CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
January 20, 2026

1. CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE IN HONOR OF THE US MILITARY TROOPS

The City Council Meeting was held in a hybrid format (in-person and via Zoom videoconference and broadcast) from the Pinole Council Chambers, 2131 Pear Street, Pinole, California. Mayor Pro Tem Murphy called the Regular Meeting of the City Council to order at 5:05 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Before we begin, we would like to acknowledge the Ohlone people, who are the traditional custodians of this land. We pay our respects to the Ohlone elders, past, present and future, who call this place, Ohlone Land, the land that Pinole sits upon, their home. We are proud to continue their tradition of coming together and growing as a community. We thank the Ohlone community for their stewardship and support, and we look forward to strengthening our ties as we continue our relationship of mutual respect and understanding.

3. ROLL CALL, CITY CLERK'S REPORT & STATEMENT OF CONFLICT

An official who has a conflict must, prior to consideration of the decision; (1) publicly identify in detail the financial interest that causes the conflict; (2) recuse himself/herself from discussing and voting on the matter; and (3) leave the room until after the decision has been made, Cal. Gov. Code § 87105.

A. COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT

Anthony Tave, Mayor*
Devin Murphy, Mayor Pro Tem
Norma Martinez-Rubin, Council Member**
Maureen Toms, Council Member
Cameron Sasai, Council Member
*Arrived at 5:52 p.m.
**Attending Remotely

B. STAFF PRESENT

Melissa Klawuhn, Acting City Manager/Police Chief
Eric Casher, City Attorney
Andrea Dwyer, Community Services Director
Lilly Whalen, Community Development Director
Heba El-Guindy, Public Works Director
Markisha Guillory, Finance Director
David Hanham, Planning Manager
Roxane Stone, Deputy City Clerk

Deputy City Clerk Roxane Stone announced the agenda had been posted on January 16, 2026 at 11:10 a.m. with all legally required written notices. A correction memo had been prepared for Item 10B and written comments had also been received in advance of the meeting, distributed to the City Council and staff, posted to the City website and made available to the public to view in the Council Chambers.

Following an inquiry, the Council reported there were no conflicts with any items on the agenda.

4. CONVENE TO A CLOSED SESSION: None

5. RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION TO ANNOUNCE RESULTS OF CLOSED SESSION: None

6. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD (Public Comments)
Citizens may speak under any item not listed on the Agenda. The time limit is 3 minutes and is subject to modification by the Mayor. Individuals may not share or offer time to another speaker. Pursuant to provisions of the Brown Act, no action may be taken on a matter unless it is listed on the agenda, or unless certain emergency or special circumstances exist. The City Council may direct staff to investigate and/or schedule certain matters for consideration at a future Council meeting.

Ann Moriarty explained she was present on behalf of the pollinators important to the City of Pinole, both native pollinators (bumble bees and humming birds) and non-native pollinators (honey bees). To address the decline of native pollinators, the City of Pinole would collaborate with the Pinole Garden Club and Friends of Pinole Creek Watershed on the Pinole Pollinator Pathway Project. The first native pollinator garden installation on City grounds was scheduled for February 7, 2026 at 10:00 a.m. at Fernandez Park, and she hoped everyone would attend. She thanked the Community Services Director and Recreation Supervisor for their support for the project.

With respect to honey bees, Ms. Moriarty noted backyard beekeepers had been at the forefront of the establishment of a healthy population of honey bee hives, which were also important in pollination; however, the Pinole Municipal Code (PMC) effectively blocked most Pinole residents from keeping bees. As such, the PMC was in urgent need of an update. While she had reached out to staff a year ago and again in mid-2025, she learned there was no staff capacity to address this update. A group of local beekeepers had also sent the City Council and staff communication with more complete details and references. She hoped there could be progress on this issue so that Pinole could be an environmental beacon in Contra Costa County. The group also submitted various models and examples from other Bay Area cities to support the discussion. She asked the City Council to agendize a request for staff to address this update to reflect current best beekeeping regulations by transitioning to a nuisance mitigation model or at the very least consider updating the PMC so it would not block Pinole citizens from keeping bees. She was happy to work with the City Council and staff on this matter.

