

**PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RICHMOND CITY HALL**
450 Civic Center Drive, Richmond, CA
October 15, 2015
6:30 p.m.

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Sheryl Lane, Chair	Marilyn Langlois, Vice Chair
Nancy Baer	Andrew Butt
Ben Choi, Secretary	Jeffrey Kilbreth
Jen Loy	

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

Chair Lane led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Sheryl Lane; Vice Chair Marilyn Langlois; Secretary Ben Choi; Commissioners Nancy Baer, Andrew Butt, Jeffrey Kilbreth and Jen Loy

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planning Staff: Senior Planner Lina Velasco, Associate Planner Roberta Feliciano, Director of Planning and Building Services Richard Mitchell and Assistant City Attorney Rachel Sommovilla

MINUTES

Commissioner Baer requested that the voting record be amended on all minutes to reflect "Commissioner Baer" instead of "Commissioner Willis".

March 19, 2015

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Butt/Kilbreth) to approve the minutes of March 19, 2015, as amended; which carried unanimously by the following vote: 6-0-1 (Ayes: Baer, Butt, Choi, Kilbreth, Langlois and Lane; Noes: None; Abstain: Loy).

April 2, 2015

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Langlois/Choi) to approve the minutes of April 2, 2015, as amended; which carried unanimously by the following vote: 6-0-1 (Ayes: Baer, Butt, Choi, Kilbreth, Langlois and Lane; Noes: None; Abstain: Loy).

April 23, 2015

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Choi/Baer) to approve the minutes of April 23, 2015, as amended; which carried unanimously by the following vote: 6-0-1 (Ayes: Baer, Butt, Choi, Kilbreth, Langlois and Lane; Noes: None; Abstain: Loy).

May 7, 2015

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Baer/Butt) to approve the minutes of May 7, 2015, as amended; which carried unanimously by the following vote: 7-0 (Ayes: Baer, Butt, Choi, Kilbreth, Langlois, Loy and Lane; Noes: None).

AGENDA

Chair Lane provided an overview of meeting procedures for speaker registration, public comment and public hearing functions. She said items approved by the Commission may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk by Monday, October 26, 2015, by 5:00 p.m. and as needed, announced the appeal process after each affected item.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Lane stated there were no Consent Calendar items.

Brown Act – Public Forum

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, spoke regarding the 7-Eleven's CUP and asked that it return to the Planning Commission due to problems relating to crime.

NEW ITEM

1. **PLN15-529: Jimi Z Grill - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a Conditional Use Permit to allow an eating establishment to operate at the Golden Gate Meat Company Distribution Center at 803 Wright Ave. (APN: 560-231-010). M-4, Marine Industrial District. 803 Wright Avenue Investors, owner; Gary Le, applicant; Planner: David Brosky. Tentative Recommendation: Withdrawn

Chair Lane announced that this item was withdrawn.

PRESENTATIONS

2. **PLN13-108: Richmond Bay Specific Plan - PRESENTATION** of the Draft Richmond Bay Specific Plan (RBSP) (Formerly known as the South Shoreline Specific Plan). The RBSP is a long-term Planning document intended to facilitate the creation of a sustainable shoreline district providing jobs, housing, transportation options, entertainment, and recreation in the Plan Area. The Plan Area consists of approximately 220 acres, located in the City of Richmond, South of Interstate 580. City of Richmond, applicant; Planner: Lina Velasco. Tentative Recommendation: Receive Presentation.

Senior Planner Lina Velasco gave the staff report, noted that staff has revised the Specific Plan's name change as brought forward by Berkeley Global Campus at Richmond Bay. She said Stefan Pellegrini from Opticos Design, Inc., Principal Project Manager is present from the consultant team. She spoke about the public input process and said a project advisory group

included various neighborhood councils, stakeholders and businesses in the area which Mr. Pellegrini will summarize. Staff's goal is to provide a broad overview of the plan to assist the Planning Commission in its review as well as assist the public. A 45-day comment period will be held after which time comments can be responded and appropriate revisions made. Staff will also conduct a similar presentation at the City Council meeting on October 27th.

Stefan Pellegrini, Opticos Design, Inc., Berkeley, introduced the draft specific plan to the Planning Commission, stating he will provide a broad overview and clarify and answer questions of the Commission.

Mr. Pellegrini displayed a PowerPoint presentation, stating they started the process in March 2013 and the project was made possible through a PDA funding grant from MTC/ABAG. A series of three public workshops were held in June, July and August and results from those workshops resulted in a recommended land use alternative heard by the Commission and Council in April and May 2014. Thereafter, the draft was put together for the City's review and the public draft of the plan was released on October 1, 2014. Comments were received from stakeholders in the property's area and he presented images from the community input process.

