

## Soco Montore

---

**From:** Cordell Hindler <cordellhindler@ymail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 12, 2020 8:56 AM  
**To:** HPCcomments  
**Subject:** Public Comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

good Evening Chair McNamara commissioners and staff, i have a couple of comments to go into the record

1. whenever there is a project that is controversial, i would suggest moving the Meetings to the Council Chambers because the Richmond Room is too cramped and it has exceeded the number of people that will fit into the conference room.
2. i will also let the record show that i am glad that Gretchen has joined the Commission

sincerely  
Cordell

## Soco Montore

---

**From:** chris atwood <chrisratwood@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 12, 2020 2:08 PM  
**To:** HPCcomments  
**Subject:** public comments – agenda item # 1 Point Molate Mixed Use Development Project

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Point Molate is the last open headland in the East Bay, and once the bulldozers hit it, we won't get it back. Instead it will become another shoreline development, for people not connected to Richmond who are willing to live next door to a refinery in exchange for a view of Marin. It will do nothing to lower rents or relieve the housing shortage in Richmond, and will add to traffic on the already congested Richmond/San Rafael Bidge. Let's preserve the hillsides and bluffs at Point Molate as a public park, run by the East Bay Regional Park District, for the benefit of the Richmond community, a gift to our children and our children's children. Please do not develop point molate into housing. Instead preserve it as a regional park. I am a professional photographer and photograph the many Osprey nests in Point Molate often. It would be a shame if they were to be destroyed.

Thank you for your time.

-Chris Atwood  
-5306 Panama Ave.  
Richmond

## Soco Montore

---

**From:** David Sanders <dsanders160@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 13, 2020 10:22 AM  
**To:** HPCcomments  
**Subject:** Comments on Pt. Molate Development

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Richmond is in trouble and needs more tax revenue. We should not put housing there, due to the expenses of building infrastructure to support them. Instead, we might want to put some businesses there, situated back away from the immediate shoreline. There could be new businesses such as breweries, distilleries, information technology companies. There must be some options available which would bring jobs and tax revenue to the city, and still provide the bulk of the land for parks and green space. Marin has been very good at doing this.

Thanks

David Sanders  
159 Shoreline Ct  
Richmond CA 94804

## Soco Montore

---

**From:** Joan Bonnar <jbonnar1@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 11, 2020 7:14 PM  
**To:** HPCcomments  
**Subject:** Project No: PLN20-057

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hello, I am one resident who loves Pt. Molate as an open space! It is so near to all of us. And so dear to all of us. Please do not allow development that is so exclusive that the rental and housing prices leave most of us out. And it ruins this beautiful place. We have so few of them that are so accessible. Please vote to halt this new development. Thank you. Joan Bonnar. El Cerrito.

**From:** [Lisa Park](#)  
**To:** [HPCcomments](#)  
**Subject:** Public comments: Agenda Item #1 July 14, 2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 2:07:14 PM

---

To the Richmond Historic Preservation Commissioners:

Regarding the proposed SunCal project within the Winehaven Historic District:

I believe the Commission should make a recommendation to the City Council only after it is informed by findings of impacts, mitigations, and an environmentally superior project from a Final and certified Environmental Impact Report.

The City of Richmond, with funding from the affiliated development companies, is requesting a recommendation from the Historic Preservation Commission that supports SunCal's Mixed-Use/Modified Project proposal before the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been released to the Commission and the public. One of the purposes of the EIR is to describe impacts to land use and planning and describe an overall environmentally-superior alternative for this site.

The City is rushing the Commission with deadlines that are political and unfairly privilege the interests of SunCal and affiliates over the public interest. The deadlines can be changed to allow for completion of, requests for and review of documents and discussions of important issues.

The deadlines are driven by the Pt. Molate settlement agreement, an agreement that is being litigated because Pt. Molate land use decisions decided by the settlement — decisions that are required to be done through a public process — were decided in a Council closed session.

It is clear the SunCal project proposal is being rushed because the project is the Mayor's/SunCal's and affiliates' preference and in their interest to ram it as far through the review process as the court will allow before the Federal Court Judge rules on the City's Brown Act violation and before the City Council changes in November.

I also ask the Commission to make an alternative project recommendation that incorporates the comments from the public and your work analyzing the proposed project for one that is more in keeping with the environmentally-superior project in the EIR, the Community Plan, which concentrates housing and other development in the north watershed's Winehaven Historic District and is consistent with city plans, including the General Plan, that guide the development of the site.