Margaret Gelhaus referenced the proposal for a ballot initiative for an Elected Mayor. She suggested whether in favor of an Elected Mayor or not, it was irresponsible for the City Council to spend $25,000 on a Special Election, particularly given the City was having trouble balancing the budget.

Jane Kaasa, agreed with the comments from the previous speaker. She loved the City of Pinole; however, there was a lot the City needed to do without incurring and spending unnecessary funds, such as for an Elected Mayor given the City's small size. She asked whether an Elected Mayor would save the City money and accomplish things that would pay for the salary of the position. She suggested this was something that would drain the City financially and there was the possibility of imposing additional taxes on citizens. She hoped this matter would not be placed on a future ballot.

Jennifer Horne also commented on the proposal for a ballot initiative to change the City's governing structure from a Rotating Mayor to an Elected Mayor. She questioned the need for the change and read the meeting minutes from the December 2, 2025 City Council meeting when the issue had been agendized, and referenced the many comments made by then Council member Murphy, who supported putting this measure on the ballot. Council member Murphy suggested placing the item on the ballot would increase civic engagement, but she found there was plenty of civic engagement. Council member Murphy suggested the City's current system was archaic and other cities' systems had moved away from a Rotating Mayor, but calling something archaic was not in and of itself a problem; the question was whether the existing system still functioned. Council member Murphy stated Pinole citizens would have a direct role in choosing their Mayor rather than being subject to an internal Council decision determining who the Mayor would be, and she stated Pinole residents and taxpayers already had a role in choosing the next Mayor. Over the past 100-years at least when citizens voted for a particular City Council member, they were also voting for that person as Mayor.

Council member Murphy suggested an Elected Mayor would be a clear mandate and it would have clear legitimacy as the chief spokesperson for the City and provide greater transparency to help residents understand who was responsible for the results.

Ms. Horn asked if there had been any questions about the legitimacy of any Rotating Mayor serving as the spokesperson for the City. She also found after living with the current governing structure for years that Pinole residents already understood who was responsible for the results. Council member Murphy also suggested the change would provide direct and powerful accountability by enabling voters to remove the Mayor. She pointed out there was already accountability since voters could choose to vote not to continue a particular Council member in their post, which eliminated that individual as a possible Mayor. She added that Council member Murphy had also suggested the current system was the same process that had been done over and over again for the past 100-years and this proposal would change the City, but she questioned that and did not understand that statement.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy provided an overview of the rules for public comment under Citizens to be Heard and for items not on the agenda, the process to speak to individual agenda items, with another opportunity for public comment at the end of the agenda with a second Citizens to be Heard for those who had not yet had the opportunity to provide comments to the City Council.

Mark Zimmerman also spoke to the proposed ballot initiative for an Elected Mayor, as initiated by the City Council on December 2, 2025. It had been asserted the ballot measure was a ballot of democracy, but he suggested it was not. It was about taking action on a proposal by one Council member and not by the citizens of Pinole.

Mr. Zimmerman suggested if one was truly interested in the democratic process, polling would be done before the City spent funds on a ballot measure, but that option had been nixed in order to rush to make the deadline for the June 2026 ballot. He suggested the City Council was doing the opposite of a democratic process, having endorsed the measure without community involvement. He suggested the current Mayoral rotation system allowed for diversity and equity of representation on the City Council and thereby the community. By limiting the Mayor's individual authority and duration of service, the current system diffused political power across the entire City Council making it harder for special interests to insert influence over a single individual and he cited the federal government as an example. The proposal for an Elected Mayor, would allow a long-term Mayor to have influence over City priorities for years, whereas the current system promoted a dynamic City Council and fostered a more collaborative team-oriented City Council environment. The current system was not archaic, as asserted by a Council member.

Mr. Zimmerman reported that 75 percent of cities in Contra Costa County had a Rotating Mayor system and it worked well. Five cities had an Elected Mayor, but those cities were two to six times larger in size than Pinole. He stated this was a case of misplaced priorities and rather there should be a focus on the vacant City Manager position, resolution of the Pinole Police Department (PPD) contract and a focus on fiscal responsibility. The proposed ballot measure would cost the City approximately $25,000 in addition to staff time, consultants and legal experts and a new Mayor would likely want a Mayor's salary, pension and travel budget competitive with other Elected Mayors. There may also be a need to fill a vacant position on the City Council, with additional costs. While three Council members supported this proposal, he suggested this was poor judgement, there was a lack of citizen input and a strong indication of misplaced priorities. He asked the City Council not to proceed with the Elected Mayor ballot measure.