He stated the Specific Plan has 7 chapters and he said he would spend most of his presentation discussing Chapters 3 and 4 and can take questions. He referred to the Introduction Chapter which describes the plan and its relationship to planning initiatives. Chapter 2 is Background and Siting and takes the key components of the background analysis and summarizes those components. The project area is described as Change Areas 15 and 16 in the South Shoreline Area which he noted were outlined in red as well as the PDA map outlined in purple.

The project includes 4 key goals and actions and programs outlined in the Implementation Chapter are organized to respond to these goals, which he briefly described:

- Goal 1: Create complete pedestrian-oriented mixed use neighborhoods in the project area.
- Goal 2: Provide increased access to open space, particularly shoreline amenities.
- Goal 3: Improve an efficient multi-modal connectivity plan, which will allow the buildout of the project area to occur.
- Goal 4: Increase and optimize community economic development opportunities.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the area has a changing industrial site, has several properties subject to hazardous materials clean-up and he noted that some properties are undergoing remediation.

Regarding Chapter 3, Mr. Pellegrini stated this chapter provides a vision and overall policy direction for what the community and City would like to see in the project area. Chapter 4 responds with development standards that are designed to implement that vision.

There are 4 key principles framed in Chapter 3: 1) organize complete neighborhoods with centers and a 5-minute walkshed; 2) to strengthen more north/south and east/west connections to enhance connectivity; 3) develop and maintain the downtown relationship with the global campus; 4) to encourage flexibility that can accommodate incremental development patterns.

Mr. Pellegrini said the program which emerged from discussing of the preferred land use alternative in 2014 is the basis for the analysis in the EIR. This includes 5.7 million square feet of research and development, related business, service and office uses, about 720,000 square feet of retail up to about 4,100 residential units and a total of 140 acres of open space. They

implemented the land use map with a series of regulated zone districts in a familiar format used elsewhere in the City. The plan takes this land use map and implements it with a series of transect zones which provide familiar language of what is occurring in other plans in the community. He described the following transect zones:

1. The Special District R&D Zone which emphasizes research and development and office uses, but still allows some related uses to occur.
2. The T-5 Main Street Environment which is intended to provide mixed use buildings that have commercial and service uses on the ground floor with residential and office above.
3. The T-5 Neighborhood Zone which leans more toward residential activities, but still allows for horizontal and vertical mixed use.

Mr. Pellegrini then briefly illustrated and discussed various sub-areas and intended vision described in Chapter 3, the how the regulating plan is used to implement the vision. He provided an overview of the plan's inclusion of long-term transit networks, ideas for shuttle buses, and other transit alternatives used to bring people to and from the shoreline. He said the plan proposes changes to truck routes to be more in line with the future land use vision and there is an emphasis on off-street Class I bike facilities.

Chapter 4 includes street types recommended for specific locations and are designed to be flexible. The standards are designed to guide building scale projects and larger community scaled projects where applicants will be required to provide a network of streets and walks. Once the plan is adopted the regulatory standards would function as zoning for these properties.

Regarding the form and character of the transect standards and land uses, the three zones are all mixed use environments. They were calibrated through several iterations to minimize issues with creating existing non-conformities. Many land uses today if conforming attempt to be incorporated into this plan and the plan seeks through the transect zones and organize land uses that are somewhat compatible. Where there are issues with compatibility, the plan provides performance standards for how uses might otherwise cause problems to work better together. He presented major categories and how land uses have been determined to be allowed in each zone, with several triggers. Definitions for these land uses have been updated, as well.

Mr. Pellegrini stated they anticipate that buildout of the area will occur over time and projects that come forward will need to be compliant and still meet the overarching goals of the plan. He said there is also discussion of building types and front types and said the project intends to be a moderate to high density area and not single family housing prototypes. There are allowances for townhouses and work units in some of the transect zones, but the goal would be to move toward more intense mixed use development in the project area.

Lastly, Chapter 4 regulates the location and type of civic spaces and provides recommendations for new open spaces that can occur. It also includes information on landscaping and lighting, performance standards designed to allow for industrial uses to be compatible in the mixed use environment, information on non-conforming uses and structures, and information on parking and transportation demand management and supplemental standards that will emerge from the environmental review process.

Mr. Pellegrini concluded his presentation and stated he was available to answer questions.

Chair Lane opened the public comment period.

Public Comments:

ARAM HODESS stated he is the Business Manager of the Plumbers and Steamfitters Union, and representing the Building Trades Council in Contra Costa County members that live in Richmond. He said the development of the South Shoreline creates exceptional opportunities to the City and redevelopment of a once vital area. He said the site is close to transportation and will be anchored by the global campus project. He referred to the job training and employment opportunities the project can offer Richmond youth and residents, stating the economic benefit will be directly tied to many jobs offered. There is a study group meeting to discuss ways in which a community benefits agreement can be developed and he strongly encouraged the Commission to look at ways to adopt conditions that will strongly encourage construction job opportunities, training and work for Richmond residents.

