

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON FEBRUARY 2, 2026**

**PRESERVATION COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING  
Richmond Room, 450 Civic Center Plaza  
Richmond, CA 94804**

October 6, 2025  
5:30 P.M.

**MINUTES**

**Roll Call**

Chair Joann Pavlinec called the meeting to order at 5:31 P.M.

Present: Chair Joann Pavlinec, Vice Chair Caitlin Hibma; Commissioners Jerry Cole, Fatema Crane, Chad DeWitt, and Michael Hibma

Absent: None

Guests: Councilmember Soheila Bana

Staff Avery Stark, Planning Manager  
Michele Morris, Senior Planner/HPC Staff Liaison

**Approval of Minutes:** September 8, 2025

|   |
|---|
| <b>ACTION: It was M/S/C (M. Hibma/DeWitt) to approve the minutes of the September 8, 2025 meeting, as shown; approved by the following voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Pavlinec, Cole, Crane, DeWitt, C. Hibma, M. Hibma; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.</b> |
|---|

**Approval of Agenda:**

There were no changes to the agenda.

**Meeting Procedures**

The meeting procedures were as shown on the agenda.

**Public Forum**

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, spoke about the Brown Act.

KAYLYNN SCHREVE, Richmond. Ms. Schreve spoke about issues regarding a proposed driveway in Atchison Village at 140 Collins Street.

**Liaison Reports:** None

**Consent Calendar:** None

**Appeal Date:** Any action taken at the meeting must be appealed prior to 5:00 P.M. on Thursday, October 16, 2025.

**Public Hearings:** None

**Commission Business:**

A. Update on Historic Inventory Report

1. Update on the progress of consultant's work-to-date, discuss potential recommendations to move from planning stage to implementation and discuss an estimate of a project budget

[Note: The recording of the meeting started during this item.]

Planning Manager Avery Stark spoke to the Historic Inventory Report, the work done on a Prism Survey Report around 2014, and the City of Richmond's evaluation of all nationally, state and locally registered sites that were not on the City's list. He also referred to an additional 286 sites that had been listed since the survey report that would be potentially eligible for consideration in the new inventory report. He explained that separately the item would be brought back to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to ensure that everything listed was appropriately sited and all the boundaries for all 11 historic districts were accurate and well-articulated in a GIS map that would be shared with the HPC for review. He stated the GIS platform would capture all the relevant information and he sought any and all feedback related to each one of the projects and any related documents that could be linked to them.

Mr. Stark reported that staff would be taking the next 30 days or so to be comfortable with the information that would be shared with the HPC and that staff would work with the Richmond Historical Society and the Richmond Museum to begin the public process of engagement around the beginning of a repository, with the understanding that more would be considered to be added to the list and engaging the HPC and the City Council with that list. He had already seen a first draft of the map, which looked good at this point, but noted that the HPC would help determine whether or not everything had been captured.

Responding to questions, Mr. Stark clarified that there were 11 historic districts, some sites were not in the historic districts, and there were 723 established and recognized historic sites that would be included in the map, which had been done. There were also 12 historic sites whose locations had yet been clarified. All that information would be submitted to the HPC and the City Council for feedback. There were other sites that were being evaluated as potentially being historically significant, which would involve another discussion. The intent would also be to learn how to capture oral history in the City and expand the program to capture not only physical sites but take in oral history and other places of importance in the City that would need to be added to the story. There were also other sensitive archeological assets in the City that could be identified as part of the process but not be marked to keep them confidential to protect them.

Mr. Stark stated the consultant would be brought in for the meeting with the HPC for a formal presentation to get feedback and move on to the next step to gather more input and ultimately go back to the City Council to look at further programs that might need to be investigated for future funding that could not be accomplished with this first effort to gather a baseline.

Chair Pavlinec clarified with Mr. Stark that the 723 total established and recognized historic sites included the 286 additional sites. She verified that a portion of those sites would be documented prior to pursuing the commemorative signage and plaque portion of the plan to create a consistent plaque program for the City. She also verified that the consultants had

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON FEBRUARY 2, 2026

consulted with the Richmond Museum but had not consulted with the Point Richmond Historical Society.

Chair Pavlinec commented that the North and East neighborhood had done some historic research in at least portions of that neighborhood and it was recommended that the North and East Neighborhood Council be engaged to help in that regard.

Commissioner M. Hibma asked if the consultant had reached out to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to determine whether the NAHC had done a sacred lands file. He suggested there may be other conceptual resources to consider and recommended that a sacred lands file might fall into the confidential category of assets.