Debbie Long suggested an elected Council member served all the people properly and effectively and having an Elected Mayor would give the perception that one person had more power than the other Council members. This concern had been raised during the December 2, 2025 City Council meeting, when a Council member stated that the Mayor would be responsible for making decisions on public housing, transportation and the like. That alone would have the Mayor as one person held responsible directly to the people, which sounded like a power grab. Another argument was that an Elected Mayor would strengthen leadership, although an Elected Mayor as argued by the same Council member would have the opposite effect.

Ms. Long suggested an Elected Mayor process was trying to delete leadership roles from the rest of the City Council who Pinole citizens had already elected to serve some of those roles for the entire community. An Elected Mayor may actually dilute representation and if an Elected Mayor was elected with 36 percent of the vote, as an example, that person was not really representing the entire community and that was not democracy in play. She found this proposal would silence the majority of the community, which was why the beauty of a five-person City Council structure most fairly represented democracy and since there were more people to share the number of votes and represent the overall population. It was also suggested that a Rotating Mayor structure was archaic, which she suggested was a new buzz word, whereas two thirds of the cities in the State of California had Rotating Mayors and those with Elected Mayors had vastly larger populations than the City of Pinole. For the new cry of democracy, she emphasized there was no need for a King of the City of Pinole.

Cathy McFarland, commented that two major items residents wanted was safety and good roads, although time and time again they were being ignored with promises unfilled and the City Council was too busy being self-serving such as wanting an Elected Mayor, rather than the current protocol that was working well. She also found the constant City Council vote of 3-2 on many items had given residents a loss of confidence in who was representing citizens. Possibly it was time for Council members to be recalled. She added there had been another month without an approved contract for the PPD, Measure I had been approved in November 2024 and put into place on April 1, 2025, with nine months of increased sales tax revenue but still nothing for the PPD. Possibly it was time for the Closed Sessions on these items to be made public to allow the public to see who was actually working for the City.

Ms. McFarland added after reviewing the City's impacts fees and seeing what the City wanted to fund in upcoming years, she found it had shown Council members were not working for the residents of Pinole once again. Additionally, the State's pro-housing agenda did not protect the community. As an example, senior housing had been recently built in Pinole with little parking and there were issues in surrounding areas including issues with respect to safety. She understood the City now wanted $390,000 from residents of those neighborhoods to correct the problem. The City also had two large pro-housing projects with the same blueprints located on Appian Way and Fitzgerald Drive, and a storm drain project that was to be completed prior to the senior housing development cost had escalated beyond the original estimated amount from $700,000 to approximately $750,000. After talking with a Department Head, she understood there were issues with the senior housing development that had increased the estimate. The City's lack of oversight and rushing into the pro-housing agenda significantly cost the City. She asked the City to tell the State to stay out of Pinole and stop putting the financial risk on residents.

Ms. McFarland further commented that the City was migrating towards the State's cleaner environment and expressed concern the City was going down a rabbit hole due to the State's agenda, with unrealistic goals for all-electric development as an example. On another issue, when reviewing the top 25 incomes for Pinole, she noted that gas stations provided the greatest tax revenue.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy acknowledged Ms. McFarland had provided written comments as well.

Janet Wilks also spoke to the topic of an Elected Mayor and suggested the move to circumvent the input of Pinole residents was a clear attempt to consolidate executive power, which was seen daily in the news and which had political ambition written all over it. The Council passed on the opportunity to poll residents on their opinion whether an Elected Mayor should be placed on the ballot, with the City Council deciding to spend $25,000 to put the question on the ballot without so much as a by your leave to Pinole residents. The City Council also decided to place the question on the June versus November ballot, with the decision precluding polling. She pointed out the turnout for June elections was abysmal and exactly what some were counting on.

Ms. Wilks asked of the budget impacts if Pinole were to move to an Elected Mayor structure since every time a sitting Council member won a Mayoral position, it would force either a Special Election with associated costs, or allow the City Council to circumvent Pinole voters and appoint a Council member to fill the position, which to her spoke to consolidation of power.

