



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CITY OF RICHMOND PLANNING AND BUILDING SERVICES

LINA VELASCO, Director, Richmond Planning and Building services

CEQA Consultants

ANALYTICAL ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

RYAN SAWYER, Vice President, Project Manager

BIBIANA ALVAREZ, Project Manager, Presenter

---o0o---

PUBLIC COMMENT

	PAGE
SHIRLEY DEAN.....	18
BERYL GOLDEN.....	20
NORMAN LA FORCE.....	21
ROBERT CHEASTY.....	23
ROBERTA WYN.....	26
DAVID HELVARG.....	28
MICHELE RAPPAPORT.....	30
GAIL SEYMOUR.....	32
JIM HANSON.....	34
TONI HANNA.....	36

(continued)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PUBLIC COMMENT  
(continued)

PAGE

PAUL CARMON..... 39  
LUIS PADILLA..... 42  
ALIX MAZUET..... 42  
NINA SMITH..... 45  
DEBORAH BAYER..... 46  
CHARLES SMITH..... 49  
WALTER LINDSLEY..... 51  
DAVID REINERTSON..... 54  
JANET JOHNSON..... 56  
PAM STELLO..... 57  
BEN THERRIAMT..... 59  
ELIZABETH DOUGHERTY..... 61  
EDUARDO MARTINEZ..... 64  
KELLY HAMMARGREN..... 66  
DONNA BALL..... 68

---o0o---

1 Monday, July 29, 2019

6:01 p.m.

2 ---o0o---

3 LINA VELASCO: Good evening, everyone. Happy  
4 Monday. If we're ready to get started -- I know it's  
5 6:00 o'clock, and we want to value your time, so I just  
6 wanted to start.

7 So first of all, welcome. My name is  
8 Lina Velasco. I'm the Planning and Building Services  
9 Director. And we are here tonight for the public  
10 scoping meeting for the Point Molate mixed-use project.

11 So I'm going to introduce a few people from  
12 AES, Analytical Environmental Services. We have  
13 Ryan Sawyer and Bibiana Alvarez. And they are both up  
14 here in the front.

15 We are also recording the meeting this evening  
16 so that we make sure we get all your comments on the  
17 record. So I ask you to please not speak over each  
18 other when you're given the microphone. Please state  
19 your name and your city of residence or any  
20 organization you may be representing as your comments  
21 will be recorded.

22 So I'm going to do a little bit of  
23 housekeeping. We do have an agenda. So it's available  
24 in the front. And then also there is a yellow speaker  
25 card. If you're hoping this evening to provide verbal

1 comments, please provide -- fill this out and provide  
2 it to staff. I will collect those, or you can also  
3 provide them to Beatrice, who is at the table. And  
4 with that, we also do have a written comment card. If  
5 you don't want to provide your comments verbally this  
6 evening, you're welcome to provide your comments in  
7 writing.

8 The deadline is also noted in the Notice Of  
9 Preparation, so you can provide it at a later date.  
10 And we're going to start off this evening with just an  
11 overview of the CEQA process as well as the project.

12 We'll be taking your comments. We will be  
13 recording them. And we're here to sort of learn from  
14 you, from members of the public, what are some of the  
15 key issues that are important to your agency or your  
16 organization regarding the project. We -- if you wish  
17 to speak, make sure you fill out the speaker card, and  
18 additional instructions will be given at the end of the  
19 presentation.

20 We are going to ask the speakers to come to  
21 the front. We'll sort of line you up. You will be  
22 given three minutes to provide your comments, and then  
23 we'll move on to the next person.

24 Like I said, if the three minutes is not long  
25 enough, you're welcome to provide your comments in

1 writing. And information as to where to submit those  
2 comments is provided on the Notice of Preparation as  
3 well as the agenda.

4 So with that, I will pass it over to  
5 Bibiana Alvarez.

6 BIBIANA ALVAREZ: Good evening, everyone, and  
7 thank you so much for being here this evening. I'm  
8 Bibiana Alvarez. I'm the project manager at Analytical  
9 Environmental Services, or AES, and the City's CEQA  
10 consultant for this project.

11 The following presentation will provide an  
12 overview of the Point Molate Mixed-Use Development  
13 Project, outline the environmental review process, and  
14 discuss opportunities for public involvement.

15 Following the presentation, we will open up a  
16 hearing for public comments, as Lina mentioned,  
17 regarding the proposed scope and environmental analysis  
18 alternatives and mitigation measures to be evaluated in  
19 the CEQA document.

20 The Point Molate site is located on the  
21 San Pablo Peninsula within the City of Richmond in  
22 Contra Costa County.

23 The project site is bounded by San Francisco  
24 Bay to the West, open space parcels to the north and  
25 south, and the Chevron Richmond Refinery to the east

1 with Potrero Ridge's 480-foot hillside separating those  
2 two sites. Approximately 142 acres of the  
3 approximately 413-acre project site are submerged in  
4 the San Francisco Bay, leaving approximately 271 acres  
5 above the water.

6 The project site is approximately 1.5 miles  
7 north of Interstate 580 and the Richmond-San Rafael  
8 Bridge and has a direct freeway access through Stenmark  
9 Drive, a City-owned roadway.

10 The Point Molate site was primarily used for  
11 fishing, commercial, and naval activities through the  
12 20th century. After the U.S. Naval fuel storage and  
13 transfer facility in 1995, under the U.S. Department of  
14 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Act, a Blue Ribbon  
15 Advisory Committee developed the Point Molate Reuse  
16 Plan, which was approved by the Richmond City Council  
17 acting as the Local Reuse Authority in 1997.

18 The Reuse Plan contemplated a development  
19 scenario as Point Molate site with 670 residential  
20 units and preservation of approximately 70 percent of  
21 the land within the Point Molate site as open space.  
22 In addition, the Reuse Plan envisioned that the  
23 Winehaven Historic District, listed on the National  
24 Register of Historic Places, would be preserved for  
25 adaptive reuse.

1                   A Draft Environmental Impact  
2     Statement/Environmental Impact Report for proposed --  
3     previously proposed casino project was released in July  
4     of 2009. Because the City prepared the 2009 DEIS/EIR  
5     jointly with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to satisfy  
6     the National Environmental Policy Act, it addressed all  
7     alternatives to the same level of detail as the  
8     proposed casino project.

9                   The 2011 Final EIR included full analysis of  
10    the five alternatives addressed in the 2009 Draft  
11    EIS/EIR as well as the six alternatives added in  
12    response to comments. In March 2011, the City  
13    certified the 2011 Final EIR for the Point Molate  
14    Mixed-Use Tribal Destination Resort and Casino but,  
15    soon after, discontinued consideration of the casino  
16    project.

17                  In 2018, the City undertook a comprehensive  
18    community visioning process to obtain input from the  
19    local community regarding what types of land uses  
20    should be considered on the project site. Because the  
21    Point Molate Mixed-Use Development Project or modified  
22    project may result in new and substantially more severe  
23    impacts than the former alternatives analyzed in the  
24    2011 Final EIR, the City is preparing a Subsequent  
25    Environmental Impact Report or SEIR for the modified



1 project, which is described in the NOP and which I will  
2 summarize in the following slides.

3 In brief, the project will include the  
4 development of approximately 80 acres of the  
5 approximately 413-acre Point Molate site that includes  
6 a variety of residential and commercial uses as well as  
7 supporting road and utility infrastructure. The  
8 remainder of the Point Molate site would remain as open  
9 space that is enhanced with the incorporation of  
10 natural trails.

11 It is anticipated that the -- once -- or if  
12 approved, it's anticipated that the project will take  
13 18 to 24 months to design and be developed in a single  
14 development phase that would last seven to nine years.

15 The modified project is a mixed-use community  
16 consisting of residential development, historic  
17 rehabilitation, and open space divided into eight  
18 planning areas, A through H. The planning areas shown  
19 depict the approximate outer limits of where  
20 development could occur and may ultimately include some  
21 open space within those areas.

22 Outside of the historic district, the modified  
23 project proposes approximately 650 medium density  
24 residential units in Planning Areas A through D and  
25 approximately 350 high density residential units in

1 Area E.

2 Planning Areas F through H, which represents  
3 the focused historic rehabilitation areas, will include  
4 300 residential units in Planning Area G.

5 Approximately 374,572 square feet of existing  
6 structures will be rehabilitated to include up to  
7 20,000 square feet of retail and restaurants and the  
8 remainder as flexible-use space for commercial and/or  
9 residential uses; 250,000 square feet of new  
10 construction within the historic rehabilitation areas  
11 will include up to 20,000 square feet of retail and  
12 restaurants with a remainder as flexible-use space for  
13 commercial and/or residential uses.

14 The buildings highlighted in orange are the  
15 buildings proposed to be rehabilitated in the historic  
16 district.

17 The hillside land in the northern portion of  
18 the project site will be maintained as open space in  
19 accordance with the Reuse Plan. The open space will  
20 include pedestrian trails, picnic areas, restroom  
21 facilities, and a shoreline park.

22 Lastly, the project proposes a terminal on the  
23 existing pier that may be accessible to ferries,  
24 shuttles, and/or water taxis and a removal of various  
25 storage tanks that are currently located within the

1 planning areas.

2 The 2011 Final EIR for casino project studied  
3 the environmental impacts of a large casino-hotel  
4 complex as well as several alternatives, including the  
5 non-trust acquisition and non-gaming mixed-use  
6 development alternative, or Alternative D, and the  
7 "Preserve Building 6" Mixed-Use Tribal Destination  
8 Resort and Casino with Residential Component termed  
9 Alternative B1.