DON SCHNEPF referred to the PowerPoint presentation and said the printed matter was not visible for him. He voiced concerns about the height limits along the waterfront. There appears to be 5-8 story buildings and asked that these heights be limited at the waterfront for the public's current appreciation. He thinks the plan is basically good and he thanked the consultant and City for working on it.

SHERRY PADGETT recognized the consultant and City leadership for following up with the draft plan and funding for it. The draft plan for Sub-Area 4 allows the City to request Cal EPA regulators to enforce a robust plan of the heavily polluted sites, specifically the Zeneca site and others surrounding it, which is critically important for shoreline properties. Cal EPA has been unequivocal that cleanup enforcement is directly tied to the City's General Plan zoning. By identifying a broad range of uses on these sites, the City has given Cal EPA the legal basis and responsibility to enforce cleanup and she appreciated the comments about restoration of the wetlands. She referred to the reference to "lagoons" on the property, but clarified that those are current chemical evaporation ponds and not fresh-water lagoons. Her suggestions for improvement are to allow for more parking structures to accommodate employees, students, workers of businesses, recreational access to the shoreline park for the public, emphasize visual landscape and environmental impacts at the shoreline. She noted that in Sub-Area 4 there are about 2500 feet going east/west where this plan allows for 8 story buildings and she voiced concern that there could be the appearance of Chicago's North Shore Lake Drive where there exists a wall of buildings along that shoreline.

Vice Chair Langlois referred to Ms. Padgett's mention of Cal EPA. Her understanding is that the California Department of Toxic Substances Control is monitoring that site and she asked if Ms. Padgett could explain the difference between the two. If zoned as described in the plan to include residential, she understands it would require the highest level of clean up.

Ms. Padgett clarified that Cal EPA has a number of departments within it, such as the Water Board, the Air Board and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) which is the current regulatory agent over this site as well as the Richmond Fuels Station site, the neighboring Union Pacific sites including the gun club area. DTSC is the agency that said they will not enforce cleanup unless the General Plan identifies specific uses that require a higher level of cleanup than to its current industrial use. Therefore, she said the T-4 neighborhood transect zone does allow for ground floor residential.

The T-4 Main Street transect zone does not allow for ground floor residential, as it is above the ground floor. She said the ground floor use does require cleanup to residential standards. However, DTSC does waffle a bit about the level of required cleanup for residential standards if there is no identified vegetable garden use. Therefore, they could have different standards depending upon the range of deep root gardening, whether children will be eating vegetables, etc., and it depends on what is described as “residential use” and what the public will be expecting from the use in backyards and in residential areas.

Vice Chair Langlois recognized Ms. Padgett as a long-term member of the South Shoreline Community Advisory Group that has been studying the toxicity issue of the Zeneca site, with about 15,000 hours studying the site.

MELVIN WILLIS, ACCE, said they are in support of the draft plan, which contains strong language on community benefits in Section 6.6 which their coalition strongly supports and includes the City to hire locally, pay a living wage, provide local businesses opportunities, prohibits most inquiries of criminal activities on job applications, requires legally binding community benefits, and includes language for commitments in terms of the City’s subsidies and release to the public at least 2 weeks before the City subsidies are approved so the public and Council have a fair opportunity to weigh in. This will be looked to by other cities as a model and he thanked City staff for working closely with the coalition to include strong language that would include community benefit agreements.

Chair Lane returned discussion to Commissioners.

Commissioner Baer thanked staff and the consultant for the great undertaking of work to date and said she was interested in hearing about initial and next steps and the Zeneca site.

Mr. Pellegrini stated Chapter 6 is the implementation chapter and provides a full matrix of implementing actions, summarizes 5 things that should be done quickly and a top 6-7 related actions. The first action is to ensure cleanup and remediation occur on site that can allow a development the community wants. This is being spearheaded by the City and work with the DTSC. The second action is to work with U.C. to create a community benefits agreement. The third action calls for the creation of a transportation management association which would be a body that property owners could elect to be a member of in order to manage transportation-related resources. Chapter 4 provides a discussion of these roles and how it should function. The plan also touches on how the City can brand and market this area to investors and can distinguish it from other R&D hubs, and he noted Chapter 2 starts to describe the framework in marketing.

Commissioner Kilbreth referred to the general planning assumptions and to marketing or branding and wanted to explain his bias, stating he is in the software industry. He did not think the R&D industry or bio-tech industry are nearly as big as the software industry in the Bay Area and he knows what is pushing people out of San Francisco, who wants to live in San Francisco and who might be attracted to living in Richmond if it was an easy connection to BART or other transportation mode. His concern is the degree of focus on the word “R&D” but also potentially the marketing of the project as an R&D center. There is a lot of competition for R&D and some definitions of R&D are actually pretty small. He said there is a much bigger sector of commercial office space that is important and he questioned how much of this development is in fact being

oriented towards the specific needs of R&D companies, which might end up not being the market for this square footage.

