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CHAIR FETTER: All right. We'll call to order the Design Review Board for the City of Richmond tonight. We'll start by doing roll call, by way of introducing us.

Lina.

MS. VELASCO: Chair Fetter.

CHAIR FETTER: Here.

MS. VELASCO: Board Member Whitty.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Here.

MS. VELASCO: Board Member -- Vice Chair Munoz.

BOARD MEMBER MUNOZ: Here.

MS. VELASCO: Board Member Woldemar.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Aye.

CHAIR FETTER: And Ray and Robin are out today.

We also have Lina Velasquez [sic], our senior planner, and James Atencio, counsel.

We have -- I didn't see an agenda -- I should say a former -- previous meeting notes --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Minutes.

CHAIR FETTER: Minutes, yeah.

So we can move on to agenda.

And, first of all, I'm kind of surprised that 70 Belvedere is on the calendar at all. It's supposed
to be slated for the 30th. Do you know why that would even appear on this one?

MS. VELASCO: From what I understood at the last meeting, it was to be held over for this meeting, but it was re-noticed for the 30th.

CHAIR FETTER: Right.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: We talked about a date certain and this was the next regular meeting.

CHAIR FETTER: Oh, okay. Yeah. All right. Well, anyway.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: The next one is an irregular -- a special meeting.

CHAIR FETTER: Special meeting, yeah.

MS. VELASCO: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Irregular meeting works well too.

CHAIR FETTER: So let's get the agenda approved by -- anyone want to make a motion to approve the agenda?

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Approve the agenda.

CHAIR FETTER: Seconds?

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Yes, second.

CHAIR FETTER: All in favor?

ALL BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR FETTER: Aye. So the agenda is passed.
And the meeting procedures can be found at the back of this document. People making comments that really, the bottom line is, you know, we welcome public comment; and public comment forms can be found right over there. They're pink. And, especially for large crowds, we tend to limit the speaking time to two minutes just so we can get through a meeting and don't last here till twelve midnight.

The next thing is that right now we'd like to open up the comment period for the public on items that are not relating to the agenda. So if anyone would like to make a comment about something that is not on the agenda, please speak now.

Seeing that we don't have any comments off the agenda, I guess we'll move on to whether or not we're going to take something off the consent calendar.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Pull Item No. 2, please.

CHAIR FETTER: Okay. And considering that the next one is already postponed, that means that --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Sure. I would move to approve the consent calendar, consisting of PLN14-930, which is Item No. 1 on our agenda.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Second.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: That's a continuance until next week.
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: I second it.

CHAIR FETTER: And all in favor.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS: AYE.

CHAIR FETTER: All right. So there's no appeal [unintelligible] actually consented.

So moving on to public hearings. We will look at PLN11-089, Chevron Refinery Modernization Project, right now.

So, Lina.

MS. VELASCO: Okay. Good evening, Chair Fetter, Board Members.

This evening we are presenting the design review permit for the Chevron Modernization Project. There -- we'll be requesting a design review permit in addition to conditional use permits, along with certification of an EIR.

And so the applicant is here, who will present their project. We are currently within the comment period for the Draft EIR. But the focus of tonight are design review permit issues and will be a recommendation to the Planning Commission when they consider certification of the EIR and the design review permit and conditional use permit.

So I'll pass it to the applicant, unless there's any questions for staff.
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: It seems a little weird that the EIR comment period hasn't closed, but we're looking at the project. What if there's some comments that come in that are -- that need to be addressed or if the comment period is extended and we act? I mean it's sort of out of sync to me.

MS. VELASCO: Yes. So the Design Review Board is a recommendation to the Planning Commission. And I think we had a brief explanation about why it was allowable to take this action, because as part of our guidelines -- and that's on page two -- where in the first paragraph it does say, Since the Planning Commission is the decision-making body for certifying the EIR, the Design Review Board can consider the applicant's design review permit application and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission to either approve or deny the permit at this meeting while preparation and review of the Final Environmental Impact Report is in progress, because ultimately all the mitigation measures --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Right.

MS. VELASCO: -- that come of that document will be a condition of approval for the conditional use permit. And this is per the CEQA --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Okay.
MS. VELASCO: -- guidelines that the City has.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Okay. It didn't say why. It just said will." So I wanted to know why.

So --

CHAIR FETTER: Well, that's the staff opinion.


BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Lina, I have a couple questions, if I may.

First, I think we should note that about 7:30 tonight, if we're not done with taking testimony and discussing the project, we probably have to continue, because we will run out of a quorum.

MS. VELASCO: Correct.

CHAIR FETTER: Oh, yes. Thank you for pointing that out.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: At that point one of the members has to leave and we'll only have three and we're supposed to have four to have a quorum.

But more importantly this is a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Then we have couple of suggested conditions that the staff has proposed.

On Condition No. 1, you very -- not you necessarily -- specifically include a series of drawing documents, Sheets 1 through 8, but no representation
about all of the visual simulations. Should they not
also be included in our recommendation because they're
part of a submittal?

And I had the same kind of question on other
projects too. We get the pretty picture stuff.
Shouldn't that be part of the submittal and be part of
the reference that that's what we're recommending?

First -- the second question that I have
tonight is on number -- Item No. 3. I note the
landscaping and I'll come back to the Board and indicate
it in the staff conditions as prior to installation. I
wondered if there isn't something a little bit more
specific, like -- maybe not these words -- but like
"prior to the issuance of a building permit." Something
that's -- because there's no time limit on this.

And so I'm asking maybe "within 30 days of
final approval of the EIR" or some words to that effect.
And we can talk further about that. But I really wanted
to raise the issue, because I think we need to be a
little bit more specific. We may not all be around next
week or next -- and not know what went on.

And then lastly -- I touched on this just
briefly before the meeting -- Condition No. 4 talks
about the project being constructed to all of these
various standards. And for this Board that's unusual.
We usually don't say that a project be constructed according to the building permit, in this case several other -- frankly, I know nothing about the American Petroleum Institute. And so I don't know how I can vote for a condition like that. So I'm suggesting that that's more appropriately something that might well be in a Planning Commission -- is it use permit in this case?

MS. VELASCO: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Yeah. And so that would be a typical kind of use permit condition.

Last comment I would just make is, just confirming, we're here for the design of the project, the visual appearance of the project. We're not necessarily here to hear about odor, smoke, fire, all of those kinds of issues. Am I correct on that, this is what the Design Review Board's function is?

MS. VELASCO: Correct. And, you know, in reviewing your staff report you probably notice that we did make mentions of odors --

CHAIR FETTER: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: I like the part about vibrations.

MS. VELASCO: And, you know, a lot of those, while those aren't typical design review items, they
were reviewed in the last project. And so we thought for a continuity it was good to provide you with information that was contained within the EIR, but really the EIR mitigation measures will deal with those specifically and will be part of the conditions of the CUP, but --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Which are more specifically also raised -- better raised -- at the Planning Commission level --

MS. VELASCO: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: -- because I mean for us to say, Oh, well we don't agree with the vibration levels, I mean I don't know that any of us are going to be able to say that.

All I'm suggesting is that, to the audience perhaps, if you have comments on those kinds of things, save them for the Planning Commission. We want to hear about the design-related ones. What's the visual design? What's this thing look like? What color is the tank on the hillside? That sort of stuff.

MS. VELASCO: Perfect.

CHAIR FETTER: Does it disappear? Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Right. And also, Lina, the staff recommendation, it should be, "And recommend
conditional approval to the Planning Commission of the
design review permit." We're recommending to the
Planning Commission.

MS. VELASCO: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah. Just add that in.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Thanks.

MS. VELASCO: And you're on page 13, right?

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Thirteen, exactly.

CHAIR FETTER: Eileen, thank you.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Thank you.

CHAIR FETTER: Mike, thank you.

So without any further comments for -- or I
should say questions for staff -- I think next we'll
move on to the presentation by the applicant.

Sir.

MARK PIERSANTE: Great. Thank you, Lina.

Hi, everyone. I'm Mike Piersante. I think
I've --

CHAIR FETTER: Hi, Mark. Yes.

MARK PIERSANTE: -- met all of you along the
way. So thanks, all, for having us. This is a good
night because we're hopefully checking this box. And
we've got a really great project. And so thank you for
the opportunity to present.
I'm going to probably be in your way if I stand here, right?

