in the contract. Areas west of a public street call Western (Main Road) Drive and Areas mostly east of Western Drive. Areas east (hillside) areas include Areas 1,6,7 & 10 and the shoreline parcels in area 8&9 would require a less intensive level of security review as the more improved portions of Pt.Molat know generally as west of the Main Road and including Areas 2,3,5,11,12,13 & the Pier. Particular attention should be paid to the Winehaven Historic Area and improvements that include former Naval Housing areas, Bldgs. 1,6,123 and those other improved Areas 11, 87, 132 and the Pier. A Map of Pt Molate including the areas noted above in enclosed.

2.2 Update the current Deggy Control Guard Tour System electronic check-in system (including adding additional checkpoints), for roving patrol personnel. This system must be shown to be operational and confirm physical check-ins by security officers, and Contractor must generate a report, submitted monthly, to the Police Department designee or other designated city representative.

2.3 Regular reports of supervisory log sheets shall be submitted that shows appropriate level of supervision.

2.4 At end of each shift, personnel must submit activity reports documenting suspicious activity, vehicles, contacts etc., supported by photographic evidence of parties, vehicles, and plates to the contracted security company supervisor.
and a weekly report to the Richmond Police Department and the City’s Project Manager.

2.5 Security personnel are required to be positioned within Pt Molate

2.6 Security will show background check clearance of employees assigned, appropriate licensing and insurance of staff and vehicles

2.7 Assure security officers are equipped with a reliable communication device (i.e., two-way radios or Nextel-type cellular phone/radio combinations), and have the RPD 24-hour non-emergency dispatch telephone number pre-programmed for quick access (510-233-1214). Cell phones are not acceptable.

2.8 Supervisory personnel must patrol the area at least once or twice per shift to check on the contracted property as well as the on-duty security officer. Contractor will hold a monthly meeting with Richmond Police Department to discuss any security issues.

2.9 Report any suspicious persons, vehicles or activity Immediately to the Richmond Police Department 24 hours a day through Nextel Wireless or the non-emergency number (510) 233-1214. Any emergency shall be reported via 911.

2.10 Maintenance Problems: The guards will report maintenance problems such as inoperative doors, lighting fixtures, broken water lines, broken or inoperative gates and locks to the Fire Department, Police Department, or other City staff as appropriate.

2.11 Other Requirements:

1. CONTRACTOR shall provide the City with assurance that a continuity of personnel shall be maintained.

2. Each Guard must have a California Security Guard Certification Card issued by the California Department of Consumer Affairs.

3. Each Guard must have the ability to work with the general public.

4. Each Guard must participate in instructional meetings when such meetings called by the City, Fire Department or Police Department.

5. The uniform of the selected CONTRACTOR must be reviewed and approved by the Richmond Police Department prior to starting work.

6. CONTRACTOR must secure a City of Richmond Business License prior to starting work.
7. CONTRACTOR must present evidence of complete insurance coverage meeting the Risk Management Department’s minimum insurance requirements, including one million dollar general liability and two million dollar aggregate with City and Agency named as additional insured.

8. LOCAL BUSINESS, LOCAL RESIDENT HIRING AND LIVING WAGE REQUIREMENTS

SP Security, LLC will be required to comply with the City of Richmond’s Business Opportunity and Local Employment Requirements as set forth in Chapter 2.50 and Chapter 2.56 of the Richmond Municipal Code. The selected Contractor will be required to execute a First Source Agreement with the City. The City’s Living Wage Requirements went into effect July 1, 2002. All entities contracting with the City of Richmond are required to pay its employees a living wage.

9. CONTRACTOR will provide services for a first year of July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 and will offer three (3) one year extension periods to this original term. Monthly invoicing for complete one guard service will be as follows:

Point Molate
Security
DP Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>2 Guards</th>
<th>1 Guard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Basis</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Labor</td>
<td>$ 15.19</td>
<td>36,180.48</td>
<td>18,090.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Stipend</td>
<td>$ 1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Cost (Ins., Gas, Etc.)</td>
<td>$ 3.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA/SDI</td>
<td>$ 1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Support</td>
<td>$ 1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation/Sick</td>
<td>$ 1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix Rate/Admin Fees</td>
<td>$ 2.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>$ 26.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periode</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>2 Guards</th>
<th>1 Guard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul-11</td>
<td>$ 36,180.48</td>
<td>$ 18,090.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-11</td>
<td>$ 45,259.20</td>
<td>$ 22,629.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-11</td>
<td>$ 36,180.48</td>
<td>$ 18,090.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-11</td>
<td>$ 36,180.48</td>
<td>$ 18,090.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A-3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov-11</td>
<td>$45,259.20</td>
<td>$22,629.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-11</td>
<td>$36,180.48</td>
<td>$18,090.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-12</td>
<td>$36,180.48</td>
<td>$18,090.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td>$45,259.20</td>
<td>$22,629.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-12</td>
<td>$36,180.48</td>
<td>$18,090.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-12</td>
<td>$36,180.48</td>
<td>$18,090.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-12</td>
<td>$45,259.20</td>
<td>$22,629.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-12</td>
<td>$36,180.48</td>
<td>$18,090.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Weeks Addl. Service</td>
<td>$36,180.48</td>
<td>$18,090.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$506,661.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>$253,330.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal, State and Local Laws: DP Security, LLC will be required to comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, including the City of Richmond’s Nondiscrimination Ordinance (Chapter 2.28), Business Opportunity Ordinance (Chapter 2.50), Local Employment Program Ordinance (Chapter 2.56), and Living Wage Ordinance (Chapter 2.60), if applicable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requester</th>
<th>Submitted On</th>
<th>Submitted To</th>
<th>Assigned To</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response Deliver</th>
<th>Response Summary</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Request posting of .mp3 files of PMCAC meeting transcripts to PMCAC web page</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td></td>
<td>KCRT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MINUTES</td>
<td>2/18/2012</td>
<td>KCRT has posted .mp3 files of PMCAC meeting audio transcripts on City's web site</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BOL - Applicability of clause 720 in Remediation Agreement to PMCAC</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>12/19/2011</td>
<td>C. Murray</td>
<td>B. Goodmiller</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>FINANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Determination of who at City receives copies of monthly reports required under Cost Cap Insurance Policy</td>
<td>Beyaert</td>
<td>12/19/2011</td>
<td>C. Murray</td>
<td>City Mgr.</td>
<td>COMPLIANCE</td>
<td>1/30/2012</td>
<td>Answer: Monthly reports are sent to Bill Lindsay, Bruce Goodmiller and Craig Murray. PMCAC will also be copied</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Secure copies of the quarterly remediation progress reports submitted by Upstream as per Section 301 (A) (3) of the Remediation Agreement: Section 301. Performance and Funding Obligations of Developer (A) (3) Developer shall make reasonable progress toward performing Environmental. CLARIFY IF THIS OBLIGATION IS SATISFIED WITH THE MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORTS, Services and shall provide quarterly progress reports to the City.</td>
<td>Beyaert</td>
<td>1/4/2012</td>
<td>C. Murray</td>
<td>City Mgr.</td>
<td>COMPLIANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Submit proposed agenda to Terraphase for 1/10/12 meeting with the PMCAC C&amp;R Sub-committee</td>
<td>Beyaert</td>
<td>1/4/2012</td>
<td>C. Murray</td>
<td>B. Goodmiller</td>
<td>City Mgr.</td>
<td>REMEDIATION</td>
<td>1/5/2012</td>
<td>Proposed agenda approved</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Request copies of back-up invoices for all charges to Navy Grant Fund by Terraphase and Arcadis</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>1/4/2012</td>
<td>A. Miller</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>FINANCE</td>
<td>Some invoices received on 1/15/2012</td>
<td>Information provided by LaShonda Wilson</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>BOL - Must every document, spreadsheet, .ppt, image, etc. that is displayed/used in support of individual agenda items on the PMCAC agenda be included in the agenda packet? And must that agenda packet (whether containing all of the used/portrayed materials or not) be posted by the same deadline as the deadline for posting of PMCAC meeting agendas?</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>1/12/2012</td>
<td>C. Murray</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>BROWN ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Secure copies of monthly remediation status reports submitted by Terraphase/Arcadis since inception</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>1/14/2012</td>
<td>L. Murray</td>
<td>City Mgr.</td>
<td>REMEDIATION</td>
<td>1/25/2012</td>
<td>Terraphase monthly remediation reports will be sent to all PMCAC members and posted on PMCAC repository</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Secure copies of all drafts of proposed plans, studies, surveys, and other submissions required by the Water Board - as submitted by Terraphase/Arcadis/upstream</td>
<td>Beyaert</td>
<td>1/15/2012</td>
<td>C. Murray</td>
<td>City Mgr.</td>
<td>REMEDIATION</td>
<td>6/30/2012</td>
<td>Terraphase with agreement by City Mgr. will supply copies of all drafts prior to presentation to the Water Board</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from Terraphase a, rough &amp; conservative estimate of the size and number of trucks, and no. of truck tons/day required for removing contaminated soil from Pt. Molate, as well as same for hauling clean replacement soil, and any anticipated additional costs involved with trucking out of Pt. Molate via proposed detour during Soefield deck replacement of traveling westbound across S.R./Richmond bridge and returning eastbound.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyaert</td>
<td>1/13/2012</td>
<td>C. Murray</td>
<td>City Mgr.</td>
<td>REMEDIATION</td>
<td>2/10/2012</td>
<td>Information supplied by Terraphase to Caltrans</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation of Upstream obligations included in any under item is contained in Appendix II of the FEIR as cited. 6. Program Management: Upstream will provide overall project management including but not limited to subcontractor procurement and management, monthly progress reporting, monthly Clean up Cost Progress Reports to the Insurer, real time schedule and budget tracking, assist in public outreach and public meetings, maintenance of a public repository of environmental documentation, site field office, site equipment storage, and financial project management.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secure full details of sums paid and purpose for additional $1.13M of charges associated with the cost cap insurance premium above and beyond the initial $3M premium.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beyaert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secure copy of the presentation given by Terraphase to C&amp;R S-C on 1/10/12 as initially prepared for a city council study session on plans for compliance with the December water board order.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide all documents contained in the bibliography on pages 8-10 of the January 2012 Monthly Remediation Status Report.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide copy of Mabe &amp; Associates audit of Pt. Molate from Dec 2010 and copy of 2011 annual audit as required under terms of the Navy transfer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide copy of Pollution Liability Ins. Policy #G248895875001 from Alliant Insurance Services.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copy of Appendices to 12/19/11 Draft Investigation Restoration Site 3 Feasibility Study/Remedial Action Plan (SAP) submitted to RWQCB by Terraphase.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beyaert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copy of Draft of the Internal Review of the proposed fact sheet as required by RWQCB for Site 2 S/RAP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beyaert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copy of Proposed draft plan for RWQCB Order Task #2: Management of soils and groundwater as required by RWQCB by March 15, 2012.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beyaert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft of internal review of proposed wetlands mitigation and monitoring plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beyaert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CALL TO ORDER
Chair Garrett called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Present: Committee Members Garrett, Gilbert, Hite, Kortz, Martinez, Puleo, Smith, C., Stello (8:07), Sundance, Whitty.
Absent: Committee Member Beyaert, Christian, Rosing, Smith, N.
Staff Present: Craig K. Murray, Staff Liaison/Development Project Manager II

