

# **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE PC MEETING ON OCTOBER 15, 2020**

## **PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RICHMOND CITY HALL**

Teleconference  
August 17, 2020  
6:30 p.m.

### **COMMISSION MEMBERS**

David Tucker, Chair	Andrew Butt, Vice Chair
Nancy Baer	Jen Loy
Michael Huang	Vacant
Vacant	

The regular meeting was called to order by Chair Tucker at 6:30 p.m.

### **ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair David Tucker, Vice Chair Andrew Butt; Commissioner Nancy Baer, Jen Loy, and Yu-Hsiang (Michael) Huang

**Absent:**

### **INTRODUCTIONS**

**Staff Present:** Planning Staff: Roberta Feliciano, Emily Carroll, Director of Planning Lina Velasco, and Attorney James Atencio

**MINUTES** – None.

### **AGENDA**

Chair Tucker provided an overview of meeting procedures for speaker registration, public comment, and public hearing functions. He said items approved by the Commission may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk by Thursday, August 27, 2020, by 5:00 p.m.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR –**

Chair Tucker gave a brief overview of the consent calendar's policies and procedures.

- 1. PLN20-200: Enterprise Rent-A-Car CUP PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for a Use Permit to re-establish a large vehicle and equipment rental, a non-confirming use at 3080 Hilltop Mall Road (APN: 405-303- 012). CM-5, Commercial Mixed-Use, Activity Center District. Klose Partners LLC, owner; Enterprise Rent-A-Car, applicant Planner: Roberta Feliciano Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Loy, Butt) to accept Staff's recommendation for conditional approval for PLN20-200; which carried by the following vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Tucker, Baer, Butt, Huang, Loy; Noes: None).**

### **BROWN ACT – Public Forum**

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of Trails for Richmond Action Committee (TRAC), announced that the Bay Trail has been very popular during the COVID-19 pandemic. The most recent Bay Trail construction project underway is along Goodrick Avenue.

ANDRE SOTO urged the Planning Commission to meet with City Council and initiate a task force regarding refinery decommissioning.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

**2. PLN20-057: Point Molate Mixed-Used Development Project PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a recommendation to the City Council on the: Certification of the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report including adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, CEQA Findings of Fact, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations; General Plan text and map amendments; Rezoning the project site to Planned Area (PA) district with an – H, Historic district overlay over the Winehaven Historic District and a –S, Shoreline Overlay for the shoreline band area; a Development Agreement, a Large Lot Vesting Tentative Map; Conditional Use Permit, and a major Design Review of the PA Plan and the Point Molate Design Guidelines for the proposed Point Molate Mixed-Use Development Project, which proposes a mix of residential and non-residential uses, including office space and retail, along with open space including recreational areas, parks, trails (including a 1.5 mile portion of the San Francisco Bay Trail), vista overlooks, and other similar spaces open to the public at 2100 Stenmark Drive (APN: 561-100-008). Existing Zoning: RM-1, Medium Density Multi-Family Residential; RH, Single Family Hillside Residential; PR, Parks and Recreation; CG, Commercial General; IL, Industrial Light; and OS, Open Space District. The project also includes infrastructure and roadway improvements needed to support the proposed development. Additional project information is online at: <http://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/3757/Point-Molate-Mixed-Use-Project> City of Richmond, owner; Winehaven Legacy LLC, applicant Planner: Lina Velasco and Roberta Feliciano Tentative Recommendation: Recommend Conditional Approval to City Council and Certification of SEIR

Ms. Velasco introduced the consultants who worked on the project with the City. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt Resolution No. 20-12.

The project site is located on the San Pablo Peninsula, access to the project site is from Stenmark Drive off Interstate 580 and the National Historic District of Winehaven is located on the site.

She reviewed the recommended changes to the General Plan Land Use Classifications, General Plan Text Amendments regarding Land Use Classifications, and General Plan Map Amendments that would reflect the proposed land-use changes. The project was found to be consistent with several General Plan's goals and policies; including Goal LU1, Goal LU4, CR1, CR2, and EC2 among several others.

The recommended Zoning Map Amendments would reclassify the project site as a Planned Area District, change the L Overlay to an H overlay and maintain the S Overlay over the shoreline.