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: You can sit, yeah. It's fine.

CHAIR FETTER: Don't worry about it.

MARK PIERSANTEE: Let me do that and --

I do have some esteemed colleagues with me in case there's questions I can't answer and such. And that would be Jeff Hartwig, who some of you may know is kind of the senior business manager/project manager for us.

Steven Yang, who's been kind of managing all the permitting aspects.

Nicole -- there's Nicole. She's one of our public affairs advisers.

I don't see Heather. Is Heather here? I guess Heather didn't make it.

Brian Hubbinger is one of our technical guys. So he can -- if you have any technical questions.

Myself.

And, of course, everybody knows Marsha, right? We also -- you know, this is a very important project to Chevron. Everyone knows that. We've been trying to encourage our employees and contractors on the refinery to support the project and make that support
visible. So we have these nice folks who have taken
their evening to come see what design review is all
about.

CHAIR FETTER: Thanks, guys and ladies.

MARK PIERSANTE: And appreciate them taking
their time, too.

You know, I think the reason that we're here
is to give you information so that you can look at the
exterior design of the project elements that are subject
to design review and make a recommendation to the
Planning Commission on the appropriate findings and any
conditions that you may feel appropriate to request.

You probably know the Planning Commission has
been holding some hearings and there will be hearings in
the future to actually look at the EIR and talk about
the impacts, look at the mitigations, and get into kind
of really the guts of that document and such.

So the focus tonight would be just on the
design review elements and the simulations, et cetera.

So if you have questions, stop me. But just
maybe in the silence I'll try to blast through this.
And then we've got -- you've got the packages I hope,
right? You got the handouts?

CHAIR FETTER: Yes.

MARK PIERSANTE: And then we've got boards of
everything in your package. So if there's something
that comes up, we can throw the board up there.

   CHAIR FETTER: Great.

   MARK PIERSANTE: So the modernization project,
now formally the renewal project, is a very different
project now than it was. There are two significant
parts of the old project that are no longer part of this
project. Sort of what remains has been renamed the
modernization project. There's two primary pieces to
that.

   One is to complete, or finish, the
construction of the partially constructed hydrogen
plant. When the original project was under
construction, we constructed for about a year before the
court shut the project down. And so the hydrogen plant
is about 50-percent complete, somewhere in that range.
I'll show you some pictures of that in a minute.

   The other piece of this is known as the
sulfur-removal improvements. There's two primary
locations in the refinery where there will be some
equipment modifications made, primarily in one existing
area, and then some new equipment added to another sort
of empty site at this point.

   And then there's, you know, electrical
infrastructure, ancillary equipment, other kind of
supporting equipment that goes along with the primary
elements of the project -- piping, pipe supports, et
cetera.

And, in addition, we have now project design
features, as we're calling them, which are some
additional project elements that are intended to reduce
the emissions from the project and bring those to a net
of zero increase for all the criteria pollutants. We'll
touch on those as well.

This map is a little hard to see, but it was
really intended just to kind of orient you. I'll show
you a blowup. But you know Richmond/San Rafael Bridge,
the Peninsula. Main operating areas of the refinery in
these color areas kind of denote locations of the new
hydrogen plant. They're in blue -- I'm sorry -- the
sulfur-removal elements are in blue, the hydrogen plant
is kind of in orange. You'll see it a little bit better
in this close-up shot. So it's kind of concentrated in
the primary operating area of the refinery.

Just briefly, this area here is an existing
area of some equipment modifications take place in this
area. And those are sulfur-recovery units. This is an
empty site right now where a piece of equipment and
supporting [unintelligible] a new generator will go.
Project design features to reduce emissions. I'll talk
about that in a minute.

This is another area where some of the sulfur-improvement -- sulfur-reduction improvements -- are going. Project -- oh, there we go. Project design feature in green, a water-reuse project. This is the existing hydrogen plant location that will be taken out of service and then dismantled following construction and completion of the hydrogen replacement area, as you see in orange.

So these are the three major components: The hydrogen plant replacement again, as I mentioned; the sulfur-removal improvements. There are sort of two pieces to that. One is at a unit called the fluid catalytic cracker feed hydrotreater, or the FCCFHT is what you'll see written down, and then this amine regenerator.

There are four project design features. Again, these are designed to mitigate or to help reduce emissions of the project.

LED lighting. There will be about 6,000 LED lights replaced.

There's one storage-tank dome that we're looking at installing. Two water-reuse projects; and then some change in some motors on one of the cooling towers to -- for better energy efficiency and energy
reduction.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Mark, can I ask a
couple of questions --

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: -- while you're at
this sort of level here?

Am I understanding correctly that all of the
improvements that are being made are out in the what I'm
going to call in the middle of the refinery? None of
them abut public rights of way --

MARK PIERSANTE: That is correct.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: -- public streets?

MARK PIERSANTE: Yes, that is correct.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Second question is --
and I can't remember, because now I can't see it, but --

CHAIR FETTER: Can we get the lights back on?

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: No. That's all right.

No lights.

MARK PIERSANTE: I think the rest of the
slides are probably --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: But the dome that's
going on tank number such and such --

CHAIR FETTER: Please.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: -- shows up in one of
the slides or one of the stuff has a white top.
MARK PIERSANTE: As the tank dome.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Yes.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Now, the question is why? So maybe you -- maybe I'm ahead of you yet, but it's on this list --

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah.

CHAIR FETTER: I think we will get to that, but I think a better question is actually -- can I -- did everyone get a chance to read over all the material supplied to us? Brenda?

BOARD MEMBER MUNOZ: Yes.

CHAIR FETTER: I mean I think you're going over a lot of the stuff that we've actually all read over. And I apologize to the members of public. But since I'm trying to kind of abbreviate this a little, if we can, it would be really appreciated if we -- we all have questions for you --

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah, let's then go through it --

CHAIR FETTER: I think a lot of this is going to come out.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah.

CHAIR FETTER: So if we can skip through some of the -- I'm really looking for --
MARK PIERSANTE: Okay. That works.

CHAIR FETTER: -- adding to whatever you've actually already handed to us.

MARK PIERSANTE: Okay. That sounds great.

Let's see. Visual character of the project and the refinery. You know, there's structures and stacks and tanks. And that's really not going to change very much, if you look at the simulations; and we'll look at those. But I'm not sure you can really see too much from outside the refinery, quite frankly, when you see the simulations.

This is a just a view to show you the existing hydrogen plant. It's the bulk of the equipment right there in the middle. So that would be decommissioned and physically removed -- the equipment removed from -- sort of demolished and sent for scrap, et cetera.

This you don't see too well. This was a pretty cool, I thought, 3-D model that we had for a while. It just shows what the whole thing looks like. Don't pay attention to the colors. It was just a kind of computer model that we've had for some time. But I thought I'd throw it in there so you get a sense of what's this thing look like new.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: I particularly like the piers underneath.
CHAIR FETTER: Yeah.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. Right.

CHAIR FETTER: It's informative.

MARK PIERSANTE: It's going to be built on stilts. It's going to be --

CHAIR FETTER: Yeah. That's pretty much what it is.

MARK PIERSANTE: This is a Google Earth shot. That's how long the partially completed hydrogen plant has been sitting there. You can see it's -- you know, it's pretty far along. I mean, if you look back at this thing, you see there's a bunch of equipment, right. And so it's about roughly 50-percent complete. Been sitting there now since 2009.

This is one of the elevations. I just grabbed one just to throw that into the presentation. You've seen them all. We've got the boards for all four sides. It in the four series of drawings, or simulations, that you see there. So that's kind of the hydrogen plant.

This is the FCCFHT. So the existing area, basically just putting some equipment into an existing area. I thought this shows it pretty well. You got all this existing stuff and you got a few little things that we're sort of adding to that.

Again, just an elevation view. There's some
stuff that's very lightly shaded and the intent was just
to show the new equipment in the existing FCCFHT area.
That series of drawings is in the 5.00 to 5.05 for those
elevations.

This is the third area, if you will, where
there is the amine regenerator site. I'll show you that
in a second, next to that sulfur-recovery unit. So,
again, some existing equipment, will be some minor
modifications made, nothing that you would even see
visually. One of the design features is over on the
right down there is the FCC cooling tower. There's a
series of fans on the top of that. Those motors would
be replaced with variable-speed drives, which is a very
effective energy-reduction measure and, again, an
emissions-reduction measure.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: It's cooling-water
tower.