Mr. Pellegrini said he would say that the R&D nomenclature initiated at the time when the Berkeley Global Campus was assumed to be the second campus for LB&L. The initial charge for the City was the spin-off opportunities.

Commissioner Kilbreth said this is an important point and said he knows someone who works at LB&L and he thinks the whole thing has been shifted to UC Berkeley. In other words, he does not think LB&L has the money or will actually do much. He knows University of California may not say what it will actually look like but there is a very big difference between an undergraduate campus or a liberal arts humanities campus and a science research R&D campus, and the City should not be putting all of its "poker chips" on one, especially if it turns out to be the other. Therefore, this goes to questions relating to the flexibility of the space and whether there is anything about the design that is overly dependent on good luck with R&D as opposed to perhaps becoming more of a general purpose office complex, as a software company does not need much other than a nice office space to operate.

Mr. Pellegrini said he thinks the way the transect zones are aligned now, and this has evolved since the presentation of the recommended land use alternative, the way LB&L was involved they saw their activities on the campus as not necessarily being good neighbors with future residential neighborhoods. The UC has started to think about that relationship differently and so this may open up opportunities for the City to think about how to distribute land uses in a way that would complement what they knew about the EGC but also be flexible enough to understand how it may need to react to a variety of things that can occur there.

Mr. Pellegrini said therefore he thinks what the regulating planning shows today is that the R&D category which really has a heavy emphasis on light industrial and compatible light industrial activities which could include any sort of office environment but would likely not include residential activities. Those uses are predominantly located on the northern edge of the site and closer to the freeway. As it gets closer to the interface with the campus itself, there is a mix both of services with the understanding that eating establishments, restaurants and services that campus users will need every day will want to co-locate very close to the campus and also there will be a whole range of residential uses that might be compatible close to that environment which could include more permanent residential facilities in different forms of housing. It might include things like hotels or temporary stay facilities.

Mr. Pellegrini said he would say that the work on the land use that has been has tried to define them much more generally to allow a very broad range of things to occur, so there are different goals of each transect zone and great flexibility in terms of mixed use environments that could occur through general implementation of the transect zones.

Commissioner Kilbreth said since there is going to be a refinement of this document, along with explicitly addressing the flexibility issue and just making sure that the thought process has gone into it, he asked what it would look like if the market turned out to warrant office space instead of R&D space. He referred to the question of the flexibility between housing and commercial and asked what would happen if, for any reason, Richmond continues to not be a first choice for employment or for this kind of white collar office employment or R&D employment, but it takes off residentially.

He said he believes the City should have a sense of range sensitivity and flexibility around both of those uses; that the pieces are all here and the plan is quite well done, but just from his point of view he would like to have some sensitivity analysis done formally because nobody has a perfect vision for where it is going to be in 30 years, so all they can do is approximate.

Mr. Pellegrini said he thinks these are excellent comments.

Commissioner Kilbreth said his last question he asked Mr. Mitchell is that he does not understand about the East Shore Railroad Corridor that would be on Amtrak's Capitol Corridor.

Mr. Mitchell asked and confirmed that Commissioner Kilbreth was referring to page 341 where a long-term transit network graph and the E-Shore Station is proposed. This would be the possibility for an additional station that the Amtrak Capitol Corridor would stop at the Union Pacific area and they would use the existing trains stopping there.

Commissioner Kilbreth asked if this is a real part of this plan or a future possibility.

Mr. Mitchell said it would not occur until there was a good deal of activity there. Much of the campus and development would need to be in place before this would occur.

Commissioner Kilbreth asked and confirmed with Mr. Mitchell that the marketing will not succeed based on this occurring. Mr. Mitchell noted that the advantage to this is that scores of trains run by it and if there is a reason to stop, they would consider it, but currently there is not enough activity as well as a station. He said the nice thing about this is that it would simply provide the ability to get passengers to the rail and across similar to what is in Emeryville or in Berkeley.

Commissioner Kilbreth said lastly, if such a thing were ever come to pass, it is an interesting possibility around just the long-range plan for Richmond.

Mr. Mitchell noted that every time a stop is added, it impacts the schedule. Currently Richmond's stop is at the BART station. In the future with many people living there, this could occur, but it would happen at the back end of the plan.

Chair Lane referred to the letter received regarding the map showing continued mixed uses in the buffer zones and she asked the consultant to speak on this, noting there were some assurances that the map would be corrected and not have mixed uses in the buffer zone along the shoreline.