10 The overall land uses and development plan  
11 characteristics of the modified project are similar to  
12 the scope of Alternative D, but like Alternative B1,  
13 the modified project proposes to rehabilitate all of  
14 the contributing buildings to the historic Winehaven  
15 District.

16 Water infrastructure would consist of a  
17 combination of existing infrastructure and new service  
18 connections.

19 The Modified Project will include the removal  
20 or abandonment of most of the existing storm water  
21 drainage system and the installation of a new storm  
22 drainage system while retaining the downstream outfalls  
23 to the bay.

24 The Modified Project may implement low impact  
25 development treatment facilities which would intercept

1 stormwater for treatment prior to discharge into the  
2 existing outfalls. Like existing water infrastructure,  
3 the existing wastewater infrastructure would be  
4 preserved to the extent feasible with the installation  
5 of minimal new service connections for the proposed  
6 redevelopment.

7 Two possible options for wastewater treatment  
8 are being considered for analysis. Proposed Wastewater  
9 Treatment Option A is to install a new sanitary sewer  
10 treatment facility which would operate as a stand-alone  
11 treatment system for the Modified Project sanitary  
12 sewer needs.

13 The second wastewater treatment option that  
14 will be analyzed in the subsequent EIR is the  
15 installation of a new force main to bring sanitary  
16 sewer service to the project site from an existing  
17 12-inch sanitary sewer line in the City of Richmond.

18 Off-site improvements may include improvements  
19 to roadway and utility infrastructure needed to support  
20 the Modified Project. The environmental effects of  
21 these improvements will be evaluated in the SEIR.

22 ROBERT CHEASTY: Bibiana, by -- when you say  
23 "off-site," do you mean, like, for example, 580 and the  
24 bridge?

25 BIBIANA ALVAREZ: That would be up to the

1 mitigation that's deemed in the analysis. So  
2 anything -- any improvements that are required off  
3 site.

4 And if I could ask everybody to please hold  
5 any questions until the end of the presentation,  
6 please.

7 The Modified Project has several discretionary  
8 approvals required from the City of Richmond. These  
9 may include but are not limited to General Plan  
10 amendment, rezoning to a plan area district, a planned  
11 area plan, design review, vesting tentative subdivision  
12 map, and certification of the Subsequent EIR.

13 The discretionary approvals needed for the  
14 Modified Project trigger a review under CEQA. The  
15 purpose of CEQA is to inform decision makers and the  
16 public of the project's potential environment effects,  
17 engage the public in the environmental review process,  
18 disclose potential project impacts on the environment,  
19 and avoid or reduce potential impacts of the project  
20 with alternatives and/or mitigation measures.

21 As noted above or previously, the City has  
22 determined that a Subsequent EIR is the appropriate  
23 document to comply with CEQA given the previous studies  
24 done for the site. The SEIR will be broken up into  
25 several distinct sections that will address the topics

1 on this slide. This will include a detailed  
2 description of the Modified Project, a description of  
3 existing conditions on the site in the context of  
4 several resource areas, an analysis of impacts of the  
5 Modified Project, discussions of alternatives to the  
6 project that could feasibly reduce or eliminate one or  
7 more of the significant effects of the Modified  
8 Project, and will also include technical appendices  
9 containing supporting analysis and information.

10 The scope of the environmental issues to be  
11 addressed within the SEIR is determined in part by the  
12 public and agency input received during the NOP comment  
13 period, including any comments that may be provided  
14 today.

15 That being said, it is anticipated that the  
16 SEIR will be rather comprehensive and will address each  
17 of the resource areas listed on this slide.

18 At this time, we are in the  
19 information-gathering phase of the CEQA process and the  
20 scoping, which means the City is soliciting comments  
21 from the public and agencies to help define the issues  
22 that will be addressed in the Draft SEIR. This  
23 includes the comments that are provided here today.

24 The Notice of Preparation, which was released  
25 on July 12th, describes the project and identifies

1 anticipated scope of analysis for the SEIR. Comments  
2 responding to the NOP, including both written and  
3 verbal comments made here in this hearing, will be  
4 documented and considered during the preparation of the  
5 SEIR.

6 Based on the results of the scoping process,  
7 the Draft SEIR will be prepared and released for public  
8 and agency review and comment. This is anticipated to  
9 occur later this year.

10 Much like in the scoping phase, comments on  
11 the Draft SEIR will be addressed in the Final SEIR.  
12 Some comments on the Draft SEIR may require revisions  
13 to the text of the document. If such revisions are  
14 necessary, they will be shown in the Final SEIR. The  
15 Final SEIR is anticipated to be released early next  
16 year. When the Final SEIR is complete, the City  
17 decision makers will hold one or more public hearings  
18 to review the SEIR and consider the requested approvals  
19 under the Modified Project.

20 Public involvement is an integral part of the  
21 EIR process. Public comments are welcomed during the  
22 scoping period, which ends on August 12th, on the draft  
23 SEIR after its publication, and at public hearings  
24 related to the project. The website listed on this  
25 slide also provides -- is also provided on tonight's

1 agenda and will include a link to the Draft SEIR and  
2 Final SEIR when those documents are available.

3 We will now begin the public comment portion  
4 of the meeting. Speakers will be called five at a time  
5 in the order in which they submitted their comment  
6 cards and will be asked to sit -- there's some chairs  
7 marked here, reserved. Each individual will be  
8 allotted three minutes to speak. There's a light box  
9 up front, and this will turn yellow when you have 30  
10 seconds remaining and will turn red and beep when your  
11 time is up.

12 Please understand that the purpose of this  
13 meeting is to receive public comments and, because we  
14 are in the information-gathering stage of the process,  
15 we will not be answering questions at this time. We  
16 will, however, listen to your comments and concerns and  
17 make sure they were carefully recorded.

18 Please state your name for the record. And,  
19 if possible, we will appreciate a copy of any of your  
20 transcripts or letters you might be able to share. You  
21 can come and leave them up here or at the -- in the  
22 back.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bibiana, I just have  
24 one question. What is the difference between an EIR  
25 and an SEIR?



1           BIBIANA ALVAREZ: So updating the sites of the  
2 EIR that was done previously. A subsequent EIR is just  
3 a CEQA analysis is done after an EIR has been already  
4 done.

5           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How much is  
6 reconsidered of the original document that's been -- I  
7 mean, do they say, "This has to be rewritten, but this  
8 doesn't," or is everything looked at again?

9           BIBIANA ALVAREZ: The scope and what is  
10 included in the Subsequent EIR is going to be based on  
11 the comments that are received during the scoping  
12 period, including the ones here tonight. So if you  
13 have questions on that or you want to see all the  
14 things, please say so tonight, and that's going to be  
15 considered for what the ultimate scope is.

16           However, as you saw on one of the previous  
17 slides of what we anticipate to be included in the  
18 SEIR, it's pretty comprehensive

19           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But all that was  
20 included in the old EIR. So I wonder was that  
21 comprehensive and it's frozen in time, or will it be  
22 amended? I'm sorry. I just need to know.

23           BIBIANA ALVAREZ: I think if you have --

24           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think her question is  
25 is it different from a new EIR?

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, how would it be  
2 different than if you were writing the new EIR?

3 BIBIANA ALVAREZ: Not very because it will  
4 take -- the EIR is going to cover the analysis for the  
5 Modified Project. So the -- the Subsequent EIR is  
6 going to be thorough for this new Modified Project.

7 RYAN SAWYER: It will include some comparisons  
8 to the alternatives previously analyzed. That's pretty  
9 much the main difference.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could you just show  
11 again that off-site improvements slide? It went by  
12 pretty quickly.

13 (Slide shown)

14 RYAN SAWYER: Okay. As Bibiana mentioned,  
15 we're going to start the public comment period now --  
16 excuse me, the public comment portion of the meeting  
17 tonight. So I will calling up five speakers at a time.  
18 So if you wouldn't mind just please coming up here and  
19 sitting in these front chairs, that way it minimizes  
20 the amount of time between speakers coming up.

21 The first five speakers will be Shirley Dean,  
22 Beryl Golden, Norman LaForce, Robert Cheasty, and  
23 Roberta Wyn.

24 SHIRLEY DEAN: My name is Shirley Dean, and  
25 I'm affiliated with Citizens for East Shore Parks.

1 Tiering an EIR off an out-dated EIR is  
2 probably illegal and so ill-advised and inadequate that  
3 a full new EIR is required.

4 The proposed project is only a fuzzy concept  
5 for a range of 1500 to maybe 2,280 housing units that  
6 someone might buy for a million each, except these  
7 homes are next door to a large, fully operating oil  
8 refinery and located in a designated fire risk area  
9 that has only one way in and one way out.

10 Independent financial studies indicate this  
11 concept will punch a hole in the City's revenue of  
12 around 3.5 million a year.

13 Counting only residential-related cars, the  
14 average-size household in Richmond of 2.87 people will  
15 probably have two cars per unit, producing around 5,500  
16 cars which spew out about 28,000 tons of carbon dioxide  
17 annually, not to mention the methane or nitrous oxide,  
18 which contribute smaller amounts but which can have a  
19 bigger impact on global warming, all because this  
20 concept is proposed for an area without public  
21 transportation and one that bypasses putting needed  
22 housing in your designated priority development areas  
23 which require you to meet Richmond's fair share of  
24 housing in the Bay Area region and which are  
25 specifically meant to reduce automobile use and reduce

1 the advance of climate change.

2 Because you aren't developing in your PDAs and  
3 also not meeting your regional housing allotment goals,  
4 you are likely to lose state and federal transportation  
5 funding and make an even greater impact on the  
6 environment, endangering everyone in the Bay Area  
7 because we now know there are only 10 to 12 years  
8 before we might lose the planet itself.