CHAIR FETTER: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: You use water to cool.

CHAIR FETTER: Yeah. So water is used to cool
process equipment and the heat exchangers and such. So
that water, when it comes back from the process, goes
through a tower that allows the water to kind of
percolate down and cool so that it can then be sent back
to the units for additional cooling.
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Okay.

MARK PIERSANTE: It's a very standard kind of -- I got a photo of it that I could show you with a little bit better here than what it is.

This is the site where the amine regenerator will go. How it looks today. That's a simulated rendition of the new equipment that will go into that location. There are two liquid oxygen tanks associated with that work at the sulfur-recovery unit. Those tanks are installed. They're sitting there right now, so they're in place.

And then the elevation view of that area. Again, everything in that one lot there on the right is essentially new. So this is one of those four views of that -- of that amine regenerator area.

And then we get into a couple of simulations. And I just picked a couple here just to get a flavor. But this is from Buena Vista Avenue. You got to look really, really hard to see the partially constructed plant. So this is kind of the current state, if you will; and it's very difficult to see it. I don't know if you can see it any better on the -- there's just a little tiny area that is the partially constructed hydrogen plant; and that arrow was pointing at it.

And then this would be the simulated view.
And this may get, Mike, at your question about the dome.  
I'll talk about that again here in a second. But,  
anyway, this would be the simulated view from Buena Vista Avenue.  

So there's other simulations in the package, very similar. I thought these were probably the two that tend to show the most. This would be the second one off Crest. Same idea, where somewhere in that equipment out there you can actually discern the fact that there is a partially constructed hydrogen plant.  

This photo was actually taken for the original project. And if you can tell me why. The bush in front is much bigger, if you look at this bush. If you look, it's a little tiny bush. Now look at it, seven years later.  

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: That's what happens at Point Richmond all the time.  

MARK PIERSANTE: It is what it is.  

Anyway, so those are the views from up on the hillside. And, again, there's several more in the package.  

CHAIR FETTER: Yes.  

MARK PIERSANTE: Now, there's some other equipment kind of here and there. And talking to Lina, we thought, you know, we'll just put some of those
photos in to just give you an idea what some of this stuff looks like. This is a reverse-osmosis unit. This is kind of a water-purification kind of thing, but again fairly -- from a visual impact outside, you don't even know it's there, quite honestly. This is a picture of an existing unit very similar to the one --

CHAIR FETTER: So it's the water as the source of the H2O rather than some other process?

MARK PIERSANTE: Yes, correct. Correct.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: And --

CHAIR FETTER: It's not stated anywhere, actually.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Right. On that note, I know that uses a humongous amount of energy to run. Reverse osmosis? Right. So I guess mine is just a little safety -- you know, this is new. Is it all in compliance and so forth?

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. So right now there are existing RO units in the refinery. So this will be adding another one essentially to that same system just to essentially give it a little more capacity.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: And then are you -- what water are you putting through there?

MARK PIERSANTE: Depends. There's water from East Bay MUD --
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Right --
MARK PIERSANTE: -- that comes in.
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: -- from down the road.
MARK PIERSANTE: There's also water reuse from the RARE project, if you remember the RARE project.
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Right. So those two.
MARK PIERSANTE: Brian might be able to answer exactly what water is going through there, but --
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Well, the only reason -- my bottom line is the debris or salt or minerals, where are those going after the reverse osmosis?
MARK PIERSANTE: Good question. Does Brian know the answer to that question?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [off microphone] I believe the back flush from the reverse osmosis goes to the refinery's wastewater-treatment plant --
MARK PIERSANTE: To the off-line system.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and processed with the rest of the industrial wastewater in compliance with our permit.
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: It goes into the Bay? Or back to East Bay MUD?
MARK PIERSANTE: No. Into the refinery's main wastewater or effluent treatment system.
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: And that dumps into --
where's the out-flow?

MARK PIERSANTE: Eventually after treatment there is a discharge through the deep-water out-fall --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Good.

MARK PIERSANTE: -- pipe, as it's called, out kind of the north end of the refinery out through a permitted discharge.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Great. Okay. Thanks.

MARK PIERSANTE: This was that cooling tower I mentioned that has the fans on the top and for which the motors will be upgraded to variable-speed drives.

We're trying to show some photos of what the water-reuse project would be. In this case for these particular pumps, it may result in a larger-sized pump motor. So, again, from a visual perspective, not a whole lot, but in case you had an interest --

CHAIR FETTER: Inconsequential, yeah.

MARK PIERSANTE: -- you now know what that looks like.

And then the storage-tank dome. So the story on the domes is that, if you recall in the original renewal project there was a number of tanks with domes. That kind of went away. But we also had the replacement storage tank project in which we proposed and the City approved six above-ground steel storage tanks. Three of
those were to be equipped with domes. So this is the first one. And sort of the standard fabrication is with aluminum framing and a slightly different type of aluminum or Plexiglas -- can be panels. And over time, you know, they tend to weather and become a little grayer and a little more mute in their finish. They're really not intended to be painted. They're not designed for the weight of the paint, for example. In order to repaint them, you've got to put people on top of the tank, empty the tank. So it's kind of the standard practice.

And we've talked to you folks before about the fact that they would just weather over time and that is kind of how they look. In addition, painting them will increase the emissions from the tank as a matter of heating the tank up. So, anyway, that has been kind of our logic that --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Seems to me -- I'm doing a really difficult memory bank thing here. Last time we saw you all was back doing a water-storage tank --

MARK PIERSANTE: Yes, that was --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: -- that was visible from the bridge.

MARK PIERSANTE: Correct.
BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: That's never been built or has it?

MARK PIERSANTE: It's in process right now. In fact, if you go across the bridge, you'll see it. It's -- all the steel courses are up.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: So it's doing what it's supposed to do --

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah, yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: And did it have a cover over it?

MARK PIERSANTE: That will have just a fixed cone roof on it. It's just a water tank, so it --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Was it white?

MARK PIERSANTE: No, that's --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Because I seem to remember us going through this discussion before. That's the reason I'm raising it.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: I think it was down on Canal on one of those projects, wasn't it? Or Cutting.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Well, it could have been down there.

MS. VELASCO: Yeah. I know we did do it with IMTT, with the floating roofs.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah. And they had to be white.
MS. VELASCO: Well, I think the tank itself, you wanted it to be whiter and off-white.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: But what I'm also remembering back -- and I'm really dating myself -- but Eileen's going to remember this too. We were on the PDRB, I believe, when the original Chevron paint scheme of all the tanks and everything. And Marsha was the consultant at that time.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: And that's where the dirty brown fits into the hillside, all of that comes out. And so what I'm sliding in here and I'm wondering is where did this white or even off-white sort of show up from?

MARK PIERSANTE: For --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: I really -- because it really -- as I'm seeing it on those slides --

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: -- it's really popping out. It's sticking up there. So I'm wondering, for example, could you build the tank -- pick a number -- six feet higher, mount the dome down inside the tank, so the top of the dome is the tank or the sightline is such that I'm seeing brown and I'm not seeing white as at least one method of trying to be reasonably
constructive?

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. I don't know how you can get people on to the edge of that roof then to inspect inside the tank. So the top of the tank has to be -- around the rim -- I don't know if you can see it.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: I can see an edge up there, sure.

MARK PIERSANTE: It's kind of a girder -- wind girder -- around and a walkway, so there's got to be the ability --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: But you've got all these marvelous engineers setting out there. I'll bet you they could figure something out. Anyway, that's what I'm frustrated about is that we spent a long time ago, years ago, dealing with the colors. And, gee, what a great solution it's turned out to be over the years and all. And now we're kind of blowing it.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah, so --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: But it's down in the field or down in the -- we'll call it the level area of the refinery. It's sort of -- it doesn't really matter, because it fits in with all the other clutter.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: But up there, up on the roof -- up on the roof -- it's like a sore thumb
sticking up there.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. So just to be clear, so the water tank that you're talking about will have a fixed roof that will be the same color as the tank.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Yeah. That's what I thought --

MARK PIERSANTE: So that one -- is that a different animal --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: And I thought I remembered us talking about that.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. So that's an entirely different type of tank.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Yeah, it's water.