The Large-Lot Vesting Tentative Map included a recommendation to subdivide the property into 44 development parcels, 7 Open Space parcels, 3 right of way dedication parcels, 2 water parcels, and 1 utility parcel. Included was a Master Association for all residential and commercial owners that are required to fund the ongoing operations and management of the sites.

The new zoning designation for the site was Planned Area District which is intended to facilitate the orderly development of larger sites consistent with the General Plan. The applicant has submitted a Master Planned Area Plan (PA Plan) to guide future development of the project site as well as Design Guidelines that would be used to guide architectural components of the project. Future development on the site would require additional City entitlements and approvals.

The Master PA Plan identified eight planning areas, A through H. The Winehaven Historic District would include rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of existing contributing structures along with newly constructed structures. The PA Plan allowed up to 2,040 residential units. The Historic District Planned Areas F, G, and H allowed up to 1,098 residential units along with 40,000-square feet of general commercial space. The Planned Areas A and E allowed up to 15,000-square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial spaces and Planned Areas D, E, and F permitted 10,000-square feet of cultural and/or civic uses.

The Design Guidelines were reviewed by the Design Review Board and included the Historic Conservation Plan which coincided with the H Overlay and the Planned Area District Zoning.

The submitted application was for the Refined Project and it included 1,452 residential units, approximately 375,000-square feet of rehabilitated existing historical structures, and approximately 250,000-square feet of new construction. It also included 15,000-square feet of neighborhood retail outside of the Winehaven Historic District, 10,000-square feet for a joint fire station and police substation, and 70 percent of the total above water portion of the project would remain as open space. The project included updating an existing terminal on the pier for water transit, new roads, utilities, and infrastructure improvements. Subsequent entitlements for future projects would be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator to ensure that projects that fell outside of the Refined Project complied with the SEIR and the capacity of the Planned Area District Zoning.

The Refined Project included a Development Agreement that negotiated customized vested rights; froze zoning, planning, and applicable fees at the time of the project approval; as well as required the applicant to fund financial and public benefits beyond Nexus and Proportionality Requirements. Other benefits listed in the Development Agreement beyond vested rights included funding for Bay Trail improvements on-site and off-site, Disposition and Development Agreement obligations, creation of a Community Facilities District, and stormwater facilities and maintenance.

The Refined Project application included a request for a Conditional Use Permit to ensure that public access is maintained along the shoreline.

The Design Review Board recommended that the Planning Commission approve the Design Guidelines with additional conditions Number 7 through 39 included.

The Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the project and voted to recommend approval of the project to the Planning Commission.

Kathleen Diohep, Bay Area Economics, provided a summary of the Fiscal Impact Analysis. It was predicted that the project would generate more taxes and fee revenues than the new expenses both after first phase and at buildout. The land sale proceeds and the Transfer Taxes would provide one-time revenues to the City.

Bibiana Alvarez, Analytical Environmental Services (AES), gave a brief overview of the SEIR and CEQA presentation that the Commission received at their August 6, 2020 meeting. The Draft SEIR analyzed five project alternatives. The proposed project generated a Less-Than Significant Impact on Land use and Planning as well as Population and Housing. The draft SEIR found a Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigations for several areas including Noise, Energy, and Biological Resources. The Final SEIR included the Draft SEIR and the Response to Comments Document. Also, included were the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations which concluded that the project's significant and unavoidable effects and adverse effects are considered acceptable.