Ms. Wilks asked about the fully loaded costs for a Special Election, the compensation package proposed to be offered to an Elected Mayor, and who among the City Council planned to run for the position and whether they were the same people rushing this through. She asked if this scheme was the reason the City had lost two City Managers in such a short period of time, whether the past two City Managers had been a threat to City Council power, how much it cost residents of Pinole to drive out two qualified City Managers, the amount of their severance packages, the cost for another third City Manager recruitment process and what other budget priorities would be sidelined to meet the Mayor's compensation package or whether the City Council proposed another tax increase. She also asked why Council and staff time was being spent on this issue when there were other more pressing issues that needed attention, such as roads, the PPD contract, Measure I funding, public safety and hiring another City Manager. She further asked whether the City Council had any intention of engaging with Pinole residents on the question of going to the ballot for consolidation of executive power in an Elected Mayor position and challenged the City Council to respond to her comments.

Kent Moriarty commented on the likely results of an Elected Mayor and consolidating more power in one person. He suggested residents would see the Mayor position used as a tool for personal ambition, would see more of an individual taking credit for the work of others, would see continued increases in City funds being allocated for the City Council as they had seen the City Council do approving increases in salary and travel allowances and would see an additional Mayor's salary. They could also see continued and increased conflicts between the Mayor and staff, and he too referenced the fact two City Managers had been let go, which had cost taxpayers and would continue to cost the City hundreds of thousands of dollars. If the City Council wanted to spend its time, effort and money on a ballot measure, he suggested pursuing something that benefitted the City as a whole.

Jason Littlefield described the differences between a Strong Mayor, Weak Mayor and City Council-City Manager structure, which the City currently had and which was not archaic, but very common and successful in many places, but much depended on the members of the City Council. He too referenced the meeting minutes from the December 2, 2025 City Council meeting when the topic of an Elected Mayor had been discussed, and when a statement had been made that an Elected Mayor would provide greater transparency, help residents understand exactly who was responsible for results and if the Mayor failed to deliver, the voters, not the City Council, would have the power to remove that individual at the next election. He suggested that sounded like a Strong Mayor attribute. Although it was also stated this change would not change the City Council – City Manager form of government, he found that to be a contradictory statement since there could not be a Mayor who took accountability and not change the form of City government/ management. He added it had also been suggested the intent was to create the office of an Elected Mayor to not be a Strong Mayor, which was the intent, and continuing to reference the meeting minutes, referenced the statement that was something Pinole voters would have to decide.

Marcia Joswick, speaking to the same topic, opposed the idea of an Elected Mayor in Pinole since cities the size of Pinole did not require an Elected Mayor, the associated costs of an Elected Mayor would be substantial now and in the future, and the City did not need a Special Election in June 2026 at a cost of over $25,000. She opposed her taxes being used wastefully and she asked City Council members to stop this nonsense before another penny was spent.

Margaret Young also opposed a full time Elected Mayor and agreed with the prior speaker's comments, who were people she knew. She suggested this was a very poor choice for the City since it would cost taxpayers, was unnecessary, the current Mayoral rotation worked well and did not cost taxpayers money, and with more important uses for City dollars such as a new City Manager, schools, road repair or any other issues previous speakers mentioned.

Peter Murray commented he had spoken to the topic of an Elected Mayor before and suggested it was a bad idea and a waste of time. He would like to see the City Council think of this situation as an individual seat, not as a group thing, and consider how this would affect the City Council in the future. If an Elected Mayor was allowed, it would likely diminish the position of other Council members since an Elected Mayor, depending on personality, may step up and lead the conversation, and assume authority and final decision making. He had seen this happen in the past, information that should get to the entire City Council did not happen because the Mayor decided they had to peruse information to ensure it fit his/her agenda, and this was a likely scenario for an Elected Mayor. He asked whether this was what the City Council really wanted to do, who was being appeased and who wanted to find their seat in a diminished capacity, whereas the current system allowed the City Council to have an equal say and the public knew they could approach any Council member and get questions answered. If that was not the case, there was only one person they could go to and there could be issues with special cliques and being influenced, sometimes to the detriment of others.