MARK PIERSANTE: So for these -- again, this being a very standard industry design, I think when we talked to you before about the colors, the point we got to was a recognition that ultimately when it's -- over time that this thing will weather and be muted and you won't have that white visual appearance. And, you know, we decided -- you folks -- that that was acceptable. So for the original renewal project, we had the same discussion. I think we had eight tanks in that original project going back, you know, six, seven years.

For the five new tanks -- the six new tanks, including the water tank -- we had the same discussion.
And, again, you know, when I made the case, they're just really not intended to be painted in that over time. I think you'll find that they'll be fairly muted and not have that visual difference --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Slightly different question: Could that tank, instead of being up on the hill, be down on the flat some place? This slide seems to be one of those down on the hill. I mean down on the flat area.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. This one is pretty close to the -- in fact, it's right outside of the -- when you come in the main entrance of the refinery, it's fairly close to that. It's just slightly above the new firehouse location that we --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: My point being is again, down low it sort of fits in with all of the other -- I use this -- I don't mean it --

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: -- negatively, but all the other clutter that's down in that visual field.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: -- and up there it's --

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. So --

CHAIR FETTER: I'll add that, for tensity
structures like this, which are geodesic -- the spar
thickness for that product line can be expanded just a
little -- just barely. Or you can choose a different
spar and/or enhance the connectors. And for an
tenserity structure, it's incredibly strong. You can
walk right across that.

And so I want to point out, yes, you can walk
across it. To painting it, you just increase the spar
depth just barely. And you can compensate for the paint
weight.

So I'm thinking it's more of an issue about
[unintelligible]. And so the big question there is, you
know, I don't know -- that's a technical issue. But I
think that for appearances, though, it really does stand
out. And that's why I want -- I don't want the weight
issue to be a part of that decision. But I think we can
come back to that.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. But to answer your
question about the tank you've seen, you know, that's an
existing tank, right? So there's not a lot of -- can't
really move that tank --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: No. And that's not
the concern.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: A better question is:
Is there space somewhere else down in the flat area where that hillside tank that has a dome on it goes down there someplace, in which case then for me it's a non-issue, because it just fits in with all the other stuff.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. We have to look at that. But I think most of the larger tanks for which there would be an emission reduction worth putting a dome on for are going to be up on the hillside.

MS. VELASCO: Yeah. And if I can add to that, the Draft EIR actually looks at the potential of doing 28 domes throughout the refinery. So -- but right now at the project level, the utilization that we're anticipating, they're only required to do one to stay at the no-net-increase.

But I was also being reminded that, the last project approval, that issue of this color was raised as well; and the condition was allowed that this color would remain. And I could definitely go back and do that additional research if it's needed.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: When was that?

MS. VELASCO: When the 2008 project was approved, that this discussion was had. It was agreed to not paint them white and to just let them weather naturally so that eventually they would tarnish and be
less visible, but --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Unfortunately, none of the Board Members that were on at that point in time are on now --

MS. VELASCO: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: -- interestingly enough.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: You're saying not paint it white? Well, is it going to degrade and cause a problem if it's not coated with something?

MARK PIERSANTE: No. They're intended to be in this condition. I mean one of the concerns about painting is they start wearing unevenly and you start -- well, they get a bit of a splotchy -- it ends up looking potentially worse over time, which causes you to have to paint them more frequently.

And then the second project was the replacement storage tank project. Same thing. That was 2011, I believe, or '12. 2011.

MS. VELASCO: Yes. And that was noted --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: But those were out -- if I recall correctly, those were out in the flats.

MARK PIERSANTE: No, because that -- this one is here is one of those. But the other two are, you know, starting to get up on that hillside on the
refinery side --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: I don't remember that being a particular pop-out-like-a-sore-thumb issue at that time.

Anyway, maybe we should move on --

CHAIR FETTER: We should come back to this.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Certainly, assuming we do get continued tonight, I think I would love to hear some more about it.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Is it a storage tank for fuel? For what?

CHAIR FETTER: For water.

MARK PIERSANTE: This particular one is for what we call recovered oil, so it's a bit of a mixture of different --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Well, that one's already built.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: The new tank that's going to be built will be used for what?

MS. VELASCO: The base project doesn't include a new tank. It's just the tank's dome --

MARK PIERSANTE: Just the dome on an existing tank.

MS. VELASCO: -- which is just sort of that
crystallization --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: -- just a -- okay.

MS. VELASCO: -- top. There is no new tank

that -- the new tanks were approved as part of the
tank-replacement project --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Right, that we looked

at.

MS. VELASCO: -- that was approved in 2011.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Did we see that?

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah.

MS. VELASCO: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yes, we did.

MS. VELASCO: I think Lamont was still here

when --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Yeah.

MS. VELASCO: -- it was worked on.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: So why are -- so I'm

lost in space now. Why are we looking at this? It's

already built --

MARK PIERSANTE: So this --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: -- it's not part of the

project --

MS. VELASCO: No, this is an example --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: It's an example.

MS. VELASCO: -- the design, the dome itself,
was already approved, but now we need to build another one to offset emission increases.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Okay.

MS. VELASCO: And so the one that they're proposing is up on the hill and the ridge, like Mike said --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Okay.

MS. VELASCO: -- but, you know, we could condition them to begin with interior tanks and -- but, ultimately, they will have to rely on tanks that are on the ridge. But there could be a prioritization where they start low and move up as they need to, which --

CHAIR FETTER: Well, let's --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: We could also -- check me on this -- make the connection, the nexus, to require, say, some larger-than-normal landscaping. As I'm looking at that slide -- and I wish I could instantly zoom in on it a little bit -- but it appears to me as if there are some existing trees from that view covering part of that tank. And if additional trees were planted tomorrow, the tank doesn't get covered until year six. Now we've had a head start on screening or some version of --

MARK PIERSANTE: However, we're no longer planting trees and combustible materials in and around
storage tanks in the refinery. And that was something they came out of the replacement storage-tank project as well.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Nice try. Well, the next thing is we just paint trees on the side of the tanks with cutouts up above -- above the white.

MARK PIERSANTE: A cardboard tree, right.

MS. VELASCO: It would have to be antiflammable material.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Add steel extensions to the side -- to the front side of the --

CHAIR FETTER: You know, what they do for the cellular antennas, just fake trees.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Obviously, we got a visual issue for you all to think about and talk about.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. I guess I would just say in the end I guess our view is that over time it would be much less intrusive. And we tried to have the simulation so that you could actually see something.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: How long has that one that you've been showing us been there?

MARK PIERSANTE: Less than a year.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Okay. Do you have any that have been --

MARK PIERSANTE: It's not even in service yet,
so that tank is actually still under construction.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: I'm curious to see what, over the course of time, it looks like.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Is there anything out there already that's got a dome on it that sort of can simulate better than that one does?

MARK PIERSANTE: Yep, that's --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Some of the overhead view --

CHAIR FETTER: Well, Mark, why don't you move on to --

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. So I think that --

CHAIR FETTER: -- finish up your presentation.

MARK PIERSANTE: The only other thing in here really was the simulations, which I think are some of the coolest ones Marsha has ever done on these LEDs, where you have the current and then you have the future. I thought they looked pretty cool. And, again, I just picked two views so you could see the difference, you know, kind of current state and --

CHAIR FETTER: Quite enlightening.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: The best view of the refinery is at night.

MARK PIERSANTE: That is. That's what -- I
used to tell Jeff Lee that. You'll have a beautiful view from your living room.

So if I may, I want to talk a little bit about landscaping. So I don't know if you remember, but for the Maritime project that we were here back six months ago or so --

CHAIR FETTER: Yeah.

MARK PIERSANTE: -- we thought it was a nice idea and everybody seemed to agree that we propose some options for landscaping consistent with the, hey, we're not going to landscape kind of in the guts of the refinery anymore in light of the fuel and fire concern. And so this particular project ends up with about 1.25 acres of landscape requirements.

So I talked with Lina a little bit before. And we sort of said, Well, let's consider some options. And I don't know if you had a chance to look at those in your package. You know, provide the City with some trees and we'd figure it out. We did this on the Maritime project, where we gave Chris Chamberlain 30 trees and he was to going plant them where he wanted. He was pretty happy about that. That worked good for us.