Ms. Alvarez presented answers to questions that were brought up during the August 6, 2020, Planning Commission meeting. All Point Molate documents are available to the public online. The timeframe for the project is 18-24 months for the Design and Engineering phase and 7 to 9 years for construction. In terms of emergency evacuations, the site included a joint fire and police station as well as widening Stenmark Drive to accommodate 12-foot vehicle travel lanes and 5-foot bicycle lanes. The Draft SEIR does require an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) which pointed out emergency evacuation routes via land and water. The Draft ERP is included in the Response to Comments Document and is subject to City review and revisions. In terms of wildfires, the project is subject to the City's Zoning Ordinance Article VIII (Fire) Section 8.16.080, and impacts associated with wildfires were addressed in the Draft SEIR Impact 4.7.5 and 4.7.6. Mitigations were set in place to minimize fuel reduction, minimize fire ignition during construction from equipment, and a required Wildfire Emergency Response Plan (WERP). The Draft WERP was included in the Response to Comments Document, has been reviewed by the Fire Marshal and is subject to further review and revisions by the City. In terms of consistency with the General Plan, if the General Plan Amendments and rezoning changes are approved, then the project would be found in compliance with the City's General Plan. Regarding consistency with the Reuse Plan, the Draft SEIR, Impact 4.9.1, found the project to be generally consistent with the Reuse Plan and would generally adhere to the basis of several of the proposed development area ideas. Regarding Significant and Unavoidable Impacts cumulative Green House Gas Emissions and traffic congestion, the Draft SEIR called out these areas and recommendation mitigations in the document. The project team used a net-zero Green House Gas threshold because there was no established threshold existing, which resulted in a rating of Significant and Unavoidable Impact. The Draft SEIR laid out mitigation measures, which included a Green House Gas Reduction Plan (GHGRP), that would help reduce Green House Gas emissions. The only way the project could be brought down to a net-zero level emission was for the project to purchase carbon offset credits. Offset credits may not be available and the City could not enforce such a condition. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts regarding traffic, major intersections such as Blume Drive/Interstate 80, Stenmark Drive and Dutra Materials, were already failing LOS standards and would continue to fail LOS standards even if the project was never developed. The Draft SEIR recommended mitigation measures, but because the mitigation measures were outside City Control, the City could not enforce them. However, permits to complete the mitigations would be requested and if granted then the impacts would be reduced to Less-Than-Significant. A comment was made that a Traffic Study listed in the Draft SEIR that was not refuted in the Final EIR. The Traffic Study did not evaluate the traffic impacts for the proposed project and many road improvements that were listed in the Community Plan were planned for the proposed project.

Impact 4.2.3 of the Draft SEIR found that Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 (h) for air quality impacts may not be feasible and thus found the impact to be Significant and Unavoidable. The applicant has confirmed that all Bay Area water taxis and WETA can support Tier 4 engines. CARB has drafted propose code changes to require all vessels to meet Tier 4 engines. The City will require that any ferry or water taxi that services the project have a Tier 4 engine which would reduce the Impact of 4.2.3 to Less Than Significant with Mitigations.

Any concerns or questions raised by the comment letter O15 that was drafted by SWAPE regarding air quality can be addressed by Staff. Tribal consultations were conducted and initiated between the City and the Guidiville Indian Rancheria, Confederated Villages of Lisjan, and Wilton Rancheria. Mitigation Measure 4.4-3, 4.4-4, 4.4-6, and 4.4-7 required tribal monitoring during construction of the project. The City sought input from the Lisjan Tribe regarding the Cultural Resources Data Recovery Plan which is included in the Response to Comments document.

The City has received an additional 370 comments outside of the SEIR comment period. None of the comments triggered a recirculation of the Draft SEIR or Response to Comment document. It was found that the Community Plan would not improve traffic congestion due to several intersections already operating below standard Level of Service (LOS) requirements. The Community Plan would not avoid the majority of Significant and Unavoidable Impacts, it proposed demolition of contributing historic structures, and the Community Plan did not meet all project objectives.

Vice-Chair Butt requested more information regarding mitigations measures that could be implemented by entities outside of the City and the difference between LOS and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Ms. Alvarez reported that the City did not have a threshold for VMT, so in the Draft SEIR the City used the LOS thresholds. Under VMT specific intersections would not have been analyzed. Steve Abrams, Traffic Consultant, reiterated that the intersections that are under the jurisdiction of the county and Caltrans, those improvements were not guaranteed. A pilot program on Interstate 580 was conducted by Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and could improve the intersection to acceptable standards. The traffic study did not take into account the COVID-19 impacts and teleworking.

Commissioner Loy and Mr. Abrams discussed the State of California's push to moving to VMT instead of LOS. Mr. Abrams stressed that the change would not tie Commissioner's hand regarding mitigations they believed to be appropriate for projects.