WELCOME AND MEETING PROCEDURES
Garrett welcomed audience, explained meeting procedures, and discussed the Speaker Card process.

AGENDA REVIEW AND ADOPTION
Garrett reviewed Agenda items and briefed PMCAC on the Agenda order and speakers. Whitty made motion to adopt the Agenda, Martinez seconded. Passed unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS THROUGH THE CHAIR
Chair read statement from Committee Member Rosing that he will be stepping down in order to complete studies; however, Mr. Rosing is interested in returning once his studies are complete.

OPEN FORUM
No Speakers.

PRESENTATIONS, DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS

A. Presentation by Terraphase of remediation costs to date and projected, and costs for clean up, and documentation as related to Insurer.

Garrett introduced Bill Carson of Terraphase. Mr. Carson reviewed the monthly report and cost summary worksheet for remediation work as submitted on January 8, 2013 to insurance group ACE USA. Policy limit is $20,000,000 with a Project Remediation Cost of $24,689,076 and a Self Insured Retention of $29,500,000. Carson showed Committee the elements within the monthly letter report to ACE USA including Scope of Work conducted during the reporting period, changes in project conditions, project schedule that is based on RWQCB Order R2-2011-0087, Out of Scope Activities, Project Cost/Controls for Out of scope activities, Project Deliverables – Milestone Completion, Project Budget Reports, Potential for Excess Remediation Costs, and Backup Documentation. A detailed spreadsheet was reviewed including IR Site 1 – Closed Landfill, IR Site 3 – Former Oil Sump Area, IR Site 4 – Drum Lot 1 and 2, Underground Storage Tanks, and Long-Term Groundwater Monitoring.