Ms. Velasco clarified that currently the project area does not hit the buffer zone. It is on the other side of Marina Way South and is in the General Plan and the specific plan would modify that.

Chair Lane said last year when the Commission discussed this item, there was concern from existing light industrial users. The message was that this is a very long-term plan. She asked what the timeline of implementation is. Mr. Pellegrini said the plan anticipates a very long window out to 2045 or a 30 year horizon.

Chair Lane said earlier in the presentation Mr. Pellegrini used the word "intense" and she asked him to speak to this in relation to numbers of stories and units.

Mr. Pellegrini said in terms of future land use, Appendix 7 includes a discussion on how the General Plan might be amended to incorporate the vision of the specific plan. It describes typical building heights of up to 55 feet or 5 stories, but there are provisions in the plan for projects to reach up to 8 stories in height if they provide some degree of community benefit such as affordable housing. It also describes an FAR between 1 and 5 which tends to be somewhere between 25 and 150 dwelling units to the acre.

Chair Lane echoed points made by speakers in terms of implementing actions relating to the various goals and the importance of them. One related to the remediation, the community benefits agreement and the City's inclusionary housing ordinance. As this is fully built out over the next 40 years, she hoped this is an inclusive area of income levels as well as it providing for local hiring, training and construction. To her, the implementing actions are extremely important and she hoped that this is truly an inclusive community for Richmond.

Commissioner Butt said he was very impressed, said he is excited for the bright future of the Richmond Bay and he appreciates comments. He said the Commission recently reviewed a project where there was significant discussion about environmental impacts from the freeway and rail traffic. He said there is not a lot of residential areas proposed that are approximate to the freeway in this plan and asked if this was something considered.

Mr. Pellegrini said this was considered. The SD:R&D zone was predominantly designated along the freeway corridor and there is a buffer from the freeway corridor for residential uses. It is technically possible to propose a residential project within this zone but it typically would require a CUP.

Commissioner Butt asked Mr. Pellegrini to talk more about the southern-most part of the special planning area zoned Open Space and how that would work if something were proposed there.

Mr. Pellegrini responded that the land south of the Bayview interchange in sub-area 4 is currently owned by Union Pacific. The General Plan land use for that set of parcels is currently Open Space, but the zoning is a mix of M-3 Industrial and Open Space. Therefore, a goal of this project was to try to resolve that discrepancy.

He said there is about 36 acres of land that the property owner is interested in developing at some point and that includes the pistol range site which has undergone environmental remediation. This project area is proposed to be part of the specific plan program and would be analyzed in the EIR. Because the site is in a sensitive location, any approval for a project would require a decision of the City Council and this would be very different from other properties within the specific plan.

Once the specific plan is adopted, if they propose something compliant and permitted as a by-right use, they could achieve administrative approval and no public hearings. But, because of this project's location, the developable lands are actually very challenging. There is a lot of low-lying land subject to flooding and it is likely that it is in BCDC's jurisdiction. Therefore, the specific plan recommends it would require subsequent public hearings for approval.

Vice Chair Langlois thanked the consultant for the very thorough plan. Overall she thinks it is an excellent plan and roadmap for the future. In making things more user-friendly, in looking at page 4-5, she asked for the definition of transect zones.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the definition is included in the plan area vision chapter on page 3-8. The term is a scientific term which means a “cross section through an environment.” They use this term to describe a cross section of human environments and the range or spectrum of intensities that can occur along that transect, with T-1’s being the most natural and T-6 as the most urban.

Vice Chair Langlois suggested making this definition more upfront in the Executive Summary along with the definitions on Page 4-5 for the general public, which she thinks might be helpful. She noted it took her a long time to find the map on page 4-6 that provides the overall intended zoning uses for the various areas.

Vice Chair Langlois also questioned Zone 1, stating the Commission recommended to the City Council the Baywalk project. She noted this is supposed to be a plan for the next 30-40 years and the area where the Baywalk is located is clearly identified here as SD:R&D and identified to be prioritized for research and development. She wondered how or why the City is already changing it.

Ms. Velasco referred to the transect zone land use table on page 4.8 under residential uses, and looking at zones, under residential the first block is dwellings and it lists different dwelling types. In looking at multi-unit residence under the SD:R&D, it is a Conditional Use Permit and it would follow a similar process as the Baywalk project. Again, staff has identified where they foresee particular uses; however, it is not meant to prioritize any one. She said it is a way of streamlining it and if it were SD:R&D it would have been automatically permitted, but acknowledging there needs to be a procedure where there are potential conflicts, this helps avoid that. She said the goal is not to separate uses completely. Staff is looking for a mixed use environment that will provide a balance of housing and jobs to put forward the General Plan’s vision to have complete neighborhoods.