Commissioner Huang asked what the timeframe is if the applicant submitted permits to improve intersections. Mr. Abrams did not know the answer but predicted it would be roughly a year to start construction at those intersections.

Chair Tucker asked how the Community Facility District would operate on the site. Ms. Velasco answered that only the components of the project would contribute to the Community Facility District. Ms. Diohep added that it would result in \$6,000 a year of additional assessments and the City would not be responsible for those additional costs.

Commissioner Baer inquired what the traffic increase would be if the project is constructed and what the LOS would be for residents leaving the property. Mr. Abrams disclosed that LOS for residents exiting the property is acceptable, but there was a minimal increase of LOS for Interstate 580.

Nicole Emmons, a consultant, gave the timeline of the project as it has moved through the City's process, Commission, and Board reviews. The project has morphed over the timeline into something that the public and the City has helped shape into a preferred project. The goals of the plan were to conform to the goals of the General Plan including public access to Point Molate, public access to open space, public access to trails, public access to a new beach park, and to provide a walkable pedestrian scaled community.

The General Plan modifications that the project requested included an increase of FAR so that the buildings in the Winehaven Historic District could be renovated and reused. An additional range of density was being requested due to topographical constraints that were unique to the site. An additional request included a height allowance in the Design Guidelines to provide variety and diversity among the site.

Per comments that were provided by the public, the proposed project is environmentally sensitive and is informed by the land. The underground storage tanks will be removed, maintenance for parks and open space will be provided, and the Bay Trail will be constructed to run through the site by the applicant.

As encouraged by the public and the City east/west connectivity trails and greenways would be provided within the project for access from the open space to the shoreline throughout the development.

Peter Kindel, consultant, emphasized that Winehaven is a historic legacy that is located on the project site and will be preserved, restored, and reused in a way that will bring benefits to the proposed community as well as the public. The project proposed that 10-acres of public open space be located within the Winehaven District.

Ms. Emmons requested that the zoning recommendations that were provided by the Design Review Board, Conditions of Approval 16 through 25, not be recommended for adoption. Ms. Emmons explained that the existing proposal for zoning allowed for flexibility in diversity and a range of housing types.

If approved, Phase 1 of the project would begin grading in the second quarter of 2022 and the historic structures would begin the restoration process once utilities were established.

Commissioner Baer asked what the specific impacts would be for the Design Reviewed Board's Conditions of Approval that were being requested not to be adopted. Ms. Emmons answered that those conditions would decrease density as well as decrease product type and diversity of product type.

Commissioner Loy inquired if the Design Review Board had mentioned any comments regarding the request from the applicant to not adopt their recommended Conditions of Approval. Ms. Velasco reported that Staff proposed that the Conditions of Approval 16 through 25 be restructured and be expressed as a preferred development pattern within the Design Guidelines. Staff did not have enough time to analyze all of the potential impacts of such a change.

Vice-Chair Butt added that the Conditions of Approval that were recommended from the Design Review Board were to ensure that high-density structures would not be included in the project and to maintain the open space feel of the project. He announced he supported the Design Review Board's recommendations for their proposed Conditions of Approval and Commissioner

Baer agreed with that remark. Ms. Emmons proclaimed that there is no issue with the height requirements, but with the front and rear setbacks as well as the lot coverage.

Regarding Chair Tucker's questions, Ms. Velasco answered that Staff continues to study the impacts regarding the Conditions of Approval set forward by the Design Review Board as well as Staff's proposed restructure of those conditions.

Public Comment:

DENNIS SHUSTERMEN reported that in a wildfire people would not be able to evacuate Point Molate quickly which would result in many lives lost and that the evacuation plan needed to be revised.

ELSA STEVENS reported that 85 people died in the Paradise fire of 2018 because there was only one road to and from the area. She foresaw the same thing would happen at Point Molate. She was concerned about the Eel Grass beds getting destroyed and equally concerned about the funding that was raised to make Point Molate a public park.

KATRINKA RUK, spoke on behalf of the Council of Industries, supported the project that was being presented by SunCal. The project would bring jobs, revenue, and housing to the City of Richmond.