Thank you,

Lisa Park  
5626 Bayview Avenue  
Richmond, CA 94804

## Soco Montore

---

**From:** Roni Bhere <ronibhere@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 12, 2020 12:43 PM  
**To:** Soco Montore  
**Subject:** Pt. Molate - Save the open space!

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Decision Makers-

Represent the me and the other people of Richmond, CCC, the Bay Area, CA, and the Earth. Preserve the open space of PT. Molate; do not allow this precious area to be developed. Save Pt. Molate - Open Soace for all.

Thank you,  
Roni Bramwell  
Richmond, CA

**From:** [Sally Tobin](#)  
**To:** [HPCcomments](#)  
**Cc:** [Lina Velasco](#); [Roberta Feliciano](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comments - Agenda item # 1  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 2:48:47 PM

---

Dear Ms. Velasco and Ms. Feliciano,  
I would appreciate it very much if you would forward the letter below to the members of the City of Richmond Historic Preservation Commission.  
Thank you,  
Sally Tobin

**Sally Tobin**  
**742 Lobos Avenue**  
**Richmond, CA 94801**

July 14, 2020

Re: Point Molate Mixed-Use Development Project (PLN20-057)

Dear Members of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC):

I appreciate all your hard work, and thank you for the opportunity to comment on issues related to the use of Point Molate for the benefit of the City of Richmond and its residents.

The Staff Report summarizes a number of subjects and requests your approval to go ahead. This seems premature:

**1. Lack of Access to DSEIR Responses and Comments**

A key piece of information is missing. The community's comments on the DSEIR have not yet been released. When the DRB asked for the DSEIR comments, Ms. Velasco estimated that they would be posted before the end of June. It is now halfway through July. To the best of my knowledge, this critical community input has not yet been posted. This prevents you from being able to draw on broad (as well as detailed) community comments and perspectives as you decide the fate of Point Molate and the Winehaven Historic District. Richmond residents are both intelligent and creative. To make recommendations without their input is not an example of good government, and I am disturbed that the HPC is being asked to move ahead. That said, Community Development resources are probably becoming strained to the breaking point. While I sympathize with their situation, the long-term use of Point Molate for the recreation and enjoyment of the residents of Richmond must come first.

The importance of the DSEIR is admitted in the Staff Report, on pages 119 and 127 of the pdf.

**2. Deadlines**

There seems to be a great deal of emphasis on deadlines. It is my impression that this emphasis is responsible for pressure on the Community Development Department. However, the ERN has been extended three times, and the other deadline is in litigation (due to alleged violation of the Brown Act by the City) and therefore may not apply at all. I believe it is fair to characterize the deadlines as political, rather than legal. Point Molate and the Winehaven Historic District are important. Let's take the time to do this well .

**3. Proposed Changes to the General Plan**

Dedicated Richmond residents worked on the General Plan for three years, and it truly reflects community values. The General Plan was widely recognized for its innovative incorporation of a section on Wellness, with an emphasis on parks and recreation. The Staff Report would have you dismiss the significance of the proposed changes to the General Plan as “building height” and “text edits.” First, in past meetings, I have heard that the justification for the proposed adjustments in building height are due to the existence of historic structures that are taller. If so, why not just make an exception for the existing historic buildings, rather than set a precedent by changing the General Plan? Or show a map of proposed building heights with those exceeding the General Plan limitations highlighted so that the public can evaluate the proposal. Second, use of the term “text edits” to describe the proposed General Plan changes is misleading. Such “text edits” remove key environmental protections for woodlands and riparian streams and ephemeral drainages by allowing them to be “managed” instead of the current standard of “remain undisturbed.” Instead of choosing building sites with care for the natural topography, such a change releases a developer to place structures across streams, to use culverts instead of open drainage with native plants, and to destabilize hillsides so that silt can damage eelgrass beds. This change also would make it easier to remove trees. In this era of climate change, environmental damage should be avoided, not enhanced City-wide for the convenience of a developer.