There's landscaping from Castro -- along Castro Street -- that we could add to and, you know,
sort of improve upon what's -- some of what's already there. There was some screen planting in place now. It needs a little bit of renovation, could sort of blend that in as a potential option.

Again, looking kind of from the entrance to the Chevron Energy Technology gate down towards where General Chemical is and kind of somewhere along that span.

Likewise, the -- in that same area some sort of screen planting along Castro Street that would help sort of screen views of the refinery from the parkway and from Castro Street.

Or contribute to this fund for the City to sort of be used as you deem appropriate. Various options that Marsha came up with. And the greenbelt option and some other things. Or then some combination.

So, you know, my thought was that, if you had any specific passion around any one of these or more, we would certainly welcome that suggestion on your part. We'd also, as we did before, be happy to work with the Parks and Rec folks or Public Works and decide what's best from the City's perspective in terms of can we do some stuff outside the refinery essentially or, again, along the parkway.

So would be very interested in your thoughts
and comments. And Marsha can certainly speak to what
her logic was in kind of helping put this list together,
if that's of any value.

CHAIR FETTER: Okay. Do we have any questions
for Mark right now?

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: I have a comment about
that last piece. If you did the alternative that's on
the second slide at four bucks a square foot, if my
arithmetic is anywhere near correct, is about $217,000.

MARK PIERSANTE: That's what I came up with
too, yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: My concern about the
$4 a square foot, that feels light to me when you
consider having to take care of it over a period of time
also. I'm not opposed to that particular kind of
method. It's just that number feels light. And I would
love to have the opinion of staff -- our direct staff --
and is Chris still around? Or is Chris Chamberlain
gone?

MARK PIERSANTE: Chris moved on.

MS. VELASCO: No, he's gone.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: He's gone?

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Not that I don't trust
that number and all, but, you know, between irrigation
and planting, it always comes out more than $4 a square
foot on my projects. And so I'm going to go hire
Marsha, because she's obviously --

MARK PIERSANTE: She's really good.

CHAIR FETTER: She's apparently a genius.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: -- less expensive.

So I think that's a really interesting way to
come about it, because if it's a quarter of a million
dollars or some number like that, that's a fair thing to
be able to contribute to some other part of the City,
which could certainly use it. And there are pieces here
that, when I go along Castro Street, for example, it's
done pretty well over the years, from way, way, way
back. This was all the way back to the paint-color-tank
thing. And that landscaping has done pretty well. So
certainly there's places that could be filled in. But
it just seemed to me that that's an interesting approach
to it.

Are we establishing any kind of project
precedent that we might not want on anywhere else in the
City or any other project in the City? Is it something
that -- and would we make that decision? Or would that
be a decision that would be made at Planning Commission
or City Council?

These are -- I mean we don't have to answer
those right now, but you see where I'm going on in my
mind is I like the idea. I worry a little bit about precedent. But on the other hand, gee, just think what a quarter million dollars would do for Hilltop, for example, and signage and lots of other things like that.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: I have a comment. I drive along the front -- I don't know if it's Castro or Richmond Parkway -- but, anyway, going to Marin from Hilltop, I go along the parkway in front of Chevron, take a left at that light, and then get up on --

MARK PIERSANTE: On the freeway.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: I notice lots of Chevron employees trying to make their way from work over to Point Richmond for lunch. And you have them going under the -- where they cross is really under the freeway. It's very -- number one, it should be improved. And it could be easily done. And they should really be fed over to where the bus stop is. There should be some kind of a walkway at that light maybe --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: You're talking about pedestrian access, aren't you?

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah.

CHAIR FETTER: Just improving that.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: The pedestrian assess really needs to be improved and get them out from underneath the freeway trying to dodge those cars and
trucks. Maybe that could be fitted into the landscape
plan. It's been like that too long. It needs to be
improved.

CHAIR FETTER: It's a bit unsafe, quite
frankly.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: And a lot of people go
over there and we want to encourage them to go over
there. It's a good walk for their health and get them
moving. So do something about -- do you know where I'm
talking about?

MARK PIERSANTE: I do know where --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Okay.

MARK PIERSANTE: -- because it's -- when I
make that -- I mean I'm very nervous driving through
there just --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah.

MARK PIERSANTE: -- because the lights are a
little --

CHAIR FETTER: Especially at lunchtime, yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: And then to go to
Oakland, I mean it's just a mess trying to figure out
what to do. You could easily hit somebody.

CHAIR FETTER: That involves, obviously,
Caltrans also. So, you know -- but maybe Chevron will
be able to tackle it.
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah. They can figure it out.

CHAIR FETTER: All right. So do we have anybody else presenting?

MS. VELASCO: We do not.

CHAIR FETTER: Okay.

MARK PIERSANTE: Did I get through it? Let's see. Oh, I didn't say thank you.

CHAIR FETTER: So I'd like to try to get this along to -- you know -- get through public comment and then we can get around to asking questions. I'd like to ask questions after, if that's okay with the Board, if we can get through some of this.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Shouldn't we ask the applicant questions before public comment?

CHAIR FETTER: Well, I was trying to get through this as quickly as possible so that we can -- because I know that we're going to have a lot of questions for him. But if you'd like to, that's fine.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Oh --

CHAIR FETTER: No, no, no. We'll do that first, because we do have questions for you, Mark.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Okay. I have a few.

Hydrogen plant replacement. So you're going to dismantle the current one --
MARK PIERSANTE: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: -- and build another one at another site?

MARK PIERSANTE: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Okay. Number one, can you make sure that a Richmond firm dismantles and recycles that old plant?

And number two, where are you going to reuse all that stuff? Like Port of Oakland, when they dismantle stuff, they reuse it all over the place and they have a site to stockpile it.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. So the company that we use is Plant Reclamation. They're based here in Richmond --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Great.

MARK PIERSANTE: -- they do all of our demo, quite frankly --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Okay.

MARK PIERSANTE: -- we like them because they're very safe and they've done a great job for many years. But we basically give them the opportunity to recycle the steel --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Great.

MARK PIERSANTE: -- so it all gets rescheduled. I can't tell you necessarily where, but --
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Okay.

MARK PIERSANTE: -- that's their standard practice. It's our requirement that they recycle it and we've been real happy with their work.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Well, that's great.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah. And on that same topic, what is going happen to that vacant site?

MARK PIERSANTE: Well, it will sit there possibly as a location for a future project --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Okay.

MARK PIERSANTE: I don't think there's been any decisions made other than to just --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Nobody knows.

MARK PIERSANTE: -- dismantle and remove the equipment and the steel and the electrical, et cetera.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Okay. And then just one other little thing I guess. Under the dust, when you're doing the construction, all exposed surfaces shall be watered. I'm on page 11. Can you make sure you're using non-potable water so you're not using fresh drinking water to water down the --

MARK PIERSANTE: I think that's standard.

Yes. I think that's standard.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: I think it's standard,
but I don't know that much about --

MARK PIER SANTE: And there's really not a heck of a lot of exposed surfaces left to go. I mean basically everything that is to be constructed is already concrete or asphalt already so we don't expect there to be --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Great.

MARK PIER SANTE: -- hardly any exposed surfaces during construction --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Great. Okay. Those are my --

MARK PIER SANTE: It would be very small in their extent, maybe for a foundation or something.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah. Good.

Thanks. That's all.

CHAIR FETTER: Brenda, do you have questions?

BOARD MEMBER MUNOZ: Yes.

And looking south -- south elevation -- there is a tank that you say is existing --

MARK PIER SANTE: Do you have a drawing number?

BOARD MEMBER MUNOZ: It's 6.03.

MARK PIER SANTE: 602?

CHAIR FETTER: 603.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Looking south.

BOARD MEMBER MUNOZ: Okay. You say that there
is one existing tank and the other two, the particular
one are the proposed tanks, but they’re not constructed
yet. And is this one a white color too?

    CHAIR FETTER: The white tank in the
    foreground?

    MARK PIERSANTE: So this tank --

    CHAIR FETTER: Is that proposed also?

    MARK PIERSANTE: No. Right now today --

    CHAIR FETTER: That's existing. Okay.

    MARK PIERSANTE: Right now today that tank
    you're asking about is right here. And, again, it's a
    fixed-roof tank. It doesn't have a dome on it. It's
    kind of just a steel roof, if you will. And, again,
    that's way so far inside the refinery you never see it
    because it's just not that big.