9 There is significant new traffic information  
10 that must be analyzed, costs determined, and new  
11 information regarding the environment that has never  
12 before been considered as to how it all fits into the  
13 plan to reduce climate change. That's why a new EIR is  
14 necessary.

15 Further comments from -- further comments from  
16 CESP about this issue and other issues will be provided  
17 in writing.

18 Thank you very much.

19 BERYL GOLDEN: I'm going to --  
20 Beryl Golden, Richmond.

21 I'm going to speak about the traffic impact  
22 analyses that need to be done. This project has the  
23 potential of 2,280 residential units, 40,000 square  
24 feet of retail and restaurant uses in addition to the  
25 potential 2,280 residential units.

**Public Hearing  
PH2**

1           The analysis of the SEIR needs to analyze the  
2 effects of the existing projects that have been  
3 completed since the 2011 SEIR and also the projects  
4 that have been approved since the 2011 FEIR but not yet  
5 completed. The analysis needs to update the traffic  
6 impacts fees that would apply. It needs to include  
7 public transit possibilities. It needs to include road  
8 improvements and/or reconfigurations that may be needed  
9 and have not yet been completed since the 2011 FEIR.

10           RYAN SAWYER: Next speaker is Norm -- Norman,  
11 excuse me.

**Public Hearing** 12           NORMAN LA FORCE: Yeah, good evening. Norman  
**PH3** 13 LaForce. I speak on behalf of the Sierra Club and  
14 SPRAWLDEF. Written comments will be submitted by both  
15 organizations.

16           First, this whole process is legally null and  
17 void because the City entered into an illegal agreement  
18 with the developer and Indian tribe in violation of the  
19 Public Open Meeting Act; therefore, we're engaging in a  
20 process that should be stopped immediately.

21           Secondly, the SEIR relies upon a legally  
22 invalid prior EIR because that EIR, while purportedly  
23 certified, is legally insufficient since it did not  
24 certify a project that was ever approved. Moreover,  
25 that prior EIR failed to provide any statement of

1 overriding considerations for the many significant  
2 unavoidable and mitigatable adverse impacts as required  
3 by law and therefore is null and void.

4 This purported SEIR includes a new alternative  
5 for 2,280, homes that was never identified or approved  
6 by the City Council, and therefore, an alternative is  
7 being thrown into this process that came out of  
8 nowhere, and that's legally invalid. This SEIR needs  
9 to look at various other alternatives, particularly the  
10 Community Plan that was put together by CESP, Sierra  
11 Club, the Point Molate Alliance, and SPRAWLDEF. If it  
12 fails to do that, it's not fully analyzing a range of  
13 alternatives as required by law.

14 The fifth, the traffic analysis is null and  
15 void because the prior EIR relied upon a now outmoded  
16 and legally insufficient method for doing traffic  
17 analysis that's no longer used. Therefore, all new  
18 traffic analyses must be done pursuant to the latest  
19 methodology.

20 In addition, the Bay Plan needs to be analyzed  
21 because Point Molate is not one of the preferred  
22 development areas, PDAs, identified for Richmond for  
23 residential development. And there has to be an  
24 explanation for why that would be case. There's a  
25 number of other deficiencies concerning the eel grass.

1           The EIR must also address the fact that an  
2           economic analysis done by Alexander Quinn of Hatch  
3           shows that there would be a \$3.5 million subsidy by the  
4           City, either through a reduction in services or  
5           increase in taxes, to provide the infrastructure costs  
6           for the proposed project, and that needs to be part of  
7           this document.

8           In addition and finally, the document also has  
9           to look at the lack of feasibility of providing  
10          low-income and affordable housing at the Point Molate  
11          site since there is no infrastructure for that housing,  
12          and that housing would be more appropriate in the PDAs  
13          where it should be, should go. Thank you.

14          ROBERT CHEASTY: Good evening --

15          RYAN SAWYER: Sorry. You can start.

16          ROBERT CHEASTY: I'm Robert Cheasty. I'm the  
17          Executive Director of Citizens for East Shore Parks. I  
18          begin with by -- I'll truncate things a little. I'll  
19          adopt and incorporate the remarks by Shirley Dean,  
20          Beryl Golden, and Norman La Force before me as part of  
21          my presentation, and I endorse the comments that they  
22          made.

23                 Though perhaps a larger view of what we're  
24                 doing here is required, we have, according to the U.S.  
25                 government and a particular scientific agency that's

Public Hearing  
PH4

1 responsible for informing the government and the  
2 population about the impacts of human activity on  
3 global climate change, we have between now and the end  
4 of this century an expectation of a degrees of increase  
5 in heat from 4.2 to 8.5 degrees. This means that the  
6 estimated ability to adapt, which is limited to about  
7 2.5 degrees, is going to be far exceeded.

8           This means also that, based on that trajectory  
9 that we're going, unless we reverse the trend, we will  
10 see consequences that will be catastrophic. There will  
11 be a global collapse of the oceans, seas, and bays due  
12 to acidity. There will be mass extinction, global  
13 droughts leading to crop failure worldwide, massive  
14 increase in the force of hurricanes, tornadoes,  
15 typhoons leading to coastal devastation and inland  
16 disasters, melting of the glaciers worldwide, melting  
17 of the tundra in the Arctic region causing the release  
18 of tons of methane gas that will accelerate increasing  
19 temperatures worldwide to the point that the damage  
20 cannot be reversed.

21           The second point that needs to be observed is  
22 that, according to the scientists that are working with  
23 the United Nations and to the report that they issued  
24 in November, we have between 10 and 12 years to fix  
25 this and to reverse the trend. And if we don't, we



1 will not be able to reverse the trend, meaning that we  
2 will have planet collapse.

3           Why is this important for us? Well, we need  
4 to address these issues both on a global front and deal  
5 with them in national legislation and international  
6 agreements. But we also need to deal it with on a  
7 local basis. And that includes land use decisions that  
8 are going to be made in thousands upon thousands of  
9 cities all across the United States -- coastal cities,  
10 inland cities -- in dealing with how we're going to  
11 address climate change, climate crisis, the amount of  
12 carbon that we're putting into the air and the risks --  
13 greater risks of putting methane into the air.

14           So decisions like this one, which are local,  
15 affect things. We have in Point Molate the best and  
16 most healthy eel grass beds in the bay. We're going to  
17 need things like that. Like that's -- they provide the  
18 basis for the food chain and the health of our bay and  
19 the existence of our fish.

20           We will need that kind of help in order to be  
21 able to sustain the oceans and the bays when our oceans  
22 and bays are facing increasing acidification due to  
23 heat rise.

24           So we've submitted a letter. We will be  
25 submitting further comments regarding the kinds of

**Public Hearing  
PH5**

1 things that need to be done in order to be able to  
2 preserve and protect those eel grass beds and preserve  
3 and protect the watersheds, the very watershed that the  
4 City is now planning to build these housing  
5 developments in and which will destroy the watersheds  
6 and damage the eel grass beds. Thank you.

7 ROBERTA WYN: Hi, I'm Roberta Wyn.  
8 What is being proposed for Point Molate in the  
9 SEIR is an entirely new project and requires a new EIR.  
10 Not only is this a new project, everything has changed  
11 since the last EIR was developed. We are in a climate  
12 crisis with pleadings from each new scientific report  
13 to reduce carbon emissions to save our planet. We  
14 cannot ignore those pleas.

15 We are experiencing unprecedented climate  
16 change, different environmental, economic, and social  
17 circumstances in substantially different environmental  
18 impacts of development than a decade ago. To use an  
19 outdated EIR is to ignore the scientific information,  
20 events, and changes of the past ten years. It is a  
21 mistake the City of Richmond cannot afford. A totally  
22 new EIR is required.

23 One area with new environmental impacts that  
24 needs to be thoroughly examined in light of the changed  
25 conditions is traffic.

1           Among the many aspects to be examined, I will  
2 highlight a few:

3           We need a thorough and updated analysis of the  
4 impacts of the proposed project on the surrounding  
5 traffic conditions, including the increased  
6 Richmond-San Rafael Bridge traffic and backups.

7           We need an analysis of the impacts of the  
8 maximum number of residential units proposed, 2,280, on  
9 surrounding traffic conditions.

10          We need an analysis of transportation impacts  
11 on carbon emissions and how does this -- how does this  
12 or does not [sic] address state or local efforts to  
13 meet GHG reduction targets.

14          We need analysis of the project's  
15 environmental impact on air pollution.

16          We need the analysis of the vehicle miles  
17 traveled this project would generate and impacts of  
18 those findings on the environment.

19          Mitigation banks and offsets are not an  
20 adequate solution. We do not have time. The EIR needs  
21 to address the effects on global climate change of  
22 siting housing in an isolated, car dependent, limited  
23 access area versus housing where services,  
24 transportation, and infrastructure exist.

25                 RYAN SAWYER: Thank you.

1 I'm going to ask the next five speakers to  
2 please go on the opposite side of the room so we can  
3 see you even better and record your comments. David --  
4 Melgard?

5 DAVID HELVARG: Helvarg.

6 RYAN SAWYER: Michele Rappaport, Gail Seymour,  
7 Jim Hanson, and Toni Hanna.

8 DAVID HELVARG: I'm David Helvarg. I'm a  
9 resident of Richmond, one of the chairs of the Point  
10 Molate Alliance. Have to endorse everything that's  
11 been said to date. The local is global. And in the  
12 words of the late Peter Douglas of the California  
13 Coastal Commission, the coast is never saved; it's  
14 always being saved.

15 So the idea that we can amend an inadequate  
16 decade-old environmental impact report for a failed  
17 mega casino and somehow shoehorn that into SunCal's  
18 equally bad plan for Point Molate, it's like saying we  
19 can, you know, amend the 2012 Barack Obama plan for  
20 re-election to fit Donald Trump's re-election plan for  
21 2020. It's just not going to work.