Vice Chair Langlois asked and confirmed with Ms. Velasco that SD:R&D does include housing as a possibility, and it simply creates an additional process application. In some cases the City does have procedures that trigger additional review and it is more discretionary.

Vice Chair Langlois referred to definitions of labels on Page 4-5 and said the definition or intent of SD:R&D does not mention housing. She guessed all zones are intended for mixed use and suggested this be highlighted that every zone is intended for mixed use with different criteria and requirements.

Vice Chair Langlois referred to Area 2, she has attended several neighborhood meetings as well as Secretary Choi. Neighbors in the Marina Bay across from the Meeker Slough south of Area 2 and there have been various issues with light industrial uses there and right now they are getting familiarized with what is occurring at Bio-Rad. She referred to the map on Page 2-10 regarding environmental contamination and said it looks as though the Bio-Rad site has not been fully assessed or characterized. She asked how this would be taken care of to be fully addressed and mitigated, especially if additional development and housing is envisioned for that area.

Ms. Velasco said there will be existing uses that are either conforming or non-conforming for various reasons. Staff has tried to work with existing business owners and there was apprehension about being too restrictive. What they have done is brought forth non-conforming

structures and uses ordinance in the zoning ordinance into this plan which provides for rebuilding a site. Specifically with Bio-Rad, it will be an existing use and they will be vested in what approvals they receive.

Regarding contamination, Ms. Velasco said staff has been working with the neighborhoods on those issues and she knows there have been conflicts about other operators in the area about truck activity, so staff has worked with the consultant team to include additional performance measures that deals with truck idling, noise, and hours of operation. Even though the use is allowed, if working outside of certain hours of operation, the City will require a minor use permit or CUP to ensure those conflicts are addressed through conditions and hopefully they will be avoided. This will be part of the challenge, given that the area has development there now and overall as it transitions, conflicts can occur which will be addressed.

Vice Chair Langlois asked for the timeline or plans for fully assessing and characterizing the Bio-Rad site in terms of contamination.

Ms. Velasco said depending on the type of contamination, staff would need to determine which reviewing board handles the assessment. She said concerns heard have been both water and air related and these concerns have been forwarded to agencies who are working to investigate issues. Vice Chair Langlois asked that staff provide an update on this in the future.

Vice Chair Langlois referred to Sub-Area 4 and said much of this is the current Zeneca site and she has followed the work of the Community Advisory Group (CAG). She is pleased that site is intended for a variety of mixed uses including housing which would require more thorough cleanup of toxins. She referred to Page 3-26 and the image of the upper and lower lagoon as pointed out by a speaker. She asked if there is a vision that those would be remediated as well. She also asked who would be responsible for developing the green, open space areas between the buildings and the shore.

Mr. Pellegrini said that area and its future outcome is currently influx. ARCADIS, on behalf of Zeneca, is studying environmental remediation strategies for the lagoons. A few of the alternatives being analyzed look at a significant reconfiguration of the existing ponds and some degree of wetland restoration in order to remove the toxins located within the lagoons. This is a very important habitat area and is adjacent to an even more important habitat area. As the work moves forward, the outcome will become clearer. The plan recommends those lands that are contiguous to the EBRPD may be appropriate to be transferred over once the cleanup has been completed, so future management of that area could occur under one body.

Mr. Pellegrini said also what makes this uncertain is that there are existing levies which separate those lagoons from the marsh and those likely would need to be reconfigured as the ponds are remediated. Therefore, the relationship between the wetland ponds and the rest of the shoreline could also change and the form of the area will emerge as these studies continue.

Vice Chair Langlois stated lastly, regarding employment opportunities, she supported having language indicating the City's commitment to maximizing the hiring of local residents and approved apprenticeship programs with prevailing wages.

Commissioner Loy echoed fellow Commissioners in all of the great work done on the plan, particularly comments from those in the community who have stated the consultant and the City

have been receptive to their concerns. She said she was curious as to how often land is transferred to the EBRPD.

Mr. Pellegrini said as part of the evolution of the Zeneca property, conservation easements have already been applied to for portions of the site which removes their development opportunities and would make them appropriate for transfer, but could not speak specifically to the history of the EBRPD.

Ms. Velasco said she thinks there have been other property owners who have expressed their willingness to dedicate some land to the EBRPD later. It will be up to the agencies and those parties, but the plan lays out open space and development as being separated, with views preserved and with community access to the shoreline is enhanced as much as it can be.

Commissioner Loy said she works for UC Berkeley and much of her work involves the Berkeley Global Campus. She is thrilled to participate in a study session and recognizes that in the future she may need to recuse herself. She said it would be great to see all instances in the plan that say Richmond Bay Campus be changed to reflect the Berkeley Global Campus and said she could forward staff the page numbers where these should be revised.