    BOARD MEMBER MUNOZ: It's a small tank. Yeah.
    But this one is going --

    MARK PIERSANTE: But right now today that tank
    is the color that you see --

    BOARD MEMBER MUNOZ: It's going to stay the
    way it is right now, white?

    MARK PIERSANTE: In fact, here it is again in
    that corner. You can see it down there.

    CHAIR FETTER: It likes to lurk in the
    foreground.
BOARD MEMBER MUNOZ: Uh-huh. Yeah.

[inaudible]. They won't match the color with the proposed tank that's next to it. It's going to remain white?

MARK PIERSANTE: That tank right now would remain white because it is white, save the paint emissions and --

BOARD MEMBER MUNOZ: There is not any need to [unintelligible] with this one?

MARK PIERSANTE: That would be our thought going in, yes. Okay?

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: No questions.

CHAIR FETTER: No questions? Okay.

The lighting for the whole project, the LED, that wasn't part of the original project because it's all LED --

MARK PIERSANTE: No, no. That was, again, kind of an add to this project for --

CHAIR FETTER: Right.

MARK PIERSANTE: -- a project design feature to --

CHAIR FETTER: Now, this is most likely -- and I didn't look back through the Environmental Impact Statement, the draft version. But what I'm puzzled by is that -- unfortunately, the photo renderings make it
seem like there's a larger lumen output by the LED. And
I don't know if that's deliberate or not. One simple
question is is there a larger lumen output expected,
even if it's supposedly dark-sky-compliant?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [off microphone] It
should not be, but I need to go back and check
[inaudible].

CHAIR FETTER: Because that would definitely
be a condition on this approval, because, you know,
obviously the idea is to not make it brighter. It's to
make it whole -- to make it dark-sky-compliant, it's to
reduce light pollution.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. It's hard for me to
really say is it bright. It's hard to know. Is it --
it's hard to see it on this screen, right.

CHAIR FETTER: Honestly, this is a -- this is
not a true photometric representation. This is an
artistic representation --

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Somewhat.

CHAIR FETTER: It has to be. I'd love to see
the person that would produce correctly a true
photometric representation. I mean I do this for work
and that's incredibly difficult in a model that size.

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah.
CHAIR FETTER: So --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [off microphone] Right, right. And, you know, we can talk about that off-line, because [unintelligible] extremely careful about taking the colors and the --

CHAIR FETTER: Oh, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and translating that into exactly [unintelligible]. And the other great thing, if you click back, Mark, to the before picture [unintelligible]

CHAIR FETTER: It would definitely improve it for the people working there. Don't worry about it. It's okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But we happen to have an existing one --

CHAIR FETTER: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- that we were able to use --

CHAIR FETTER: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- to make sure that we didn't go any brighter than the existing LEDs that were on-site.

CHAIR FETTER: Okay. Well, that was a very distinct, nice, clean question, whether or not it's going to be more lumen output.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

CHAIR FETTER: The new flare stack -- how many flare stacks are there right now?

MARK PIERSANTE: Six, right? Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Seven.

MARK PIERSANTE: Seven.

CHAIR FETTER: Seven. So this would be the eighth. Okay.

Is there the intent of taking down any flare stacks?

MARK PIERSANTE: Not right now, not as part of the project. There's no flare directly associated at the existing hydrogen plant. There's a flare that is used by that plant, but it's also used by some of the other facilities. So there's not a one-for-one on that stack. So, no, not being plans to --

CHAIR FETTER: Is there a way to -- I mean I know that's good to have it right near the equipment. But, technically speaking, are there any flare stacks that, through efficiency improvements in other parts of the facility -- and the reason I'm asking is because the overall appearance of the facility -- I mean it's a forest of -- well, forest of ugly. But that's a -- that's the facility. I mean that's what it's for. And I think overall it would be preferable to try to improve
the overall look of the facility. And, obviously, if
you're getting more superstructures, it would be
desirable to see if -- just to even know. I mean are
you guys planning on making the flaring equipment or the
redirection equipment -- you know -- of -- you know --
materials --

MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah.

CHAIR FETTER: -- is that possible to make it
more efficient so you don't need so many flare stacks?

MARK PIERSANTE: Let Jeff --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [off microphone] Yeah.
Actually, what's happened lately [unintelligible]

CHAIR FETTER: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And over time what's
happened is the folks that provide design guidance for
[unintelligible] systems have asked to increase the
capacity of the flare system. So we have gone through a
number of designs and with the flares that we now have.
I [unintelligible] everything that I know about those
flare studies indicate that we've got what we need.
There's not an over-capacity -- and I understand your
question. But everything I know about those studies
[unintelligible].

CHAIR FETTER: Okay. Well, I mean, obviously,
I'm just trying to ask a question -- obviously, there's
MARK PIERSANTE: Yeah. No. It's a good question.

CHAIR FETTER: I mean as a homeowner in Richmond it would be nice to improve even the plant, but if you can't do it logically.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: I think it's beautiful. It's a huge industrial --

MARK PIERSANTE: It's a chemical engineer's dream.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: It is. It's like Disneyland of chemical engineering.

CHAIR FETTER: I'm sorry. Hey. I go out -- you'd be surprised. I actually go out and shoot places like this because I do actually enjoy it.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: It's amazing.

CHAIR FETTER: But I'm speaking for -- I can't just speak for myself. So I have to speak as part of the public too. So I apologize if I offended anyone.

I guess we'll move on to public comment, if there are no objections, no more comments or questions for the applicant, Mark.

So, Lina.

MS. VELASCO: We only have one speaker.

CHAIR FETTER: Oh.
MS. VELASCO: Which I'm sure -- with a lot of support. So Ken Miller?

KEN MILLER: Yes.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of the Board. My name is Ken Miller. I'm a business agent for Ironworkers Local 378.

And I am here on behalf of the 21 percent of my membership that lives in Richmond and the surrounding county to urge you to support the project to the Planning Commission.

That's it, short and sweet.

Thank you.

CHAIR FETTER: Thank you.

MS. VELASCO: I just had another notice item. So it's up to you if you want to hear the speaker.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Oh, yeah.

CHAIR FETTER: We have time.

MS. VELASCO: Bruce Kaplan.

BRUCE KAPLAN: Hi. I'm here with my wife, Bonnie Kaplan.

According to the notice we received, we live within 300 feet of the Chevron property --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Could you come up to the podium -- or there is no podium, but some place [unintelligible] not behind the column.
BRUCE KAPLAN: Here I am. Okay. So we live on Golden Gate Avenue, 440 Golden Gate Avenue. We can see the refinery from our -- certainly by stepping out our front door.

We believe that no net increase in emissions is an inadequate standard for the project and that Chevron should design the modernization project in such a way as to make a material improvement in the impact on the neighborhood and the city's air and water quality. This should be done without the use of traded credits, which are all well and good, but do not accrue locally to the neighborhood.

Secondly, we're not experts on the matter, but we fear that refining crude with higher levels of sulfur presents a risk to air quality and safety.

Finally, we suggest that as a condition to any permit for the project that the general manager of the refinery demonstrate his Richmond pride by locating his family residence within a half a mile of the refinery in Point Richmond so neighbors can be assured that he and his family are breathing the same air and taking the same risks that we do. This would greatly increase our confidence that Mr. Judd makes the quality of life and safety of the neighborhood, and therefore Chevron -- makes it a serious priority.
Thanks.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Thank you.

CHAIR FETTER: Thank you.

Well, seeing that we have no further public comment.

ANDREW FRIEDRICH: Can we ask questions? Can we ask questions? No? That was the way to ask questions?

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: You can sign up if you rush over there.

CHAIR FETTER: If you want to talk, you're more than welcome to --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: You can talk first. I'll give you a pink slip if you want to talk.

ANDREW FRIEDRICH: I just had a question.

CHAIR FETTER: Oh.

MS. VELASCO: Just for the record --

CHAIR FETTER: Please state your name.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: We'll fill it out later.

ANDREW FRIEDRICH: I'll fill it out. Just my name? Easy enough, isn't it?

Andrew Friedrich. I'm an employee at Chevron. I want to learn about the project myself.

I was wondering about the domes and what that does. How does it function? Is it -- is it covering --
it's reducing emissions, correct?

MARK PIERSANTE: Correct.