22 The reasons are multiple, including the fact  
23 that the whole process today is illegal, it's being  
24 challenged in court. If there's not a new  
25 environmental impact report, there will be new -- a new

Public Hearing  
PH6

1 court case filed. But if there is a full environmental  
2 impact report, this plan won't stand. It won't stand  
3 on environmental reasons. It won't stand on the  
4 economic reasons because it will end up subsidizing  
5 wealthy people with the people -- lower income people  
6 of Richmond who average \$50,000-a-year income. They're  
7 going to end up subsidizing people who are going to  
8 have to have at least a \$200,000-a-year income to buy  
9 housing, high-end housing at Point Molate, which you'll  
10 hear later, high-end purchasers aren't going to buy in  
11 a high fire hazard zone next to a refinery.

12 So just like a few of the reasons why this  
13 makes no sense is climate change. It's changed in the  
14 last decade since its original impact report.

15 Twenty years ago, I was covering the  
16 California Department of Forestry, which in subsequent  
17 years became the California Department of Forestry and  
18 Fire Prevention and which today we all know as  
19 Cal Fire.

20 The -- Richmond -- of the most dangerous areas  
21 in the city, of course, and in the state, the nation,  
22 in the world are the fire hazard severity zones. City  
23 of Richmond has three: Wildcat Canyon Regional Park,  
24 Point Richmond, and Point Molate. Building in harm's  
25 way makes no sense whatsoever.

1           And on the biological side, this original EIR  
2 made no sense at all. We've had two bio blitzes out  
3 there in the last two months. These are citizen  
4 science. These are where people are documenting one of  
5 the biological hotspots in the Bay Area; 77 observers  
6 have photographically documented 454 different species  
7 of plant and animal and insect out there.

8           Last week I was out there, it was like 50-plus  
9 volunteers, plus a dozen ospreys, a wild pig in the  
10 uplands. Boars may be problematic in terms of what  
11 they do to the environment, but they're nothing  
12 compared to Southern California real estate  
13 corporations.

14           So we have so many reasons, I'm going to let  
15 other people speak about why this is bad. But it's a  
16 bad deal for the environment. It's a bad deal for  
17 Richmond's local economy. It's a bad deal for public  
18 safety. And on top of that all, it's illegal.

19           RYAN SAWYER: Michele Rappaport.

20           MICHELE RAPPAPORT: The need for a new  
21 environmental impact report is like the need for a new  
22 lab report for a medical condition, the FAA inspection  
23 of a new airplane, or inspection of trees near  
24 electrical lines.

25           Those who want to push through this multi-unit

**Public Hearing  
PH7**

1 development say, "We must move quickly, or we will go  
2 bankrupt because of the agreement," scary. But I say  
3 better to go bankrupt because we did the right thing  
4 rather than because it's faster, caused the ecosystem  
5 in the bay to deteriorate, created risk to new  
6 structures due to climate change, or god forbid, a fire  
7 took irreplaceable life when people needed to evacuate  
8 and there was only a two-lane road.

9           The lack of adequate inspection and oversight  
10 killed over 600 people when their team of engineers was  
11 pressured to cut costs and hurry production of a  
12 737 Max. The one road out of Paradise was narrowed  
13 from four lanes to two, to make it quaint; 86 people  
14 died. Thirty seven lives were lost in the Ghostship  
15 fire in Oakland, skirting around reports and  
16 inspections.

17           Open your eyes to Chevron fuel tanks, the  
18 traffic congestion at 580, the two-lane road that  
19 provides only one way out. At least 4,400 lives will  
20 be at stake.

21           It's an environmental impact report. There's  
22 no reason we shouldn't do a new one. Hiding our heads  
23 in the sand, cutting costs, claiming ignorance, using  
24 the iron fist of power because you can is of no use.  
25 There are too many people in Richmond who now know. We

1 have information, the Internet; we're talking to each  
2 other -- even when it's harder. We're sick of lies,  
3 insults, and corruption. There is too much at stake

4 Let's be a model of good government, set an  
5 example of forward-thinking city planning. The rest of  
6 the residents of Richmond could end up paying for  
7 services for the development.

8 The new EIR should address the fiscal impact  
9 of the project as well. There is no choice here.  
10 Richmond is made up of moral and honorable people. We  
11 want to do the right thing. And our elected leaders  
12 should follow us. The oath of those caring for your  
13 body is "Do no harm." Richmond residents are demanding  
14 that this beautiful Ohlone land be treated in the same  
15 way.

16 Do no harm to Point Molate. An independent  
17 environmental impact report is necessary.

18 RYAN SAWYER: Gail Seymour.

**Public Hearing** 19 GAIL SEYMOUR: Thank you for the opportunity  
**PH8** 20 speak. I'm an environmental scientist, and I've worked  
21 for the past 30 to 40 years with various state and  
22 federal resource agencies. The last 20 years, I was a  
23 supervisor with the California Department of Fish and  
24 Wildlife in watershed restoration for the nine-county  
25 Bay Area. Today, I'm now representing Turtle Island



1 Restoration Network. And that's international  
2 non-governmental organization that protects sensitive  
3 endangered species.

4 I reviewed the biological resources section of  
5 the previous Point Molate EIR from July 2009. Your  
6 modified development plan that you are now proposing  
7 has a different footprint, a significant increase in  
8 new residences, and has potential to significantly  
9 impact biological resources in a more deleterious way  
10 than the previous development plan. Therefore, a new  
11 EIR is called for.

12 The biological assessments conducted by  
13 Tetra Tech and AES are now over a decade old and not  
14 sufficient to evaluate critical habitat and species  
15 presence/absence as it exists today. Note that the  
16 animal or plant doesn't have to be present for a  
17 critical habitat designation. I'll just through that  
18 in there.

19 The proposed footprint and density of  
20 development will eliminate existing habitat and the  
21 potential for restoring habitat.

22 Another note is that CEQA requires that, if in  
23 any way big or small the proposed project contributes  
24 to cumulative impacts created from the past and the  
25 present, the proposed project shall be considered a

1 significant impact and a cumulative impact analysis is  
2 required in the EIR process. And I'd like to know or  
3 please advise us if this will be done.

4 I've been discussing development of  
5 Point Molate with my colleagues at California  
6 Department of Fish and Game -- or Fish and Wildlife  
7 now, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the San Francisco  
8 Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the National  
9 Marine Fishery Service, NOAA. I will continue to  
10 advocate for prioritization of the Point Molate EIR  
11 review -- I hope it is the new EIR -- in order to  
12 prevent any rubber-stamping of the CEQA document by the  
13 resource agencies. Thank you.

14 RYAN SAWYER: Jim Hanson.

**Public Hearing** 15 JIM HANSON: Hello, thank you. My name is Jim  
**PH9** 16 Hanson. I'm the Conservation Chair for the East Bay  
17 Chapter of the California Native Plant Society and also  
18 for the California Native Grasslands Association.

19 Could you -- could I ask you to put up the  
20 Figure 4 slide? And I'll be referring to that.

21 This project, as described in the NOP, does  
22 not resemble Casino Alternative D. Instead of impacts  
23 from 1100 housing units, this project projects up to  
24 2,000 units, at least in the footnote within the NOP.

25 Second, when one looks closely at the

1 conceptual plan, Figure 4, there's a strong evidence  
2 and indication that this proposed project as  
3 represented in the NOP --

4 (Cell phone interruption)

5 JIM HANSON: I'll just wait for a moment.

6 -- is an expansion into developable land  
7 beyond the publicly represented 30 percent developable  
8 space represented as official and binding by the City  
9 in the settlement agreement with Upstream and as noted  
10 in the NOP.

11 The Drum Lot immediately north is expanded  
12 further into the hills. The Area B as described -- if  
13 you look the Base Reuse Plan that was the basis of the  
14 settlement agreement -- is significantly expanded into  
15 the hills. The Areas G and F are expanded into the  
16 hills. And there's an entirely new area, Area C; it  
17 has never been represented publicly or presented to the  
18 public for comment.

19 So this becomes an entirely new project  
20 indeed, and what we're looking at is much more than  
21 30 percent. So this needs to be corrected and fully  
22 and specifically described in a new, full EIR.

23 As such, it -- all grading impacts need to be  
24 fully represented. They, frankly, were not in the  
25 casino EIR. They're very difficult to read.

1           Secondly, I'm going to comment on a couple  
2 things Ms. Seymour mentioned. Updated comprehensive,  
3 realistic, well-timed botanical surveys of the special  
4 status plants and sensitive plant communities, as  
5 required by CDFW protocol, should be done.

6           The Draft EIR needs to account for and avoid  
7 seasonal wet water courses within the 50-foot -- up  
8 where it's demarcated in Figure 1 of the Supplemental  
9 AES Habitat Analysis from August 2010. Please look at  
10 the Bay Trail Biological Assessment.

11           And you'll please consider as an alternative  
12 the Community Plan for actually genuine alternatives  
13 represented within this full EIR.

14           Thank you very much.

15           RYAN SAWYER: Toni Hanna.

**Public Hearing  
PH10**

16           TONI HANNA: Hi. I'm a member of Point Molate  
17 Alliance. I'm a Richmond resident and local Realtor.  
18 I've been a licensee with the State of California since  
19 2003, and I want to speak to my expertise, which is  
20 real estate, and the concept of highest and best use of  
21 this land.