Carson also presented a Power Point document titled Summary of IR Site 4 Remediation. This report included an Overview of Enhanced Reductive Dechlorination of TCE, Discussion of wells and soil gas samples, a summary of injection methodology and application, and Carson noted the next steps that will include a remediation summary report to RWQCB, quarterly performance monitoring for at least a year, developing risk assessment based on treated conditions and if necessary prepare a remedial action report.

Carson noted that Jim Levine of Upstream signs this monthly report. Carson answered inquiries from the PMCAC and noted that there is not a Claim until the remediation costs go over $29M and when project is closer to 80% of funds expended, then ACE will start to review expenses. Garrett asked for past copies of this
monthly report. Carson indicated that it has been tasked only in approximately the last six months but he can share reports. Carson noted reports are quite large at about 145 pages and can share soft copies with PMCAC Staff Liaison for distribution. Discussion regarding proposed housing for IR Site 3 and Garrett noting that the Deed notes that the use is only for Commercial and use changes would need Water Board approval. Garrett noted that the City will need to amend its 2030 General Plan and this can’t be done through administrative or ministerial action. Puleo inquired about Ethane Reductive Dechlorination and how long will it take. Carson explained that process will take about 1 and ½ years and compared processes with and without molasses that can take PCE, a dry cleaning solvent, that can degrade to a toxic, industrial solvent TCE but with the process is converted to Ethene, a harmless gas. Further questions were asked about the Membrane Interface Probe (MIP) applications. Carson explained that the geotechnical aspects of area provide some limitations and also explained that site requires Mitigation Monitoring with a biologist and archaeologist and that Terraphase is using LSA in Richmond for its cultural resources and biological monitoring and can need an assessment from State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) if there is a need for incursion into some sensitive areas. Carson discussed a map in the presentation that shows colored areas of monitoring concern. Carson summarized that next steps include a final summary report on the injections leading up to closure of the site expected in approximately August, 2014.

B. Presentation by University of California (UC) Berkeley Graduate School Findings and Recommendations to PMCAC.

This item was moved to 12.b in order to report out with the Subcommittee.

8. STAFF REPORTS

A. Committee Log for PMCAC inquiries to staff, contractors

Garrett noted an upcoming meeting with the City Manager to identify the process in making land use and related remediation level. Garrett indicated that some outstanding items on the inquiry tracker had been closed.

9. CONSENT CALENDAR

Martinez moved to adopt Consent Calendar, Puleo seconded. Passed unanimously.

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Garrett noted that an upcoming presentation in regards to the Presidio Trust is being sought and would also like to see a report from Public Works on the Electric Plant Infrastructure.

11. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORTS

A. REPORT BY COUNCILMEMBER/MAYOR MCLAUGHLIN REGARDING RECENT ISSUES IN RICHMOND RELEVANT TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
B. PMCAC APPOINTMENT STATUS

No Report.
12. **CHAIR AND SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS**
   a. Clean-Up and Restoration:
      1. Synopsis of Terraphase draft December 2012 Monthly Status Reports

      Kortz reported on monthly reports regarding IR Site 3 and IR Site 4. Carson provided additional information on each of the reports.

   b. Community Outreach: Hite noted that UC Berkeley student team is not available and prefers to bring this back at future meeting with specific information from their efforts that can be reported.

   c. Grant Development: Stello discussed the National Fish and Wildlife grant sponsored by Wells Fargo submitted on 12/17/12. Application was for approximately $50,000 for development of native plant species demonstration plot and educational interpretation and watershed demarcation project with educational interpretation for the watershed outfall at Pt. Molate Beach. Application also includes consideration for Grade 8-12 curriculum development.

   d. Finance: Puleo reported efforts to receive invoices as approved by the City Attorney. Puleo discussed amount of $800,000 deducted from escrow with $630,000 to the City and $170,000 to Upstream. Garrett clarified the subject audit was the FY 2010-11 single audit and not the 2011-12 audit, and Committee will need the City response to the auditors findings from the FY 2010-11 audit.

   e. Chair: No report.

13. **ADJOURNMENT**

    Puleo moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:31 pm, seconded by Whitty. Passed unanimously.

14. **Assemblage of PMCAC Standing Sub-Committees**

    Adjourned to Sub-Committee Meetings.