#### 4. Reduction in Size of Winehaven Historic District

At the last HPC meeting, Ms. Velasco stated that the City's application to the National Trust to reduce the size of the historic district (from 71 acres to 27 acres) had been withdrawn. Apparently this application was motivated by a wish to exclude noncontributing structures from the Historic District? But given that the district will stay at 71 acres, how will the nonconforming structures (all from the Navy era, I think) be slated for demolition? Has another application been submitted? What is the process and the current timeline? If a new application has been submitted, it would be helpful for a copy to be included in the minutes and in the Staff Report.

#### 5. Landscape as Habitat

At some time in the distant past, eucalyptus trees were planted along Stenmark Drive north of the cottages. Though these trees are non-native, they have reached maturity, and this section of Stenmark is now very beautiful. In addition, they provide habitat for birds, butterflies, and bats. Viewing Point Molate from the water, one of the most attractive features are its trees. Can you provide some measure of protection for existing trees in the Historic District? Between the proposed grading and the proposed removal of 200 trees, Point Molate may end up looking like bare earth.

#### 6. Stenmark Drive

Stenmark Drive is conceptualized as a quiet country road through a charming village. But overdevelopment of the site may interfere. For example, drivers will go past looming Drum Lot buildings on their way to the Historic District. Plus with the proposed removal of mature trees, the natural canopy will disappear. And in addition, the City recently approved industrial storage at Terminal 4, even though it is zoned for parkland. This will send tractor-trailer rigs up and down Stenmark Drive, adding to potentially damaging vibration and traffic while eroding any charm. Stenmark Drive needs all the help it can get!

#### 7. Trailhead Design

Usually, amenities in planned developments are designed for the use of the residents. But in this case, with 70% open space allocated to the public, the challenge to the designers is to welcome the public into the open space. With the recent documentation of 911 calls being made regarding black people in public areas (now called CAREN calls), it is very important to avoid requiring hikers to drive



through and park in neighborhoods in order to take public trails. On pages 47 and 104 of the pdf, two trails still seem to emerge from neighborhoods. Please see what you can do to provide dedicated trailhead parking off of Stenmark Drive.

#### 8. A Ranger Station

On page 22, a fire and police substation is described. According to the description, this is to be operated by the City. However, it is possible that the large residential project outside the Winehaven Historic District will not be built. In that event, perhaps the number of residents and visitors may not justify the expense of a formal substation. I would suggest using flexible language so that the structure could be used as a classic Ranger Station, with a Ranger(s) available to guide visitors and perhaps to administer first aid. It could also house educational programs and exhibits. Of course, this would need future coordination with administrative management of the parkland, such as with East Bay Regional Parks District. Please leave the door open to such flexible future uses.

#### 9. Archeological Resources

What is the current state of negotiations with the Ohlone? Are there tribal sacred sites within the Winehaven Historic District? How will Native American heritage be acknowledged?

#### 10. San Francisco Bay Coastal Development Commission (BCDC)

On page 27, there is a reference to "restored bay edge." Why does the bay edge need restoration? How will it be restored, given any limitations due to historic status? Has a BCDC permit been applied for? More information, please!

Also, on page 23, the BCDC line is pointed out, but the line on the map does not appear to follow the shoreline. I believe that BCDC monitors and supervises the shoreline for 100 feet from the water line. Why would this line veer off? Perhaps there is periodic flooding?

#### 11. Missing Information, Duplicated Information, and Contradictions

Missing information: Section 5.4.2 is referenced under lighting standards, but not provided. "Dark Sky" principles should be followed. Lighting to accent architectural features should not be allowed to trespass beyond the feature.

On pages 33 and 35, some buildings should be darker, but did not appear so on my screen.

Duplicated information: Attachment 3 appears twice.

Contradictions: On page 3, the statement is made that "The Historic Conservation Plan would be adopted by Resolution separately from an Ordinance approving an -H, Historic District, Overlay." But then in the Conclusion, "Staff recommends that the HPC recommend approval of the proposed Historic Conservation Plan to the City Council as part of the proposed -H overlay rezone." Which is it? Separate or part of the overlay?

Thank you for your patience! I applaud your hard work to maintain standards in the Winehaven Historic District, and I hope you will push for answers to your questions and mine before moving the project to the next stage.

Best regards,

Sara L. (Sally) Tobin, Ph.D.