22           I have three points to make.

23           One, lack of marketability. The site does not  
24 have the elements that are attractive to buyers. There  
25 is one narrow road in and out. It's not near

1 amenities. It's surrounded by the Chevron Refinery in  
2 a high fire hazard zone, and you have to get on the  
3 freeway to get anywhere. Even in an extremely strong  
4 summer's market like we're in now, both new and resale  
5 properties that have any of these negative  
6 characteristics are not selling. And I can give you  
7 concrete examples in writing.

8           Number two, construction loans are very hard  
9 to come by for condos because banks still see them as  
10 high risk. The vast majority of new and  
11 under-construction condos in the East Bay are rentals,  
12 and that is in heavily urbanized, in-demand areas of  
13 Oakland and Berkeley near transportation. It is highly  
14 doubtful that a bank would take a risk on a residential  
15 project at Point Molate.

16           Furthermore, construction costs have risen to  
17 such a level that new construction isn't penciling out.  
18 And for-profit developers will only build if they can  
19 have at least a 20 percent profit margin.

20           Three, due all the wild fires, major insurers  
21 have been leaving the California market wholesale. And  
22 most of --

23           (Cell phone interruption)

24           TONI HANNA: Can you please turn that off?

25           -- and most of the insurers left only cater to

1 the specialty market. My insurance expert tells me  
2 that the master HOA would have a very hard time getting  
3 insurance for this project.

4 Access is a big issue, and there is a high  
5 likelihood that insurance would be denied because of  
6 the fact that there is only one point of ingress and  
7 egress, making it difficult for a fire truck to turn  
8 around. Also, if the master insurer cannot offer  
9 earthquake insurance as required, they cannot write the  
10 master policy. And there is a high degree of sloping  
11 in this area.

12 In light of the facts and the obstacles, I  
13 highly doubt that new homes will ever be built at Point  
14 Molate. So it begs the question of what is the highest  
15 and best use of this land, and whose purpose it would  
16 serve to sell off our land cheaply to a property  
17 flipper like SunCal?

18 I'll be submitting my comments by e-mail with  
19 up-to-date charts from the insurance industry.  
20 Thank you.

21 DAVID HELVARG: I've got a question. Where  
22 will all these public comments be publicly available  
23 online or when?

24 RYAN SAWYER: Well, the City will be posting  
25 information related to the project on the project

1 website. I'm not sure at this point the public  
2 comments, scoping comments are going to be posted  
3 there, but that will be where to check.

4 DAVID HELVARG: But they will be accessible?

5 RYAN SAWYER: Yes.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are these comments  
7 recording? Are we recording?

8 RYAN SAWYER: Yes, we are.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

10 RYAN SAWYER: Okay. I'm going to call the  
11 next five speakers. Just a quick reminder if everyone  
12 can please silence your cell phones.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Please.

14 RYAN SAWYER: Okay. The next five speakers  
15 will be Paul Carmon, Luis Padilla, Alix Mazuet, Nina  
16 Smith, and Deborah Bayer.

17 PAUL CARMON: Paul Carmon, Richmond resident.

18 So it's obvious from reading this original EIR  
19 that it's woefully out of date. But the thing is, I  
20 know that's not only obvious to me. I know it's  
21 obvious to the City as well.

22 If I were to point out that the EIR says it  
23 will use Year 2007 construction standards, of course  
24 you're going to say, "Of course we're going to update  
25 that to year 2020," or 2030 or whatever.

**Public Hearing  
PH11**

1           If I were to point out that the original EIR  
2 gives a complimentary electric lawn mower to everyone  
3 who buys a residential unit at Point Molate, of course  
4 you're going to say, "Well, that doesn't make sense  
5 anymore. We're not going to do that."

6           If I were to point out that, in the original  
7 EIR, the tribe will replace all of the City's vehicle  
8 fleet with hybrids, you would probably say, "Well,  
9 that's not actually going to happen."

10           So the problem becomes -- the question becomes  
11 how do I know what's obvious to me is obvious to you?

12           So aside from the fact that we don't even know  
13 what this project actually is, we have no fixed  
14 reference points for even attempting a discussion of a  
15 subsequent EIR.

16           The first three words of every sentence in the  
17 mitigation section of the EIR is, "The Tribe shall,"  
18 "The Tribe shall." Well, there is no more tribe  
19 anymore. So do you just cross that out and put  
20 "SunCal"? To me, it means the mitigation section is  
21 null and void because these are all guarantees from a  
22 tribe that is no longer part of this process.

23           So even before a preliminary scoping meeting  
24 can be held, you must first reproduce the EIR. And I  
25 think if you undertake that endeavor, you'll see that's



1 tantamount to just starting from scratch.

2           So I want to make a few points on climate  
3 change. I think the word that best describes the  
4 original EIR's approach to climate change is leisurely:  
5 low-flow appliances, reduce diesel idling, energy  
6 efficient lighting, recycling bins. The EIR states  
7 that the tribe shall participate in PG&E's Climate  
8 Smart Program. PG&E discontinued this program in 2011.

9           Even taking into account the response in  
10 climate change resolutions passed by the U.S. Mayors  
11 Conference this month, the current literature clearly  
12 shows that the most critical step a city can take in  
13 response to our climate emergency is to maintain  
14 greenscapes on its outskirts and concentrate  
15 development in its urban core. It's imperative that  
16 any new EIR acknowledges this fact.

17           Ironically there's one piece in the original  
18 EIR that's actually a gem. It says --

19           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Go ahead, finish.

20           PAUL CARMON: "The tribe shall implement smart  
21 land use strategies which would reduce vehicle trips  
22 and promote efficient delivery of goods and services."

23           I think that a sincere commitment to this  
24 measure will lead to the conclusion that it will be  
25 impossible to do this under the project which is currently

1 under consideration. Thank you.

**Public Hearing  
PH12**

2 LUIS PADILLA: Good evening. My name's Luis  
3 Padilla. I represent Richmond Firefighters Local 188.  
4 And I'm here to speak in favor of Point Molate  
5 Mixed-Use project.

6 Our city is in trying times. We need to find  
7 ways to increase revenue. This increases our tax base.  
8 It gives us the recreational -- it addresses the  
9 recreational opportunities. We would like to see the  
10 widening of the road addressed for fire access.

11 And also -- what was I going to say? Also  
12 address the issue of a firehouse out there for  
13 emergency response.

14 That's all I have. I yield the rest of my  
15 time.

16 RYAN SAWYER: Thank you.

17 Alix?

**Public Hearing  
PH13**

18 ALIX MAZUET: Yes, hi. Alix Mazuet. I'm a  
19 Richmond resident and -- in Belding Woods.

20 So today I would like to address the issue of  
21 affordable housing at Point Molate. There is no doubt  
22 that we need housing in Richmond, but we need safe,  
23 durable, and conveniently located housing development,  
24 close to public transportation, schools, shops and  
25 medical facility.

1           Also, we need housing that most of us can  
2 afford without having to spend half or more of our  
3 monthly income on rent and without having to live in  
4 overcrowded apartments to cut housing costs. And here  
5 I'm referring to a growing trend in Richmond, one unit  
6 for a single family with several generations --  
7 grandparents, parents, children, and grandchildren --  
8 living under the same roof, not by choice, but because  
9 a vast majority of people in Richmond and in the Bay  
10 Area as a whole cannot afford to live in a home of  
11 their own.

12           To better illustrate the latter, let me say a  
13 few words about the new housing development under  
14 construction in Richmond, the Nevin Terraces. In  
15 Richmond, we are in desperate need of housing that our  
16 families can afford. The City of Richmond and its  
17 developer, AGM and Associates, advertised this new  
18 housing development as an affordable housing complex  
19 made of family-oriented units.

20           However, out of 289 units total, 112 are  
21 studios and 84 one-bedroom units. In other words, a  
22 third of the units is made of studios or, taking the  
23 entire complex as a whole, more than half is made of  
24 studios and one-bedroom apartments. How then can the  
25 City of Richmond and its developer claim that the Nevin

1 Terraces is an affordable family-oriented housing  
2 complex?

3 Another important point in the description of  
4 this housing complex, one can read that the project --  
5 the project, both buildings, would have a total floor  
6 area of approximately 350,000 square feet, including  
7 residential space, common spaces, and parking.

8 What will be the surface square footage of  
9 each rental unit -- studio, one-, two-, three-bedroom  
10 apartments? And what will be the price per square  
11 footage for each kind of unit?

12 These are very important questions that, to  
13 this day and after many discussions between the Belding  
14 Woods Neighborhood, City Council, and City Planner  
15 Jonelyn Whales, remained unanswered.

16 Yes, we need housing in Richmond. First and  
17 foremost, we need housing the majority of Richmond  
18 residents who live as families can afford. We now know  
19 that the Nevin Terraces will not deliver this for us.  
20 So there remains a great shortage of affordable housing  
21 for our families in Richmond.

22 With building and labor costs, home and hazard  
23 insurance, HOA dues, and tax and utilities cost, how  
24 can the City of Richmond offer any kind of affordable  
25 housing at Point Molate? If Richmond City planners

1 work on Point Molate development project, when will  
2 they have time and resources to work on projects that  
3 Richmond truly needs, conveniently located housing  
4 development that people desperately need and can  
5 afford?

6 The old EIR does not address these questions  
7 and the paramount need for affordable housing  
8 conveniently located in Richmond. Therefore, I  
9 respectfully ask for a new EIR. And I will send my  
10 comment in writing. Thank you so much.

**Public Hearing** 11 NINA SMITH: My name is Nina Smith. I'm a  
**PH14** 12 resident of Richmond for the last 32 years. I agree  
13 with everything that's been said with one exception.

14 It's obvious you need a new EIR from the  
15 beginning. And I particularly want to address the  
16 hazards of building anything in that location with that  
17 -- not only is there a tiny road, but there's no way to  
18 expand it if you actually look at the land.