TOM HANSEN, Business Manager of the Electricians Union IBW Local 302, disclosed his support for the project.

SCOTT LITTLEHALE, a resident of Richmond and a representative of Carpenters Local Union 152, thanked Ms. Velasco for addressing questions about concerns regarding the Development Agreement. The Carpenters Union looked forward to the City Council adopting a Development Agreement that included binding language that supported the hiring of local contractors.

TIM LIPSCOMB, Director of Organizing for the Northern California Carpenters Union, explained that the Carpenters Union supported many Richmond residents who were in the union's apprenticeship program. He urged the Commission to require SunCal not to exclude the Carpenters Union in their local hiring agreements.

JEAN COURTS, Richmond resident, believed that the consultants had skewed the concerns regarding the impacts that were deemed as Significant and Unavoidable. She emphasized that the City should conserve the South Water Shed and all areas outside of the Historic Winehaven District should be set aside for a public park. She believed a smaller housing development inside the Winehaven District would result in no need for a fire and police station. She noted that there is no time constraint put on the developer to build the homes. In terms of trade jobs, vacant lots were splashed among the inner-City limits and she suggested that affordable housing be built in those areas with local trade union workers.

DAVID HELVARG, a Richmond resident, believed that the environmental impacts the project would bring to the area, the poorly revised evacuation plan, and the push back regarding the Design Review Board's recommendations were cause for the Planning Commission to delay certification. He noted that a new report that was just released showed that City's with low-income communities of color often had small public parks and City's with predominant white populations had more access to parks and green spaces.

ANDRES SOTO, representing Communities for a Better Environment, affirmed that the battle to either leave Point Molate as is or build high-end housing for rich folks was an issue of racial and social injustice. He urged the Commission to reject the project.

RICHARD WISE shared that he is in favor of the SunCal development. He restated that the project met all the goals of the 2018 Point Molate Vision Report and there were several public benefits included in the project.

PAUL KILKENNY, a Richmond resident, voiced frustration regarding the process the project has been taking, how the project plans to destroy endangered habitats, and that the project disrespected the tribes that once lived off the land. He concluded that the Commission should vote no on all requests the applicant was asking for.

HILDA, Richmond resident, expressed that many hotels pay minimum wage, do not provide employees with benefits, and often employees are treated badly. She announced that more reputable jobs need to be brought to Richmond. before any hotels are built she urged the City to request all information regarding the operator and economic impacts.

GAYLE MCLAUGHLIN, a former Mayor of Richmond, urged the Commission to not recommend the flawed EIR and the SunCal plan for Point Molate. She saw too many shocking concerns regarding fire hazards, traffic impacts, protection of habitats, Green House Gas emissions, and many more.

BRIAN HOLT, Chief of Planning Trails and GIS for the East Bay Regional Park District, shared that the district continues to engage in conversations with staff and the applicant about a regional shoreline park at Point Molate. They shared the publics' concerns regarding wildfires.

JANET JOHNSON, a coordinator of Sunflower Alliance, addressed the issue of fire risk and Point Molate's adjacency to the refinery. The combination of the refinery and inadequate access and escape routes made the project risky.

JIM HANSON, Chairmen of the Conservation Committee for the East Bay Chapter of the California Plant Society, commented that the Vested Maps showed development areas with open space acreage and that is not explained in detail in the Draft SEIR. Also, the Grading Map showed grading taking place within the protected open space. He wanted to hear what Staff had to say about those issues.

ALEX KNOX, Richmond resident, saw the site as a matter of racial justice and urged the Commission to approve the project.

ELIZABETH DOUGHERTY asked where the City planned to relocate all the current species who lived on Point Molate. She emphasized that green infrastructure is needed because of stormwater. She agreed with Mr. Helvard's (phonetics) comments.

BRUCE BRUBAKER, Vice-Chair of TRAC, reported that TRAC has sent a letter to the Commission that proposed revisions to the Development Agreement Conditions. Under Section 2.1.3.1, TRAC recommended that the contribution should be increased to \$3.2 million. Under Section 2.1.3.2, TRAC advised that the funding amount should be increased to \$1.0 million.