**From:** [Sara Sunstein](#)  
**To:** [HPCcomments](#)  
**Cc:** [Tom Butt - external](#); [Ben Choi](#); [Nat Bates](#); [Eduardo Martinez](#); [Demnlus Johnson](#); [Jael Myrick](#); [Melvin Willis](#)  
**Subject:** public comments, Public Hearings #1. Project No. PLN20-057  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 2:44:46 PM

---

Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission,

I am unable to attend this evening's meeting, so am submitting email comments instead.

Having finally seen drawings and photos of the site, I'm now thoroughly amazed that any housing is recommended here. or anything other than historic preservation/educational-visitor center within E. Bay Regional Parks.

How many years before the bay breaches that very low sea wall, the Bay Trail and flood Building #1?

Would a king tide along with El Nino breach it now?

What will be the added environmental detrimental effects of thousands of residents walking that bay front daily?

What is the cost of sewage lines from there to the next main sewage artery? and how deep is the water table from the surface, in terms of those lines' placement and durability?

Add to the mix Stenmark Dr, which is really 1.5 lanes, not 2, and has more ditches bordering it than shoulders, and other than some totally convoluted tiny roads, connects only to a freeway that is known to regularly come to a standstill westbound.

Even if you design this buildout to be in keeping with the historic buildings—the brickwork is to be honored and studied!—it makes absolutely no sense in terms of environmental sustainability, financial sustainability, or good city planning that's about infill for housing, whether affordable, luxury, or anything in-between. To try to create a totally new community in an environmentally vital, yet fragile area and infrastructure nightmare makes no sense at all. A child could tell you that.

Forget all the words and pages and pages of design details. Look at the larger picture and get real. Preserve the history—as Inverness did with Pierce Point Ranch at the beginning of Tomales Point Trail, and Albany did with the Bulb. Following in Albany's lead, Richmond can partner with E Bay Parks to create a wonderful, environmentally sound, historic preservation park and trails, to be enjoyed as long as nature allows us.

If the pandemic has taught us anything, it's about caring for one another, appreciating nature, and doing what's right for the community. Capitalist greed has no place in our lives anymore.

Sara Sunstein  
1664 San Benito  
Richmond

## Soco Montore

---

**From:** Viki von Lackum <vvonlackum@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 12, 2020 6:38 PM  
**To:** HPCcomments  
**Subject:** public comments – not on the agenda

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Good morning.

I'm writing to ask you to please listen to the Sierra Club on corralling the development of Pt Molate.

We are such a proud and green city. We have such a great start. I visit Pt Molate for the incredible remoteness just miles from the bustle of concrete environments. This is the time of year I take my banjo out to the water off Stenmark Drive to sit and watch the fabulous osprey. The beachsides of Pt Molate (and Pt Richmond) remind me greatly of my childhood of the 50's and 60's in Tiburon.

I visit my mother in Tiburon weekly. The tiny little stretches of sand that we once coveted, now covered in rip rap, with sterile green lawns lining the waterfront. Ug. Wrapped around the coast, cheek by jowl, house upon house. Every square inch accounted for with a property line (who could afford to lose an inch of that precious land!?). Gone with those little sands are crabs, sand fleas, whips of kelp, driftwood, even the flies! Pt Molate has all of those things, and then so much more in those grassy hills.

Please don't build over our wild animals' homes. Please don't sell out to monied interests. Where we can hang on to nature, we need to nurture it.  
Please follow the Sierra Club's recommendations.

Thanks much, Viki von Lackum  
5711 Huntington Ave. 94804

.....  
[https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce-authors/u1054/Yodeler\\_Summer%202020\\_web.pdf](https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce-authors/u1054/Yodeler_Summer%202020_web.pdf)

On page 7 of the Sierra Club's 2020 Summer edition of the YODELER you'll find a concise, 1 page article by Norman La Force.

**From:** [Lina Velasco](#)  
**To:** [Soco Montore](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please forward my letter to members of the Historic Preservation Commission. Thank you.  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 6:40:51 PM

---

[Can you add this letter to the HPC comments please?](#)

**From:** Pam Stello [mailto:pamstello@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 5:58 PM  
**To:** Lina Velasco; Roberta Feliciano  
**Subject:** Please forward my letter to members of the Historic Preservation Commission. Thank you.