19 Plus, the traffic on 580 going towards that  
20 bridge has gotten so much worse over the last 10, 15  
21 years since they originally did whatever study they  
22 did. I'm no expert, but any anybody who drives there  
23 knows that. You would not be able to get people out if  
24 there was fire. It's right underneath huge tanks of  
25 jet fuel and crude oil.

1 I mean, I went on a tour of the Chevron  
2 Refinery, and they told us that's what's up in those  
3 tanks. You can see in the photographs, the tanks are  
4 directly above where the houses are going to be built,  
5 multi-unit houses on what was called Drum Lot. I don't  
6 know -- now it's the South Valley or whatever.

7 It is absolutely insane. And it's not going  
8 to sell. It's going to bankrupt the City. The fiscal  
9 analysis that I saw that was done by Hatch shows that  
10 it is a losing proposition.

11 We're being sold a bill of goods -- I don't  
12 know who's going to get all the money from it, but it's  
13 going to be devastating for the City, and it's going to  
14 be terrible for anybody who might be foolish enough to  
15 live there.

16 So, yeah, full EIR, address the traffic,  
17 address the hazards. And what's been said about the  
18 environmental impacts are important, too. That's what  
19 I have to say.

20 RYAN SAWYER: Thank you.

21 Deborah Bayer.

22 DEBORAH BAYER: Hi, I'm Deborah Bayer. I'm a  
23 Richmond resident. I've lived here since 1992. And I  
24 want to talk about the Hatch Report, which Nina just  
25 mentioned. It's an economic analysis that basically

1 says the City's sort of been promising us all of this  
2 money that we're going to get from this high-end  
3 housing.

4 And Hatch Report puts a light to that. It  
5 says that the City will be -- probably cost 3- to  
6 \$5 million annually to provide services to that area  
7 over and above the revenue that would be coming in  
8 through property taxes.

9 So, okay. The City has never -- even though  
10 they promised they would over a year ago, they have not  
11 provided their own financial report on how we're going  
12 to make money there. And so they think the Hatch  
13 Report is wrong; maybe they better come up with  
14 something else because right now that's all we have  
15 because the City did not do its due diligence.

16 So there needs to be an economic impact  
17 report. So in the old Alternative D, which was half  
18 the number of people, the tribe was going to provide  
19 the City \$8 million for a year for eight years and  
20 then, after that, \$10 million a year for the duration  
21 to pay for the Municipal Services Agreement, which was  
22 going to cover the cost of fire and police. They were  
23 going to put a police station there. They were going  
24 to put a fire station there, manned 24/7 with three  
25 people.

1           So that is not mentioned. That is gone, and  
2 yet we're going to have twice the number of people as  
3 reported in the -- our old Alternative D. So the  
4 question of those services is really important and the  
5 question of who's going to be paying for that.

6           And I want to talk about democracy really  
7 briefly. The NOP states all over the place -- it  
8 states it's going to be 1200 units or 1500 units. And  
9 then a tiny little footnote, it says it's going to be  
10 2,280 units. That's -- it took me a long time.  
11 Someone said it's in there, and I had to keep looking  
12 to find it. That's not very honest.

13           Also, the NOP here says that in 2018, the City  
14 undertook a compre-" -- I'm quoting, "a comprehensive  
15 community visioning process to obtain input from the  
16 local community regarding what types of land uses  
17 should be considered at Point Molate."

18           Well, I was there at every single one of those  
19 meetings. And the input was ignored by the City  
20 because the input was people did not want houses there,  
21 and they wanted nothing built in the South Valley.

22           So where is the democracy in this?

23           Thank you.

24           RYAN SAWYER: Next five speakers, Charles  
25 Smith, Walter Lindsley -- I'm hope I'm saying that



1 correctly -- David Reinertson, Janet Johnson, Pam  
2 Stello. And that's five.

3 CHARLES SMITH: Good evening. My name is  
4 Charles Smith. I'm a 47-year resident of Richmond.  
5 I'm one of the founding members of Friends of Point  
6 Molate. And for the past five years, our group goes  
7 there every Tuesday and works from 10:00 to 12:00 --  
8 sometimes longer, sometimes it even comes in on other  
9 days -- to do the work the City can't afford to have  
10 workers come out and do. That place would look like a  
11 dump if it wasn't for the work that we've been doing.  
12 However, we like it.

13 And I'll tell you what. This is what we look  
14 at when we're out there working. This is the South  
15 Valley. And we work right on that water line and that  
16 park.

17 For five years -- sorry. I'm talking to  
18 people in the back.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, give yourself a  
20 little more distance to the microphone.

21 CHARLES SMITH: Oh, I see. Okay.

22 So for five years we've been looking at that.  
23 And while we're -- when we're looking at it and  
24 conversing while we're working, we see that tank right  
25 there.

1           You know what that is? It's a Chevron storage  
2 tank. We don't know if jet fuel's in it or if crude  
3 oil is in it.

4           Over here -- did you people see that, that  
5 tank? That's the tank right there. That's what's on  
6 the south lot.

7           LINA VELASCO: Turn it around. Let them see.

8           CHARLES SMITH: They saw it.

9           Okay. Now, same tank, right there. But guess  
10 what? There another tank right there [indicating].  
11 And if you get a camera with telephoto lenses, you can  
12 shoot the back side of that. And this is what's there,  
13 three more. I mean, a total of three here and one  
14 there.

15           The south lot is the most dangerous place on  
16 -- in Point Molate. This is where they want to build  
17 the most expensive houses, right down there. I've seen  
18 this for five years, and I can tell anybody in this  
19 room that this is crazy. This is money grabbing. It's  
20 insanity. It's going to put people's lives in danger.

21           Now I'm going to read something here. This is  
22 excerpts from "Military Jet Fuel And Its Possible  
23 Implication On Public Health."

24           "The apparent hazards included oil refineries,  
25 oil storage, and distribution depots," that's all of

1 Chevron right there -- "railroad lines and industrial  
2 sites. Effective ranges extend as far as 3.1 miles  
3 from the source." That covers that whole area.  
4 There's no question that the people living here, their  
5 lives will be in danger. No question.

6 I'll read one more thing. "These chemicals,  
7 being heavier than air, are capable of having an  
8 intrusive effect on workers or population via ambient  
9 inhalation." They're heavy. They come down. This is  
10 a valley. You do not put men, women, and children in a  
11 valley with no exit with tanks up above that could kill  
12 them. This is crazy.

13 And I've been working there for five years,  
14 looking across the street, working with people who  
15 really care about this park. And we talk about it all  
16 the time. And how did we get in or out? We get in and  
17 out on one road. And every time we go there to get  
18 there at 10:00 o'clock in the morning, we have to leave  
19 earlier and earlier because that's how bad the traffic  
20 is.

21 RYAN SAWYER: Next speaker, Walter Lindsley.

22 WALTER LINDSLEY: My name is Walter Stephen  
23 Lindsley. I was the laboratory supervisor at the City  
24 of Richmond Wastewater Treatment Plant for over 21  
25 years, and I commented ten years ago on the wastewater

Public Hearing  
PH17

1 issues, how they were significant in the project  
2 before.

3 And those issues are actually still valid  
4 because the City hasn't done anything, nearly hasn't  
5 done enough to take care of those issues that made it a  
6 significant impact back then to have wastewater from  
7 this proposed project that's there now.

8 But this is even bigger, and it's a  
9 significantly different project because it proposes,  
10 among other alternatives, to build a wastewater  
11 treatment plant and treat the wastewater out at the  
12 Point Molate site itself.

13 And the problem with that is that there's a  
14 huge proposal for wastewater to be generated at the  
15 site now. Based on the utility report, which I read  
16 for this project, for the 660 units of residents, which  
17 was the original proposal, that there would be over  
18 three quarters of a million gallons a day that had to  
19 be treated. And at 2200 or more units, plus all the  
20 businesses and other commercial activities, that that  
21 would be like generating somewhere close  
22 2.5 million gallons per day.

23 Now, if you treated that on site, you have to  
24 do something with it. And right now, there's no  
25 existing permit for discharging treated wastewater

1 anywhere around there. I don't think that the State is  
2 going to allow a new domestic wastewater treatment  
3 plant to discharge shallow water discharge down in that  
4 area.

5           They would have to take the treated wastewater  
6 and discharge that to the Chevron refinery deep water  
7 outfall like Chemtray does, where they have to put  
8 their water in some sort of a force main and push that  
9 up to the City of Richmond wastewater treatment plant,  
10 which already can't handle the wastewater it receives  
11 because it's been in violation of its existing  
12 wastewater discharge permits through May, for most of  
13 the months of the past year, I believe at least through  
14 April.

15           And they still have a lot of improvements that  
16 they have to make in the existing sewers, let alone the  
17 new ones that they would have to create.

18           RYAN SAWYER: You can continue. Your time's  
19 not up. I just pressed the wrong button there.

20           WALTER LINDSLEY: Oh, okay.

21           So the other alternative, of course, is not to  
22 treat the wastewater there but to try to pump the raw  
23 sewage either under the eel grass beds or up and down  
24 with a bunch of pump stations along a bunch of right of  
25 ways that they have to get through Chevron property and

1 the existing highway and the Point Richmond area to a  
2 line that the City of Richmond already has. It's big  
3 enough to handle that, which is essentially on the east  
4 side of Point Richmond now.

5 And so that whole process would cause a lot of  
6 environmental impact. You have to build the pumps,  
7 have to build the pipes, and have to prevent any of  
8 that from ever going into the bay, particularly if it's  
9 adjacent to the bay or up-slope of the bay or  
10 underneath the bay.

11 So they would then have to have all that  
12 treated by the wastewater treatment plant the City has,  
13 which, like I say, is already unable to treat what it  
14 has.