STEWART FLASHMAN represented Citizens for the East Shore Parks and Point Molate Alliance, pointed out that there have been several attempts to develop the land and all projects have

resulted in lawsuits against the City. The project was not safe and he requested that the Commission double check to see if the project is consistent with the General Plan.

JENNA MULCARICK was against the project and that private development by SunCal would be a permanent loss for the people of Richmond. She emphasized that it was clear that the majority of the community opposed SunCal's plan.

JOHN DALRYMPLE, a co-founder of Richmond Vision 2000, represented trade worker's families who were in support of the project. An agreement was in place to hire local trades workers to work on the proposed project. He emphasized that if the project is not approved, the former owners had no obligation to do a Development Agreement.

JOHN ROSENFELD, a senior scientist for San Francisco Baykeeper, opposed the proposed development at Point Molate. The group favored Option D, Development by Local Citizens and Community Organizations. The proposed project would destroy habitat on land as well as in the water.

MICHELLE RAPAPORT asked the Commission to vote against the certification. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the public has not had a chance to fully participate in the process. The project would put more of a burden on an aging sewer system and Richmond residents would have to pay for the damages that would be caused.

LUCIE GILL, a Richmond resident, reported that from a cultural researcher's preservative it was irresponsible to approve the Final SEIR. The City failed to reach out and consult with the Lisjan Tribe. The Lisjan Tribe sent a letter to the City expressing their opposition to the project.

EDWARD CORVID, a Richmond resident, supported the SunCal project because it would provide jobs and affordable housing for Richmond residents.

MICHELLE HOOK, a Member of TRAC, supported comments made by Mr. Brubaker. She requested the Commission to amend language regarding Item 6 of Bay Trail, that the Phasing Plan on the Vesting Tentative Map is inconsistent with Condition 6A, and that the Commission delete the proposed General Plan Amendment regarding the San Pablo General Plan.

AMANDA LUCUS, a Richmond resident, concurred that the proposed project was trying to fit too many residents on Point Molate which would cause tremendous traffic issues. She was not in support of the project for that reason. She requested that a decision be made after the COVID-19 pandemic is over.

MADALINE MARROW disclosed that the community has recently discovered Point Molate and it is being used more and more as a park as the time passes. She didn't want to see the point be privatized and removed from community access.

JORDAN BROWN urged the Planning Commission not to certify the Final SEIR which underestimated the cultural resources and the impacts of development at the site. The shell mounds located on Point Molate were valuable cultural resources.

TARNELL ABBOT pressed that the site was inappropriate for housing, but she supported the restoration of Winehaven. She was concerned about losing the Eel Grass beds and the loss of habitats.

SALLY TOBIN, a Richmond resident, reported that the General Plan stated that natural drainage should be left undisturbed. She proclaimed that stormwater would increase because of all the paving and there has been no study analyzing the impacts of freshwater flooding the Eel Grass beds.

MELISSA MURPHY, a resident of El Cerrito, wished to see the undeveloped short line preserved. She requested that the Commission not approve the additional FAR.

LAURA CUMMINGHAM was very disappointed to hear limited discussion on the very high value of open space and no discussion on conserving the rare coastal prairies and native plants of the area. She did not want the Commission to approve certification for the project.

DEBRA DOCTOR wanted to see the City of Richmond build accessible housing for people with disabilities.

CYNTHIA MARTINEZ read a letter into the record from Sandra Escalante, President of Laner Electric Supply. Ms. Escalante was proud to support SunCal's plan for Point Molate because the project was committed to hiring locally for the construction of the project.

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of TRAC, requested that the Commission adopt revisions to the Planned Area Plan definitions, Zoning Map, and Design Guidelines so that features like tot lots, neighborhood parks, and the East Bay Mud Water Tank weren't counted toward the open space requirement.

LAURA THOMAS opposed the project and wished to see Point Molate preserved as a natural resource.

MJ PAUL, a small business owner in Richmond, relied on large commercial projects to support his lighting sales business and for that reason, he supported the project. He was supportive of the growth that the project would bring to the City of Richmond.

PAUL CARMON, a Richmond resident, reported that he had written a lengthy letter to the Commission and requested that the Commission reject the plan and the Draft SEIR. He saw several flaws in the Financial Report.