Commissioner Loy added that for those interested in the on-going development of what will become community benefits agreement, the Richmond Community Working Group has been working for a year and they are getting close to developing recommendations that will be legally binding. There will be a community meeting on November 30th at the Richmond Civic Auditorium and she encouraged people to attend and provide feedback.

Secretary Choi echoed the comments about how impressive the process has been. He said there have been varying amounts of opinions and he thanked the consultant and staff for having listened and worked toward resolving most of these issues.

Chair Lane thanked the public to provide their input and she asked Ms. Velasco to summarize next steps in the process.

Ms. Velasco also acknowledged Mr. Pellegrini and his colleagues and sub-consultants that have been very patient with City staff. She also thanked the DTSC who has provided additional information that helped to fine-tune work between the administrative draft and this public draft.

In terms of next steps, Ms. Velasco said the City is planning for a 45-day public comment period which will close on November 16th and they ask that all comments be received in writing so they can be addressed through a special email. Staff will then be responding and providing a summary of those when moving forward on a final draft which will be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council for consideration.

In addition, Ms. Velasco said staff is working on the Draft EIR analysis to facilitate development without additional environmental review. This is anticipated to be released to the public some time in December, and given the holiday period, it may run longer than a 45-day comment period, but staff will make this determination. Staff hopes to return to the Planning Commission early next year with a hearing on the EIR as well as possibly a study session when getting close to making recommendations.

- 3. PLN15-581: 13th Street/Rumrill Blvd. Complete Streets Study** - PRESENTATION of the Final Report Of The Rumrill Boulevard/ 13th Street Complete Streets Study. This joint effort by the Cities of Richmond and San Pablo focused on improving multimodal access, safety and connections along the corridor by identifying needs and prioritizing improvements that will facilitate pedestrian, bicycle and transit trips at 13th Street, between Harbour Way and Costa Avenue. City of Richmond, applicant; Planner: Lina Velasco. Tentative Recommendation: Receive Presentation.

Senior Planner Lina Velasco introduced Meghan Mitman from Fehr Peers who is the lead consultant on this project. Ms. Velasco described the Rumrill Boulevard Complete Streets Study as a joint project with the City of San Pablo and the goal is to connect the Richmond BART station to Contra Costa College and determining how multi-modal access can be provided from that significant community resource and transportation hub.

The portion of 13th Street that was reviewed begins at Harbour Way to the City's limit line at Costa Avenue in San Pablo. The project was funded through a CalTrans environmental justice transportation planning grant awarded to the City of San Pablo who managed the majority of the contract along with Richmond staff in the selection of the consultant team. They tried to hold community meetings in Richmond and San Pablo along the corridor with the idea to create a Complete Streets Plan that would encourage multi-modal transportation options, support future growth, given the General Plan looks at this as a major commercial corridor for the area and could have some mixed use development.

Ms. Velasco said they also want to increase and improve the sustainability and economic vitality in the area by providing more transportation options along the corridor. Additionally, the Health and Wellness Element of the General Plan provides for an environment that supports active living so people can walk, get exercise, provide additional eyes on the street, and most importantly, the City seek to achieve a plan which is reflective of users in the corridors, given businesses, residences, and also through-traffic that relies on the corridor.

Through the process, the Technical Advisory Group was established and included stakeholders and various public agencies, as well as the Richmond BPAC. In addition, a Project Advisory Group was formed mostly of community organizations doing work in the area or had represented users of the corridor. In addition, they wanted to look at the different neighborhood councils in the area that could be served.

She spoke about the joint effort with the City of San Pablo and grant reporting, the Local Government Commission in development of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, Contra Costa Health Services which was active in community outreach. A consultant team of Fehr and Peers and Callander Associates were selected to prepare the plan, given their breadth of experience. She introduced Ms. Meghan Mitman to give the PowerPoint presentation.

Meghan Mitman, Fehr & Peers, said it is exciting to have received word of the funding award for implementation of the project. She gave a background of the start of the project as one of listening, identifying existing conditions and where the community wanted to go. Based on feedback they focused on development of three different alternatives, returned those to the community, received feedback and arrived at a preferred alternative which is the one proposed for grant funding. They plan to discuss this tonight, take it to the City Council and to the City of San Pablo.

Ms. Mitman said they heard the importance of connections at the top and bottom of the corridor between the college, BART and across the corridor and future thoughts about trail connections, as well as current services, nearby schools and the brand new taco facility that went in. They use this as an opportunity to develop more economic activity, address pedestrian safety aspects, and the need to address speeds of vehicles to make it an environment where people want to spend time and provide safety. There is transit along the corridor which is currently unreliable, with no current bus stops, shade or benches, and this was something heard as well.