15 And if there was water from groundwater  
16 intrusion or rain or anything like, that they're going  
17 to create even more water to be dealt with than what I  
18 was already talking about. So wastewater is the  
19 significant impact. I don't see any way that that can  
20 be done with just modifying the existing EIR.

21 Thank you.

**Public Hearing** 22 DAVID REINERTSON: I'm David Reinertson.  
**PH18** 23 Could you hit that button in two minutes? You'll see  
24 why in a minute. I'm here first as a resident and  
25 neighbor and lastly as a taxpayer.

1           I have an obsolete mitigation quote here in  
2 the EIR.

3           The first thing I wanted to say is that, when  
4 we talk about wastewater, you have to realize we're  
5 talking about preventing the epidemic diseases that  
6 used to get rid of two thirds of us before we got to  
7 this age. So it's very important.

8           The obsolete quote comes from the original  
9 EIR, goes, "Currently, the RMSD," that's Richmond  
10 Municipal Sanitation District, "has no excess wet water  
11 capacity," meaning I think storm drains. "Planned  
12 improvements," this is from 2010, "Planned improvements  
13 to the system will incrementally improve wet-weather  
14 capacity over time through 2020. It is expected that  
15 the timing of the project, as well as the  
16 implementation of improvements will coincide to allow  
17 enough wet-weather capacity at the WWTP."

18           So expectation did not turn into reality.  
19 This was a hopeful mitigation strategy.

20           As a taxpayer, my belief is that there is no  
21 one who has -- is contractually obligated to pay for  
22 this. The City hasn't budgeted for what you're talking  
23 about. And yet I think that, if we go ahead with this  
24 project, the City will be obligated to build this  
25 multi-million-dollar system that you're talking about.

1           So since we're talking about scoping, it seems  
2 to me that this is not just a minor edit. This is  
3 really a rethinking. Someone is going to have to  
4 promise to pay for this. And that's going to impact  
5 the whole rest of the project.

6           That's why I think that the scope of the EIR  
7 out to be comprehensive rather than just a  
8 modification.

9           And now you can see why I only wanted two  
10 minutes, because you may have corrections for me,  
11 Mr. Lindsley.

12           WALTER LINDSLEY: No, no.

13           DAVID REINERTSON: Oh, okay. Thank you.

14           WALTER LINDSLEY: Thank you. Very good.

15           RYAN SAWYER: Janet Johnson.

16           JANET JOHNSON: Good evening. My name is  
17 Janet Johnson, and I've lived in Richmond for 38 years.  
18 And I wanted to just make a brief comment about fire  
19 hazard.

20           On July 10th, 2019, Richmond's new Fire  
21 Marshal, Eric Govan, gave a presentation at the  
22 Richmond Senior Center on wildfire dangers in Richmond.  
23 He mentioned three areas designated as very high fire  
24 hazard, severity zones, Wildcat Canyon down to old  
25 Brookside Hospital area, Point Richmond including

**Public Hearing  
PH19**



1 Chevron and Miller Knox, and Point Molate, also  
2 including Chevron.

3 He mentioned that building housing on Point  
4 Molate would be unwise due to high fire danger.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He did.

6 JANET JOHNSON: Even if Point Molate brush  
7 didn't ignite, Chevron, just over the hill, has enough  
8 brush surrounding electrical installations to start a  
9 conflagration.

10 He then described how fire likes to race  
11 uphill, top the hill, then race down the other side.  
12 The greater the slope, the greater the fire. He seemed  
13 to think that the entire danger was a disaster waiting  
14 to happen. Thank you.

15 RYAN SAWYER: Pam Stello.

**Public Hearing** 16 PAM STELLO: I'm one of the co-chairs of the  
**PH20** 17 Point Molate Alliance. Thank you for the opportunity  
18 to speak. I -- and I'm also a Richmond resident. I  
19 was also going to read the quote from the Fire Marshal.  
20 And thank you, Janet, for reading that.

21 I had two other points that I wanted to  
22 address. One is that I was taken aback that the  
23 history of Point Molate was presented as beginning with  
24 industry.

25 This is Ohlone land. The Ohlone have not been

1 consulted. And I am glad to see that cultural  
2 resources/tribal resources -- I assumed the Ohlone, and  
3 the Ohlone were not listed -- will be consulted. But I  
4 want to add that it's very important that the Ohlone  
5 are consulted as stakeholders and not as an  
6 archeological resource.

7 I also wanted to say that there's also a  
8 Chinese shrimp camp at Point Molate that was identified  
9 by an archeologist at UC Berkeley as having a very  
10 important -- very important artifacts there from when  
11 the Chinese lived there. And I want -- I believe it's  
12 very important to address what the impacts will be to  
13 that camp because that camp is at the bottom of the  
14 watershed where the plant development is.

15 It -- also it's important to consult with the  
16 descendents of the Chinese shrimp camp because they are  
17 here in the area. They also would be stakeholders in  
18 this project and not an archeological or cultural  
19 resource.

20 I also want to address fiscal impacts. In the  
21 original EIR, the fiscal impacts or economic impacts  
22 were no one would be displaced because of this project  
23 because apparently no one lives at Point Molate.

24 It's very important that a new EIR is done to  
25 address what the displacement would be caused by an

1 isolated high-income project due to gentrification or  
2 resulting higher economic and racial inequality from  
3 this type of economic segregation. Because this would  
4 be a high-income community, isolated, it would have  
5 exorbitant power at City Hall, financial and political.

6 I also want to address, in relation to that,  
7 that it's very important also to address in a new EIR  
8 that we have a very small Planning Department. So what  
9 projects in Richmond, especially projects that would  
10 address income inequality with affordable housing,  
11 would be either slowed or not done because our small  
12 Planning Department will be occupied with this complex  
13 project at Point Molate? Thank you.

14 RYAN SAWYER: Thank you. We have four more  
15 speakers. Ben Therriamt, Elizabeth Dougherty, Eduardo  
16 Martinez, and Kelly Hammargren.

17 BEN THERRIAMT: My name is Ben Therriamt. I'm  
18 the -- I'm a resident of the City of Richmond for eight  
19 years, worked here for ten years. I'm the President of  
20 the Richmond Police Officers Association. I represent  
21 approximately 150 officers and sergeants of the Police  
22 Department.

23 Let me just say, from a public safety  
24 standpoint, if this project were to go through, there  
25 would definitely need to be an adjustment made to the

**Public Hearing  
PH21**

1 deployment of police officers so that service -- our  
2 community service could be provided at the optimal rate  
3 that's, again, for community and officer safety so that  
4 there would be no -- no delays in service. And that  
5 would simply require an adjustment in how officers and  
6 sergeants are deployed on the street.

7           But the previous plan, I think, was based off  
8 of a casino. And in that regard, there was a planned  
9 substation. But I don't know if that would actually be  
10 something that we could put in place. So if there was  
11 just added resources, it would simply require the --  
12 you know, hopefully the Police Department would shift  
13 its resources to adjust and adapt accordingly. So that  
14 addresses the deployment for the sake of public safety.

15           When we say that -- just generally speaking,  
16 in regards to this project and other projects, we need  
17 housing in this city. Richmond has a need for housing  
18 developments. And something that a lot of people don't  
19 know, just a little housing facts, is Richmond has some  
20 of the -- actually has the most affordable units in  
21 Contra Costa County, period. A lot of people don't  
22 realize that, but there's a lot of affordable housing  
23 here, a great many. Not saying we can't do without  
24 more, but there's a lot that's here. And people need  
25 to recognize that as part of the conversation.

1           We also need housing in -- sorry --  
2       developments that provide needed revenue for the City  
3       of Richmond that allows us to provide services for our  
4       residents. Need to provide public open space and  
5       recreational opportunities that have been limited or  
6       non-existent for years. We need to provide improved  
7       stormwater runoff treatment to prevent erosion and to  
8       protect the Bay Area.

9           We also need to have developments and pass  
10       developments that provide elimination of invasive  
11       exotic plant species that have been replacing native  
12       plants for decades.

13           So that's some of the concerns that the police  
14       officers have and that I have as a resident. And I'll  
15       yield the rest of my time.

16           RYAN SAWYER: Thank you.

17           Elizabeth?

18           ELIZABETH DOUGHERTY: Hi, I'm Dr. Liz  
19       Dougherty. I'm the Director of Wholly H2O. We're an  
20       organization that does water conservation and water  
21       reuse education in light of watershed health. We've  
22       been organizing the bio blitzes for the last couple of  
23       months out in Point Richmond. And I've been going out  
24       there myself for about 28 years.

25           I just wanted to ask a couple of questions.

**Public Hearing**  
**PH22**

1 One is is the year 2019 right now? It's the year 2019,  
2 Yeah? And Richmond is in the State of California,  
3 right, one of the most progressive and innovative  
4 states in the United States? That's also true, right?  
5 Yeah.

6 So this whole -- given just those two things,  
7 the project shocks me to no -- to no degree.

8 We have the eighth largest economy in the  
9 world in California. And what we're thinking of doing  
10 in a place that is right along the Pacific Flyway,  
11 ecologically, one of the -- so we're right around the  
12 corner from the San Francisco Bay Delta. We're part of  
13 the entrance into that, the SF Bay Delta is the largest  
14 estuary on the coast of both North and South America.  
15 It is one of the four most important deltas in the  
16 world.

17 And what we're talking about here -- I mean,  
18 really, it's kind of laughable. What we're talking  
19 about here is building 2200 condos and filling up this  
20 amazing open space with concrete, eliminating a great  
21 deal of the ecological diversity that we have right  
22 here at a place where there is the most important eel  
23 grass patch in the State of California that provides  
24 eel grass forestation sites all over the state. And  
25 what we're talking about doing instead is decreasing

1 open space profoundly in this area -- looks like by at  
2 least half if not more, like three fifths at least --  
3 and at the same time, increasing stormwater because  
4 what you're doing here is covering this whole site with  
5 concrete.