Dear Members of the Historic Preservation Commission,

**The Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to the City Council for the portions of the proposed SunCal project within the Winehaven Historic District.**

The City of Richmond, with funding from the affiliated development companies, is requesting a recommendation from the Historic Preservation Commission that supports SunCal's Mixed-Use/Modified Project proposal before the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been released to the Commission and the public. One of the purposes of the EIR is to describe impacts to land use and planning and describe an overall environmentally-superior alternative for this site. **We recommend the Commission make a recommendation after it is informed by findings of impacts, mitigations, and a environmentally superior project from a Final and certified Environmental Impact Report.**

The City is rushing the Commission with deadlines that are political and unfairly privilege the interests of SunCal and affiliates over the public interest. The deadlines can be changed to allow for completion of, requests for and review of documents and discussions of important issues.

The deadlines are driven by the Pt. Molate settlement agreement, an agreement that is being litigated because Pt. Molate land use decisions decided by the settlement — decisions that are required to be done through a public process — were decided in a Council closed session.

The settlement agreement deadlines can be changed by mutual agreement between the parties, the City and the proposed casino developer, or by the judge who certified their agreement. The parties have already changed the deadlines three times.

It is clear the SunCal project proposal is being rushed because the project is the Mayor's/SunCal's and affiliates' preference and in their interest to ram it as far through the review process as the court will allow before the Federal Court Judge rules on the City's Brown Act violation and before the City Council changes in November.

Two issues of so many with the SunCal plan that may require more time by the HPC to adequately address are the following:

**Pt Molate is Ohlone Land**

**All proposals must include Ohlone consultation.** The Guidiville Tribe is not included in the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) list; apparently the Guidiville requested inclusion instead of being named; therefore, the Native American Consultation Program presented in the Report may not fulfill requirements of AB 52.

The proposal that the Guidiville will choose a monitor for disturbances to Ohlone sites during construction is inappropriate. The Guidiville Tribe has substantial conflict of interest due to the Casino lawsuit of which they are a party.

There is currently no plan for the protection of the Ohlone sacred Shellmounds at Pt. Molate. One Shellmound has archeological significance. They are all sacred sites.

At a prior Historical Commission meeting, Corrina Gould, who is the spokesperson for the Confederated Villages of Lisjan/Ohlone, stated that the Guidiville are not knowledgeable about the Ohlone sacred sites.

### **Greatly Enlarged Development Footprint — 60% of the site**

The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DSERI) description for SunCal's proposed Mixed-Use/Modified Project proposes a **greatly enlarged grading and development footprint into the Pt Molate hillsides that conflicts with city plans that guide development of the site**, including the City's General Plan, the Mixed Use Casino Project, Base Reuse Plan, and the plan alternatives from the City's 2018 Point Molate Community Visioning and Planning process.

Using acreage mapping tools in Google Earth, the Mixed Use/Modified Project development area is estimated at twice the size of development areas adopted in the City's Pt. Molate planning documents. Instead of leaving 70% of the property open space, the mapping calculation indicates that the Mixed-Use/Modified Project reduces open space to approximately 40% of the property following grading and construction.

This is a link to the grading map; planned grading is in red:

<https://tinyurl.com/y95janxe>

**The impacts of the massive development footprint to the natural historical character and the proposed historical restoration cannot be evaluated without detailed documentation.**

We recommend the Commission make a recommendation after it is informed by findings of impacts, mitigations, and an environmentally superior project from a Final and certified Environmental Impact Report.

We also ask the Commission to make an alternative project recommendation that incorporates the comments from the public and your work analyzing the proposed project for one that is more **in keeping with the environmentally-superior project in the EIR, the Community Plan, which concentrates housing and other development in the north watershed's Winehaven Historic District and is consistent with city plans,**

**including the General Plan, that guide the development of the site.**

It is important to note that the City has represented in court the review of the SunCal plan by boards and commissions as public participation in the review process, but speaking at a meeting is not a vote on a project, and the public was denied that vote when the City Council voted illegally behind closed doors on the settlement deal that is driving SunCal's plan. Further, the majority of the public envisioned recreation, soccer fields and other active recreation, education and cultural opportunities for Richmond families, 70% open space, protection of rare habitats and eelgrass beds, and support for the Ohlone — none of which is in the SunCal plan. No one envisioned a private, high-end suburb, and it is not consistent with our General Plan that designates Pt Molate as a place that includes public recreation and is a tourist destination. Pt Molate is public land, yet the majority of the Richmond public cannot participate in board and commission meetings because of COVID-19.

Sincerely,

—Pam Stello  
Richmond resident