Ms. Mitman said the three alternatives were then taken to a workshop for a vote and the alternative chosen went through an engineering analysis and was the one they applied for the grant. She displayed the existing condition of the corridor, the existing condition and the after condition with the preferred alternative in place, which she described.

Ms. Velasco noted that they also had a unique opportunity to be able to plan with the adjoining jurisdiction a long stretch of road which helped influence why they deviated what was recommended in the bike and pedestrian plan. They were now planning for a longer stretch. To be able to make one type of facility throughout the entire corridor without forcing a bicyclist or pedestrian to transition across the street and back, they believed there would be fewer conflicts throughout the corridor. Ultimately, they think the facility is very similar and the cycle track was not widely used at the time when the Bike and Pedestrian Master Plans were prepared. As they are starting to really understand where conflicts occur with vehicles, it shows the need why the plans need to be updated on a more regular basis.

Generally, Ms. Velasco said they believe that the Complete Streets Plan being presented helps implement policies of the General Plan, specifically Policy CR1.1 which is creating a balance for those who travel and equitable access and in addition to having safe and convenient walking and biking and provides for multi-modal options to the community and business users in the area. She said the City of San Pablo recently applied for \$4.13 million in grant funding from the Active Transportation Program in Cycle 2, which is through CalTrans and also CTC and MTC. They were not recommended for funding under the statewide level, but they were at the regional level and one of the highest applications. Therefore, it is likely they will get funded. The City had several other projects apply under that same program so Richmond's portion is not included in that; however, some money was dedicate to environmental analysis which would include various studies and Richmond's section will be able to benefit from that analysis.

What the City is looking for is opportunities to apply for additional grants to cover its section such as the One Bay Area grant which focuses on Priority Development areas. In addition, in the ATP funding cycle, the City submitted for the Yellow Brick Road and got recommended for funding, and this connects to the Pennsylvania section but ends at Harbour, which will leave a gap, but staff believes this will make it a competitive project to fund. Ms. Velasco stated staff and the consultant will be holding a similar presentation to the City Council but seeking funding and completing the environmental analysis will be done to implement the project.

Chair Lane opened the public comment period.

Public Comments:

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, supported the project and said he received feedback from neighborhood associations regarding the need of seniors for benches while waiting for buses.

Vice Chair Langlois said she was not able to attend community meetings but spoke with some of the organizers and is pleased with the outcome. She referred to page 19 and the chart with the 3 alternatives. On page 20, preferred concepts were mentioned. She asked if it was correct that the preferred concept corresponds to Alternative 1.

Ms. Mitman said yes, noting that additional engineering analysis was conducted.

Vice Chair Langlois questioned the process going forward and asked if the concept needs to be formally adopted or did it already fit within the City's current plans. Ms. Velasco stated it will be presented to the City Council to receive the plan, but in terms of implementation, once funding is secured and environmental analysis is conducted, contracts will be awarded for the project.

Vice Chair Langlois said she very much likes the plan components, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, and voiced her appreciation and looks forward to its implementation.

Chair Lane asked if additional funding was needed other than what San Pablo had secured. Ms. Velasco said it is her understanding the funding will not cover every component. The application submitted scaled back on some improvements, covered reconfiguration of the roadway, but additional funding will need to be secured to complete improvements such as landscaping. She confirmed that Richmond will apply under a different application for its portion.

Commissioner Baer said she is very excited to have this particular corridor of the City receive some attention. It feels somewhat detached and this project will go a long way of making it feel integrated. She asked for an explanation about what is the new or emerging analysis of bike and pedestrian travel akin to level of service (LOS). The report talked about built environment factors to analyze how the environment works and she asked to expand on that.

Ms. Mitman said LOS is one of the conventional methods used in analyzing cars and what the built environment approach seeks to do is to have similar levels of before and after analysis available for the other modes so all modes, especially in the Complete Streets Project, can be weighed against each other and see how the different alternatives fare. On the onset of the project, a report card was created for each of the different modes and collaborated with the cities and stakeholders to define how they would characterize success. Much of this has to do with comfort of the users, such as how easily cars, pedestrians and bicyclists can get through the corridor.

Chair Lane concluded the item and thanked Ms. Mitman and Ms. Velasco for their presentation.

COMMISSION BUSINESS

4. Reports of Officers, Commissioners and Staff

Ms. Velasco introduced new Associate Planner Roberta Feliciano who comes from the City of San Pablo and worked on the Rumrill project. The City is excited to have her on board and working with the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Baer reported she attended the tour of the Richmond Waterfront today which was very interesting.

Commissioner Butt reported on Saturday will be the 5th Annual Picnic in the Pointe which is a fundraiser for non-profits. He said it is a very family-friendly event, with music, food, drinks and games.

- 5. Adjournment** - The meeting was adjourned at 8:39 p.m. to the next regular meeting on December 17, 2015.