6           So it's going to decrease all the space for  
7 infiltration that's currently there. So as water runs  
8 down these hills, instead of being able to infiltrate  
9 naturally and clean naturally, something deeply  
10 necessary for this particular site given its proximity  
11 to Chevron, you absolute- -- and what -- what you say  
12 instead is, "We may" -- "We may mitigate with  
13 low-impact development or low-impact design, a.k.a.  
14 green infrastructure." And while, believe me, I love  
15 me some green infrastructure, this is a completely  
16 inappropriate place to try to implement it.

17           The Watershed Project has been doing fabulous  
18 green infrastructure projects all over Richmond. And  
19 this is not an area that is conducive to that. You  
20 would need low-impact -- the whole site would have to  
21 be low-impact development, which is what it currently  
22 is. So there's no reason to touch this site.

23           Save the Bay started this in 1964 which led to  
24 the Clean Water Act. And everything that's going on  
25 here is standing up and saying we're back in 1942 or

1 something. We're going back -- we, the City of  
2 Richmond, would like to stand up and say, "This is our  
3 best idea for Point Molate."

4 And to me, as a clean water advocate -- and  
5 somebody already spoke about the wastewater, and I'm  
6 working with people at EB MUD to figure out the numbers  
7 around what it would take to re-enliven the wastewater  
8 treatment plant or send it elsewhere as well as  
9 bringing all the pipes in. All of this is disturbing  
10 the ecosystem tremendously. Okay?

11 So just thinking about, a little bit, about  
12 what sense this makes in terms of what Richmond is  
13 saying they are as a city, we're going backwards in  
14 time as far as possible. We're ecologically ignorant,  
15 and we don't care about the city -- our current city  
16 residents. Thank you.

17 RYAN SAWYER: Eduardo.

**Public Hearing** 18 EDUARDO MARTINEZ: Yes, Eduardo Martinez,  
**PH23** 19 Richmond resident and Richmond City Councilmember.

20 I'd like to start off by saying that I believe  
21 a new EIR is necessary.

22 And I also want to take issue with one word in  
23 here on Page 5 of 10. It's "judgment." Just because  
24 the Judge signed an agreement, it changes an agreement  
25 to a judgment. But the Judge did not judge this. He



1 agreed to let the litigating parties agree to whatever  
2 it was they agreed to, which is what caused the entire  
3 situation.

4 Now, it's my responsibility -- it's the City's  
5 responsibility to provide the residents services such  
6 as police, fire, water, electricity, and wastewater  
7 collection. It is my responsibility as a councilmember  
8 to ensure these services while remaining fiscally  
9 responsible.

10 If you watched City Council meetings, you can  
11 see me asking staff for fiscal projections for this  
12 project. I have yet to receive one.

13 You just heard a firefighter talk about being  
14 in favor of this project because we need the property  
15 taxes. He also pushed for a new firehouse which would  
16 require new fire engines and firefighters. Not only  
17 would there be a capital outlay, but there would also  
18 be a continuing operating cost.

19 I have not evaluated the cost of fire  
20 protection, but I have investigated wastewater  
21 collection. So here's some numbers, Option A, 30- to  
22 30 million for the plant, which would need one and a  
23 half to two acres. The question is where would it be  
24 placed for minimal impact? That initial capital cost  
25 would be followed by a 7- to 9 million operating cost,

1 increasing another million after eight years for  
2 capital improvement.

3 Option B would also be about 30- to 35 million  
4 with an additional 1 to \$2 million per year for  
5 operating cost.

6 Now, the question is would the property taxes  
7 just pay for the wastewater collection? Or would we  
8 have to start robbing our citizens of their services to  
9 provide services for this new community that we're  
10 building, this new high-end community?

11 I think it's incumbent on me as a City  
12 Councilmember to ensure that our citizens do not end up  
13 paying for someone else's services. It's important  
14 that we keep the fiscal end of this in mind. So I  
15 mean, 30 to 35 million plus 7 to 9 million on top of  
16 whatever it's going to cost for fire, for water, for  
17 electricity, and police -- you do the math. I don't  
18 think this project is going to pan out fiscally. And  
19 it's just going to cost too much.

20 RYAN SAWYER: Thank you.

21 Kelly Hammargren.

22 KELLY HAMMARGREN: That's me. I think I'm the  
23 last speaker of the evening.

24 I'm a relatively new member of CEPS, Citizens  
25 for East Shore Parks. And it's hard for me to believe

**Public Hearing  
PH24**

1 that we're really trying to update an EIR from 2011  
2 because so much has changed in that period of time.

3 And I think about my own understanding of  
4 climate and the climate catastrophe that we are  
5 currently in and my understanding of what's happening.  
6 It -- it's just unbelievable with all of those changes  
7 that we would try to make something that is old and out  
8 of date new and current instead of starting over and  
9 looking at this.

10 It's also hard to believe that we're really  
11 even thinking about building on this site.

12 I think about the times that I've gone out to  
13 Point Molate as an artist to paint and the road going  
14 in and out and putting 2200 units in that space. And  
15 what happens to those people if we have a catastrophe,  
16 if we have a fire? It's a death trap.

17 And where does that leave anyone who supports  
18 the decision to build and to place all those people in  
19 this kind of risk? And will we tell them, if we do  
20 that building, of what kind of risk they're in? Will  
21 they be fully informed to know what is behind them, the  
22 jet fuel, the crude oil?

23 And we have so many other places where we  
24 could build and really have good housing for people  
25 with transportation. And it would be so much better.

1 And we would not be destroying the open space. And  
2 I'll just stop there.

3 Thank you very much for the opportunity to  
4 speak to you.

5 RYAN SAWYER: Thank you.

6 DONNA BALL: Excuse me. I put in a speaker  
7 card but didn't get called.

8 RYAN SAWYER: Okay. If you could just state  
9 your name, then.

**Public Hearing** 10 DONNA BALL WITNESS: Sure. My name's  
**PH25** 11 Donna Ball, and I'm speaking as a resident and as the  
12 Habitat Restoration Director for Save the Bay.

13 This project needs to start fresh with a new  
14 EIR. The EIR that was previously prepared no longer  
15 applies to this land or to this project.

16 We've learned a lot over the last ten years  
17 about climate change, threats of sea level rise, and  
18 fire risk. And we also value our offshore and upland  
19 natural habitats and understand them more than we did  
20 ten years ago, especially their benefits to humans and  
21 the need to protect them. We also understand the value  
22 of this land to the Ohlone people and to the general  
23 public. And it's important that it's preserved as  
24 environmental space for all.

25 Further, we better understand the Bay Area and

1 the need for affordable housing, especially housing  
2 near transit which can mitigate the effect of CO2  
3 emissions.

4 This project is inconsistent with the Plan Bay  
5 Area policies for development, and it doesn't protect  
6 the watersheds that lead to the bay and, hence, doesn't  
7 protect the bay.

8 For these reasons, I advocate that the City  
9 start over and do a full new analysis. Previous EIS  
10 and EIR is not relevant to the current conditions. And  
11 as was stated earlier at the outset of this meeting,  
12 this project presents new and substantial more impacts,  
13 and so that warrants a new EIR. Thank you.

14 RYAN SAWYER: Is there anyone else that did  
15 not fill out a card and would like to make a comment?

16 (No response)

17 RYAN SAWYER: And -- okay. Would you like to  
18 close?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You've got a hand back  
20 here.

21 RYAN SAWYER: Oh, I didn't see you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Carol, go ahead.

23 CAROL: I just have a simple question. Are we  
24 going to have the comments presented to us in writing?

25 LINA VELASCO: Yes. So --

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And the responses?

2 LINA VELASCO SAWYER: So what happens now --  
3 first of all, thank you all for the comments.

4 As mentioned earlier, we do have a court  
5 reporter who is, you know, documenting all the comments  
6 that have been made. So we will get that in a few  
7 weeks. And once we do, we can provide it on our  
8 website.

9 So what happens is, typically, there's a  
10 scoping report that gets done, and it's included in the  
11 Draft EIR we'll put it. So if there's no actual  
12 responses to each comment. Instead, it's integrated  
13 into the Draft EIR, the feedback, and the comments and  
14 the analysis.

15 So -- but we'll go ahead and post the  
16 comments. Again, we'll post the comments we received  
17 as soon as we get them from our consultant who's been  
18 recording this evening.

19 So just a couple of items. We do have a  
20 sign-in sheet. If you're interested in receiving  
21 notices regarding future release of the Draft EIR  
22 and/or study sessions with the Design Review Board,  
23 Planning Commission, City Council, please sign up and  
24 just make sure your e-mail is legible. I often get a  
25 lot of kick-back. So please make sure, if you want to

1 get notices, you sign up.

2 Also, just thank you for participating in the  
3 process. And we'll be around if you have any specific  
4 questions. And I hope you all have a good evening.

5 (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded  
6 at 5:32 p.m.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25


1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
2 COUNTY OF MARIN ) ss.

3 I, DEBORAH FUQUA, a Certified Shorthand  
4 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify  
5 that the foregoing proceedings were reported by me, a  
6 disinterested person, and thereafter transcribed under  
7 my direction into typewriting and which typewriting is  
8 a true and correct transcription of said proceedings.

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the  
11 foregoing proceeding and caption named, nor in any way  
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said  
13 caption.

14 Dated the 12th day of August, 2019.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

  
DEBORAH FUQUA  
CSR NO. 12948