Chair Pavlinec also verified that staff was checking the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents to gather information on historic sites.

Mr. Stark affirmed that staff would be digitizing the entire catalog of Planning Department documents to be able to extract that type of information through regenerative AI, which would take some time.

Commissioner M. Hibma requested that Mr. Stark share the consultants' (ESA and EMC's) methodology for information gathering with the HPC.

Mr. Stark further clarified, when asked, that the historic inventory list was being prepared in response to a request from the City Council, and part of submitting an existing conditions report was to address where to go from here and whether through a windshield survey or continually reaching out to other organizations would be part of the recommendation to bring to the City Council to advise of additional work that might need to be done. He also clarified that the information included everything; city-owned and non-city-owned historic sites.

The next step and what would be returned to the HPC would be the existing conditions information that was being digitized, inventoried and mapped, with the return prior to the end of the year, and there would be a request to the City Council for a windshield survey that would be considered at a later date.

### **Council Liaison Report**

Councilmember Soheila Bana thanked the members of the Commission for their service and for working on the Historic Inventory Report that the City Council had initially budgeted with \$500,000.

When asked to clarify the timeline involved, Mr. Stark explained that as outlined in the agenda report, the Planning Department had 180 days to return to the City Council with an update based on the questions that Councilmembers Bana and Doria Robinson had imposed, in collaboration with the Historic Preservation Commission and sharing the work products being produced; the map itself and the historic sites that would be submitted to the HPC by next month. He added that staff had received the draft of the Mills Contract application and the matrix to be able to implement that program, and would work with the subcommittee established to review the Mills Contract.

In addition, EMC was working on the commemorative plaque program and taking existing conditions of what may be in the City of Richmond and comparing that with other cities' plaque programs to prepare a proposed right size plaque plan to be able to create the plaque program. Five projects had been identified: the map, the plaque program, protection measures, City

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON FEBRUARY 2, 2026**

structures currently identified as historic structures in the current Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), and identifying buildings that had an existing conditions report done to identify the range of cost to see what a program would look like to be able to assess protection measures.

Mr. Stark explained that each one would return to the HPC and each stakeholder entity for feedback prior to being submitted to the City Council for funding or for grant funding. On a case-by-case approach, uniform maintenance would be considered with mandated rules and other measures that could be taken to identify what more could be done and where to go from here, after which funding would be considered along with priorities between the various entities and the grant work to be done.

Councilmember Bana did not want too much redundancy. She referred to the plaques proposed that would tell the history of the historic sites, and she asked when the 180 days would be reached, and Mr. Stark advised that he expected to return to the City Council by the first of the year, definitely before the 180-day mark.

**Support Letter**

**ACTION: By an earlier motion and determination given the immediate need to take action on an item that had arisen after the posting of the meeting agenda, M/S/C (C. Hibma/DeWitt) a Support Letter for the East Brother Light Station to replace the deteriorated pier platform and gangway at East Brother Island was added to the meeting agenda for consideration; approved by a voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Pavlinec, Cole, Crane, DeWitt, C. Hibma, M. Hibma; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.**

Chair Pavlinec introduced the item requested by Tom Butt that the HPC send a letter of support to be used in grant applications for the East Brother Light Station to replace the deteriorated pier platform and gangway at East Brother Island at a cost of \$600,000, with information provided on the history of East Brother Light Station, how it fed into the community and offered historic perspective for members of the community and those outside of the community. She asked if the HPC supported the letter and/or whether there should be any amendments to the letter.

Chair Pavlinec recommended additional information to the letter to state that the East Brother Light Station was a California State Landmark and a National Historic Landmark.

The HPC supported the letter, proposed editorial amendments to the letter, requested that a letterhead be created for the HPC, and asked who would sign the letter.

Chair Pavlinec recommended that the letter be adopted, with changes, to support the project and she offered to sign the letter as Chair of the HPC.

On the discussion of how to make changes to the support letter and how to get Commission approval of the letter within the timeframe required just after the next scheduled meeting, it was recommended that the HPC send a letter of support for the East Brother Light Station grant application process after being amended.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (C. Hibma/DeWitt) to allow edits to be made by Commissioners to a letter of support that would be compiled by staff for the Chair's signature for the East Brother Light Station; later amended by M/S/C (Crane/M. Hibma) to send a letter of support for the East Brother Light Station grant application process that would be amended by Commissioners and refined by staff for HPC review at the meeting on November 3, 2025; approved by a voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Pavlinec, Cole, Crane, DeWitt, C. Hibma, M. Hibma; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.**

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:32 P.M.