ANDREW FRIEDRICH: How? Where are those emissions going and is it being recycled? Is there a energy source throughout the refinery for us to use?

MARK PIERSANTE: So it's -- it's still a floating roof tank inside the dome --

ANDREW FRIEDRICH: Okay.

MARK PIERSANTE: -- which has a significant effect on reducing emissions compared with a fixed-roof tank [unintelligible]. You put the dome on it, it primarily eliminates the wind effects. So what happens is the roof flowed -- moves downward. You've got still material clinging to the walls. And as the wind comes across that roof, it picks up that material off the side and creates emissions.

ANDREW FRIEDRICH: Okay. So it's not really attached or -- it's more alleviating the process of [unintelligible]?

MARK PIERSANTE: Correct.

ANDREW FRIEDRICH: Okay. Yeah.

MARK PIERSANTE: That's the primary function of that dome.

ANDREW FRIEDRICH: Okay. Yeah. I was just wondering how it worked and that helps me out.
And I would say what kind of trees would you plant along Castro Street would be my question, you know. Not palm trees, I hope. Oaks or something like that, you know.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Something native.

CHAIR FETTER: I would recommend you talk to Marsha. She would be able to tell you all about that.

ANDREW FRIEDRICH: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR FETTER: Thank you for your questions.

ANDREW FRIEDRICH: Thank you.

CHAIR FETTER: Okay.

MS. VELASCO: Want to close the public hearing?

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Before we think about that, there's -- I've been trying to keep some notes about some issues that have been raised in our Board comments. I find it really interesting that we don't have a whole lot of public comments tonight, which is sort of a surprise. But I'm just rattling off this list here.

I think we need to hear more from staff and more specifically perhaps from the Park and Rec kinds of staff about the whole discussion of dollars in lieu of on-site landscaping, which is in concept what's going on
here. As I mentioned, I think that could be a great idea, but I don't think I'm prepared to make a decision about that tonight. And so I think we need to be more specific about things. And I made note of the condition the way it was -- staff's recommended condition -- the way it was written, I think it needs to be more specific.

Secondly, I think Eileen's point is well-taken, having to do with pedestrian access to the facility. I think that we would need to have City Attorney's opinion as to whether or not there's a nexus from this project to downtown Point Richmond and the connection there. I think the idea of a better connection, improved connection, a landscaped connection -- whatever the words are -- make a lot of sense. But I don't know that we can do that within the scope of this project.

I think we need more information about the lighting to know, in fact, that it's not getting any brighter. I made the comment I think the best view of the refinery is at night because I like the twinkle lights aspect of it. But I think we need to respond to Board members' concerns.

And then lastly I made the note here having to do with the white-domed tanks on the hillside versus
those down on the flats. I would like to hear more about what is possible, not necessarily what it fades to or that it gets splotchy or something like that. I'd like to know if it's technically possible to paint them and at what environmental cost.

So what I'm wondering tonight is whether we have -- of the concerns that we've raised tonight as a four-member Board, how do we recommend without having at least some further discussion and/or answers to some of these issues and more information? I would propose frankly, because I think we were anticipating this anyway, is that this item be continued for a week and give the applicant an opportunity to respond.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: That would be great.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: I'm guessing that this would be the first item on the agenda next week. I'm saying that hesitantly because there's a house that I know of and there's also a major residential project I think are on next week.

So that's where I am, is that I would really like to see this continued for a week so that we could get some better responses, some additional responses.

And we should give the applicant an opportunity to respond to my discussion here as a rebuttal before we do anything else anyway.
CHAIR FETTER: Well, Mike, also, I don't know if we can continue to next week, only because of notification -- public notification timelines. I think we're already inside that for the newspaper.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Help me, staff.

MR. ATENCIO: So given that there's been a noticing already for this hearing, so long as the hearing is continued to the next special -- there wouldn't be any additional notice required.

CHAIR FETTER: Oh, okay. All right.

BOARD MEMBER MUNOZ: And it will give more time to have more comment [unintelligible] for the next meeting. It will be opportunity to see comments for May 2nd. [unintelligible]

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: That would be great.

And also, James, can we make a nexus for pedestrian-connection improvements? Can you let us know by next -- do you think you could tell us next week?

MS. VELASCO: So the question is whether to enhance the connection that exists with landscaping?

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: No, to make it a -- with landscaping, but to make it a better-engineered pedestrian walk from Chevron to Point Richmond for lunch.

MR. ATENCIO: I can -- I can look into it,
certainly. I would say, though, my initial reaction to that is that there wouldn't be a connection to the project, but --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: It would be nice for them to do.

CHAIR FETTER: Eileen?

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yes.

CHAIR FETTER: Let's make a clarification there. It's easy to make a distinction between two different areas that we either don't or do have control over, per se, meaning, obviously there's the Caltrans areas, which is a broad area on either side of the highway --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah.

CHAIR FETTER: -- and then so are you talking about that which is outside the Caltrans area or that which is inside the Caltrans --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: I don't know. I'm just talking about people walking from Chevron to Point Richmond.

CHAIR FETTER: Because I think, if I recall correctly, most of the hazardous conditions are really underneath the highway and how the pedestrian traffic gets handled underneath there. So that would be a Caltrans issue.
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Okay. All right.

CHAIR FETTER: So it would actually be -- and for that matter, the applicant is asking for our guidance and recommendations. Can even be made part of our conditions --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Recommended.

CHAIR FETTER: -- as they're looking for us for design work [unintelligible]. Or for us to at least tell them where do we want to go with this, which is wonderful, but we at least need to tell them. And so the problem here is that with a Caltrans issue that would be quite something to tackle.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah.

CHAIR FETTER: And --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Too bad.

CHAIR FETTER: -- that would be a bit of a negotiation. And I don't know -- we'd have to segment that off in some fashion. It's difficult to relate it.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: It would be a very -- if you can do it at all by way of this project, it would be very simple to recommend a condition that indicates that Chevron is to retain an appropriate design professional to explore, investigate, and design for a more safe connection between the refinery and downtown Point Richmond, stop.
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: And maybe we'd put a timeline on that, prior to something. That's a very easy condition to write. I mean I don't see any problem with that.

What I'm more concerned about, frankly, is whether or not we can do essentially offsite improvements as part of an approval here. And that same question begs towards the landscaping as well.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah, yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Can we take a pot of money and apply it to something else? Well, we could say then, Well, yes, Chevron pay X amount of money and we'll go out and design the better connection. See, I'm having a little bit of clarity concerns here. And I think -- that's why I think we need more clarity.

CHAIR FETTER: Well, that's why actually I brought up the difference between -- and I'll make it even more clear -- City-owned land and Caltrans --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: But we don't have to worry about that, Brent. We don't have to worry about that. If we were to make that condition, if it were a proper one to make, we could simply say to Caltrans and whoever their design professional is, Go deal with Caltrans -- excuse me -- I'm sorry. I said it wrong.
CHAIR FETTER: That's okay.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: We can simply say to Chevron, Your design consultant goes out and deals with whomever they need to to see what's possible. They could go to Caltrans. They could go to Public Works upstairs and all of --

CHAIR FETTER: Just going off of our previous precedence where we had City-owned lands that were -- that were improved as a -- as a compensation. So then we're going onto Caltrans like it's -- that's really the legal aspect I was addressing.

MS. VELASCO: If I could add a couple -- in the traffic analysis -- the circulation and traffic analysis -- there were no recommended improvements to any intersections as a result --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Of course not.

MS. VELASCO: -- of the project.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Yeah, but that probably has to do with vehicles, as opposed to pedestrians.

MS. VELASCO: Well --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Vehicle-triggered --

MS. VELASCO: -- I think it looks at different metrics. But, you know, it does look at safety. And those are existing conditions.
Now, you know, the offsite landscape improvements was a tool you all used during the Maritime Academy fire-safety facility.

And, again, the idea that there's a conflict with the proposed land use and the landscaping in terms of combustible materials. So, you know, I think it's a method that's been used before and there's alternatives, whether it's enhancing the landscaping around the perimeter. Where typically we like landscaping spread out throughout the site, they have proposed potential locations around the perimeter of the refinery but not necessarily within the processing area, which is where, you know, the conflicts really happen.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Around the perimeter is basically still on property -- on the applicant's property.