15. **SCHEDULED MEETINGS**

    Committee Meeting – .
    Monday, February 11, 2012, 6:30 p.m., Multi-Purpose Room, 440 Civic Center Plaza

Minutes respectfully submitted by: ____________________________

Craig K. Murray, PMCAC Staff Liaison
February 7, 2013

City of Richmond
450 Civic Center Plaza
Richmond, CA 94804

Attn: Mayor Gayle McLaughlin
      Bill Lindsay, City Manager
      Carlos Privat, Assistant City Attorney
      Richard Mitchell, Director Planning & Building Services

cc: Craig Murray
    Bill Carson, Terraphase

Re: Site cleanup cost analysis for unrestricted use at Former NFD Pt. Molate IRSite 3

Dear Sirs and Madame Mayor,

This letter follows up on our January 17 meeting by recommending steps for resolving Former NFD Point Molate IRSite 3 remediation issues. As we explained, the Point Molate Community Advisory Committee (PMCAC) is concerned about the City of Richmond’s failure to satisfy the May 4, 2012 deadline specified for the IR Site 3 Feasibility Study/Remedial Action Plan (FS/RAP) in Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Order R2-2011-0087 for Point Molate.

Remediation planning has been stalled for almost a year, i.e. since the RWQCB’s February 17, 2012 letter to Bruce Goodmiller declaring that the December 19, 2011 Draft FS/RAP “is not acceptable” for multi-family residential use as proposed. Currently, the City via Terraphase, seems to be pursuing a mishmash of cleanup goal levels and tactics for IR Site 3, i.e. a little commercial use here and a bit of unrestricted uses there, without any consideration of compatibility between land uses. In effect, the remediation discussions with the RWQCB seem to have degenerated into the realm of de facto land use decisions based upon contaminant types and levels, rather than a reasoned consideration of appropriate and compatible land uses. A by-product of this unsettled situation is that on-site thermal desorption cleanup technology has not been evaluated robustly as an alternative to hauling contaminated soil to an appropriate land fill followed by replacement with clean fill.

As explained during the January 17 meeting, the PMCAC is especially concerned about the ongoing delay in clean up because the City’s adopted Reuse Plan does not call for residential housing at IR Site 3. However, we do understand your desire to evaluate the economic feasibility of cleaning up for unrestricted use. As a way of moving forward, we suggest that Terraphase:
a. Considering integrity of Historic District and the shoreline park with public plaza as recommended in the Reuse Plan, analyze the incremental cost of cleaning a plausibly appropriate portion of Site 3 for residential use vs. the commercial, industrial & open space standards which form the basis for the ETCA, Remediation Agreement and Cost Containment Insurance Policy with its Remediation Plan; and

b. Prepare an economic evaluation of on-site thermal desorption as an alternative to removing soil contaminated with non-hazardous waste for trucking to an approved Class II disposal site followed by replacement with clean fill.

As to on-site thermal desorption, it can have direct and indirect economic benefits that need to be evaluated by a full accounting cost analysis compared to alternative clean-up strategies. It would of course eliminate the trucking costs, traffic, motor vehicle emissions & tipping fees, as well as the analytical costs and delays of waste profiling truckload lots associated with off-site disposal. On-site thermal desorption also would allow the City to eliminate potential waste generator cradle to grave liability issues associated with off-site disposal.

If thermal desorption has the potential for appreciable cost savings, its technical feasibility should be evaluated for IRSite 3 conditions. Nelson Environmental Remediation, which offers mobile thermal desorption services, has stated that they are willing to bond their performance and offer a guarantee that “Processed soils not meeting the cleanup objectives after the first pass will be recombined with untreated soils and reprocessed at NER’s expense”. Nevertheless, an independent evaluation seems prudent, e.g. has the technology been demonstrated to meet the desired treatment levels with heavy polynuclear aromatic compounds such as those found at IRSite 3. We understand that Focus Environmental, Inc., which has expertise in this area, could prepare a technical assessment of the technology for about $3K.

The PMCAC would like to be helpful in advancing cleanup of Site 3 in a cost effective manner. To that end, we hope to have an opportunity to review the analyses listed above as soon as possible.

Respectfully,

Joan Garrett
Chair, Point Molate Community Advisory Comte.

Bruce Beyaert
Vice Chair, Point Molate Community Advisory Comte.

c/o The Mayor's Office
450 Civic Center Plaza
Richmond, CA. 94804