ASHLEY wanted to see Point Molate be developed for all of Richmond to enjoy. She read a letter that was signed by several business owners that expressed support for the SunCal project.

RASHEED supported a collaborative vision for Point Molate that benefited all of Richmond. Point Molate for All, a business industry alliance, submitted over 200 letters of support for the project.

JAMES LEE, CEO and President of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, expressed that the Chamber of Commerce supported the Point Molate project because it would create jobs and encourage growth in the community.

TONI HANNA, a Richmond resident and realtor, believed having homes located on Point Molate was a terrible idea because it was located near a refinery as well as it had limited egress and ingress accesses. She wanted to see infill housing built instead. She supported the Community Plan.

SONYA CARABELL, a representative of Unite Here Local 2850, requested that the proposal be amended to include language that supported fair and just jobs for hotel workers as well as name the operators of any hotels.

KYANI CORBET, a resident of Richmond, supported the development of Point Molate because it supported much-needed jobs and growth for the community. She liked the proposed trails and restoration of the Winehaven District.

STEVE GRILLOW, an employee of PCI, supported the project because it would clean up the area and make it safe for the community. In terms of COVID-19, he saw the project as a boost for the community's moral, for businesses and jobs.

JEFF GILBREATH, a prior Planning Commissioner, saw three risks that were not being discussed honestly. The Draft SEIR did not disclose how quickly copious amounts of cars could get out off Point Molate in the event of an emergency as well as for the morning commute. He saw a major flaw in the financial report.

BILL BEARISH pointed out that all the speakers in favor of the project who spoke had a financial interest in the project but not community interest. He declared that the unmitigated issues were glossed over and not properly addressed. He concluded that any emergency that took place on Point Molate would be a regional issue. He urged the Commission to reject the plan entirely.

STEPHANIE read a letter from the Coronado Neighborhood Council which stated that they wished to see Pointe Molate developed and that the project would bring more jobs, affordable housing, and retail amenities to the community.

CYDIA GARCIA, a Member of Trac, summarized previous TRAC speakers' comments which coincided with the recommendations that TRAC had listed in their letter that was sent to the Planning Commission.

LAWRENCE ABBOT reiterated that Point Molate contains fuel for wildfires and putting housing in such a high-risk area is wrong.

MIKE PARKER, a Richmond resident, opposed the project because there was never a period of open bidding, the increase in traffic congestion and that the funding was shaky.

KELLY HAMERGRAM agreed with all previous speaker's comments regarding fire danger, greenhouse gas emissions, traffic, and economics. She requested that the Commission retain the recommendations from the Design Review Board, require that there be a labor agreement to hire local Richmond residents, require the hiring of Richmond resident for ongoing maintenance after construction is completed, require more inclusionary affordable housing units for low and very low incomes, consider groundwater, and make sure the contract protects the City if SunCal declares bankruptcy.

JOE LEE FISHER BROKER supported the project but was appalled to see that many of the people who spoke in opposition of the project were not from the City of Richmond. He emphasized that the vast majority of Point Molate is closed to the public currently because of hazardous materials.

PAM STELLO, a Richmond resident, confirmed that there is a public benefit to preserving plant and wildlife habitats. For those reasons, she opposed the project.

MAXINE FISHER, a Richmond resident and member of the Coronado Neighborhood Council, was in favor of beautifying Point Molate but expressed concern that parks located within Richmond were not maintained well and wished to see the City focus more on those areas.

Commissioner Baer requested to hear from the Fire Marshal regarding the evacuation plan at the August 20, 2020 meeting.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Tucker, Huang) to reconvene the meeting at a special meeting on August 20, 2020, at 6:30 pm for further discussion on the Point Molate project and to continue the item at the August 20, 2020 meeting; which carried by the following vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Tucker, Baer, Butt, Loy, Huang; Noes: None).**

**STUDY SESSION** -None.

**COMMISSION BUSINESS**

7. **Reports of Officers, Commissioners and Staff** – None.
  
8. **Adjournment** - The meeting was adjourned at 11:34 p.m. to the next regular meeting on August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020.