MS. VELASCO: Correct. And there may be some City right-of-way. I think we'd have to kind of look at the actual locations. But I believe even the City may have an easement over Castro that's on Chevron property. So it may actually be owned by Chevron.

CHAIR FETTER: Would we want to state as part of our proposal, or I should say our postponement, just saying we need a better idea about what the proposed -- how do you want to handle this process?
[Cross-talk]

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: -- week to talk about it, to figure it out. They've got all these bodies sitting there and there's a lot of skills sitting there --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: I mean I could, again, easily imagine a condition on the landscaping that leaves it open for them to come back. That's what the staff already has recommended. Staff did not recommend a method yet. And maybe that's something that can be deferred for a while. I just think it has to have a cap or a limit on the timing.

CHAIR FETTER: Well, since we've held public comment -- or public comment open -- was there something you wanted to elicit?

KRISTINA KELCHNER: Could I add some comments? I'm Kristina Kelchner with Holland & Knight. We are outside counsel for the City.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Can you come forward? It's hard to hear from back there.

KRISTINA KELCHNER: Yes. Sorry.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: This is the worst room in the house.

KRISTINA KELCHNER: Yes. I hear the HVAC.
I'm Kristina Kelchner. I'm with Holland & Knight, attorney, outside counsel for the City. So we worked with the City. And I'm here with my colleague Gavin Hoch, who is an engineer and who is also a consultant on behalf of the City. So we don't work for Chevron. We're employed by the City.

And just a couple of comments. One, the pedestrian access sounds like a very important one, that improvement would really enhance the lives of the workers and a really important issue. It's -- as James indicated, it's a little hard to see how that nexus would happen to landscaping. It's really more of a traffic circulation and safety issue.

And so a couple things. One is I would urge you to -- you, as the Design Review Board, can submit comments during the public comment process. So that's a comment that you could make on the EIR, because that's really an EIR traffic circulation issue.

And the other is to let you know that as part of the project there's a greenhouse-gas community improvement fund that Chevron is funding of $30 million. And there's a menu of options. And one of those options is pedestrian and bicycle improvements. So it's possible -- and that's a comment that you could make on the EIR -- some of that funding should go toward that
pedestrian improvement to get people out of their cars and have pedestrian access.

So it's possible that there could be some funding for that built into the project. So I just wanted to let you know that.

So let me know if you have any other questions.

CHAIR FETTER: Thank you.

I guess I was trying to --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: I would ask Mark -- I would ask Mark to comment.

CHAIR FETTER: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Do you need -- you don't need an approval tonight.

MARK PIERSANTE: Well, my understanding is that, you know, this is your one opportunity as a Design Review Board, because of the need for conditional use permit, to come up with your recommendations for conditions to the Planning Commission. So I guess I don't necessarily view it as an approval but rather your comments and ideas that then get fed as part of the larger approval process.

CHAIR FETTER: Would we be holding up their calendar?

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: I think they meet on
May --

MS. VELASCO: For -- for Planning Commission, we don't -- our schedule is June 19th to go back with the Final EIR, so it doesn't delay it. Now --

KRISTINA KELCHNER: Lina, could I just add to that that, as Mark said, according to your guidelines in the zoning ordinance, were you making a recommendation and you're not the final decision-maker, there's just one public hearing.

Sorry. Let me speak up again.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Which has been defined previously as a continued public hearing is satisfactory as a single meeting.

KRISTINA KELCHNER: As a single meeting.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Yeah.

KRISTINA KELCHNER: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Because we've been through that one --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: A thousand times --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: -- a thousand times over the last year.

KRISTINA KELCHNER: Okay. You've been through it. All right.

MS. VELASCO: Yeah. So I think -- I guess my recommendation would be as we identified those key
areas. We definitely prepare a staff report; coming
back on the 30th; addressing those particular items;
revising some of the conditions based on the comments
we've heard already. And, you know, but -- you know,
maybe closing the public comment hearing so then we
could handle this as the first item. And it may be just
sort of identifying -- because I do understand the
Bottoms project will be very controversial --

CHAIR FETTER: Yeah.

MS. VELASCO: -- along with potentially the
house on Belvedere. So --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: I don't think legally
we can close the public hearing.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: We can't close it,
because we're going to continue it.

MS. VELASCO: Oh, the public comment portion?

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: No, not -- public
hearing. Yeah. Where we don't make a decision.

MR. ATENCIO: I would suggest we keep the
public hearing open. But since there have only been
two -- usually -- typically, there's a lot of people
here. And let's say there are twenty people here and
only ten spoke and then the hearing was continued. Then
perhaps there would be -- I'm speaking hypothetically --
but perhaps there would be a situation where those ten
that already spoke don't get a second bite at the apple at the next hearing. So I would say maybe the two that already spoke wouldn't speak at the next hearing, but anybody else who attends the next hearing that wants to speak should have the opportunity to anticipate --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: I think that's the only way --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Right. So do you want to reiterate, I guess, the three things that we want staff to explore?

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Well, if I could I would make a motion to continue the public hearing to the specific date of the 30th; is that correct? And to give both the staff and the applicant an opportunity to respond to the several changes that we have talked about in the conditions; and, in addition, to give the staff and applicant an opportunity to talk further about how the landscape moneys might be dealt with on-site, off-site, or however.

Secondly, to have further discussion with the applicant and the staff regarding how additional public access -- pedestrian access -- could be made to downtown Point Richmond by way of, as has been suggested, perhaps another method -- and I lost -- the green something-something. Money.
MR. ATENCIO: Greenhouse gas.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Thirty million.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Further, that the staff and/or the applicant talk further about whether there is additional lighting lumens being projected out.

And, lastly, that the applicant discuss further the fact that there is this white dome on the hillside and that other considerations should be given to mask it out, screen it out. And, again, I'm -- I'm trying to be very specific. It's those that are up on the hillside. The ones down on the flats down in the middle of the refinery is a no-brainer to me.

But that would be my motion at this point in time, just simply asking that you all come back with those kinds of ideas or discussions.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: I'll second it.

CHAIR FETTER: All in favor.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR FETTER: Aye.

The [unintelligible] has been --

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Held over.

CHAIR FETTER: -- held over.

Thank you, all.

Mark, we will hear from you soon.

MR. ATENCIO: I'd just recommend since there's
going to be an absence, we want to close up the meeting --

CHAIR FETTER: Yeah. Well, I was just getting to that.

MR. ATENCIO: Okay. I just wanted to make sure --

CHAIR FETTER: Yeah.

MR. ATENCIO: -- as opposed to just --

CHAIR FETTER: Is there any Board business?

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Move to adjourn.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: [unintelligible]

before we do this. I made note of it to staff earlier.

I very, very, very seldom ever read the City Council's agenda. And I happened to click on it last week. And, lo and behold, on it was the City Council approving the purchase of a premanufactured restroom building and the installation with site improvements at the Marina Bay Park. And I'm thinking to myself, Well, gee, didn't come here to the Design Review Board.

So I asked James before the meeting if he would inquire with the staff person [unintelligible] about what's happened to the resolution that we were going to write related to municipal projects coming before the Design Review Board. And he promised that he would.
BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Right. And what is the square footage? Did you catch that? No.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: I saw a picture of it. It's pretty ugly.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: I mean is it big enough to come to us just as a --

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: You know, I got to tell you I didn't even think about that when I did that. I did note that in the staff report they had suggested -- said that they set out several others in the city -- same company, same building. But it's -- even if the square footage is under, I'd like to know at least what it's doing to the park -- the site planning, the pathways, the landscape -- you know, all of those sorts of things.

So I just think it's appropriate that we keep pushing on these to maybe get somebody upstairs to pay attention to it.

And so that's my Board business for the night. Sorry.

CHAIR FETTER: No. Definitely. Thank you, Mike.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: It's important. Thank you.

CHAIR FETTER: Mike, you want to exchange
emails on how we want to address that [unintelligible]

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: No, they're going to
deal with it.

CHAIR FETTER: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Because I got Lina's
attention [unintelligible]

MS. VELASCO: I was like [unintelligible].

Did you just volunteer [unintelligible]

CHAIR FETTER: All right. Okay. Can I have a

motion?

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Move to adjourn, please.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Second.

BOARD MEMBER MUNOZ: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER WOLDEMAR: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER WHITTY: Aye.
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