Susan Wallace, a new resident to Pinole, loved the community and when she learned there was a proposal to change the City Council to an Elected Mayor position, she was alarmed. She asked about the budget impacts of an Elected Mayor and expressed concern there was currently no City Manager. She found the decision had been made with haste and encouraged the City Council to take a poll of the citizens of Pinole.

Nadine Robbins-Laurent, a member of the Board of Directors, Pinole Artisans, thanked the City of Pinole for those who played a part in the Art Exhibit that everyone walked through as they entered the Council Chambers, with the art to be displayed through the end of February 2026. Pinole Artisans was an organization that had been in existence for 21-years and was a 501(c)(3) non-profit. There was more information available at pinoleartisans.org. Pinole Artisans held monthly meetings, and she hoped they would be held in the City at some point since they had trouble locating a space they could afford. Artists were invited to come in and discuss themselves and their work, and she welcomed everyone to attend one of their monthly meetings. She also thanked City staff, especially Prajwol Bhandari for his help getting the exhibit going and former City Manager Kelcey Young for her collaboration.

Peter Herman also spoke to the proposal for an Elected Mayor and commented he did not have a lot to add to the reasons to oppose the initiative. His main concern was that there was little time to further develop the pros and cons of an Elected Mayor. If he were to offer the benefit of the doubt for this initiative, there could be some benefits to this type of model, but he asked that the proponents of the initiative clarify the additional benefits that were more concrete in nature that could be foreseen since the benefits laid out had been rebutted to some degree during the meeting and it would be appropriate to hear more proposals on what specifically was intended to be accomplished if this initiative were implemented.

If this was something proponents felt strongly about, Mr. Herman asked for some additional research to determine what it was they were attempting to accomplish that would be appealing to citizens and to the City Council. He was not convinced yet and suggested they needed time to consider if this was the right thing to do. He supported the comments that others had made, that perhaps this was not the time since the City had many other priorities that were very important. At this time, he was opposed, and suggested this should be considered in the future with a better case presented.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy reported many of the items discussed would be on a future agenda and he encouraged the public to keep an eye out for future City Council meetings.

7. REPORTS & COMMUNICATIONS

A. Mayor Report

1. Announcements

Mayor Tave apologized for being late having come from work. He otherwise had no report.

B. Mayoral & Council Appointments: None

C. City Council Committee Reports & Communications

Council member Sasai reported the West Contra Costa Transportation Commission (WCCTC) would meet on January 23, 2026 at the City of El Cerrito, City Hall at 8:00 a.m. and would hear a presentation on The Hercules Hub, a vacant parcel by the waterfront in the City of Hercules, among other regular business items. As the current Chair of WCCTC, he also agendized a discussion about surveillance and reported on a meeting with Senator Jesse Arreguín about the need for surveillance and how it could help public safety, particularly due to speed cameras. Across the state it was illegal to have speed cameras in municipalities with the exception of a few major cities, such as the cities of San Francisco and Oakland, which were part of a pilot project. He had discussed carve out legislation with Senator Arrequín in Contra Costa and Alameda Counties and he looked forward to a discussion with WCCTC and sending a letter to state legislators to allow for that type of new surveillance. He also reported he spent a great deal of time supporting educators and students, having participated on the picket line with teachers and education staff who held a strike in December 2025, for a fair contract with the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD).

Council member Toms reported she and the Mayor Pro Tem attended a meeting with Assemblymember Buffy Wicks who provided a review of her legislative priorities. At that time, she spoke to Assemblymember Wicks about the ongoing problems on the on- and off-ramps that crossed over Pinole Creek, where there were no trash captures. The same issue had been raised with Senator Arreguín. There was no trash capture fencing in the area that prevented trash from the freeway from flowing freely into the creek, although the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requirements were to prevent that from happening, which issue she found to be a high priority. She would continue to highlight the issue with electeds since this was a Caltrans responsibility.

Council member Toms also attended the Contra Costa Mayors Conference in the City of Pittsburg, at which time there had been a presentation on a recycling program in Central Contra Costa County, and an announcement that retired City of Richmond Police Chief Bisa French would be taking on the Executive Director position at the Family Justice Center. She had also attended the Bay Front Chamber of Commerce meeting, with upcoming programs sponsored by the Chamber including the West Contra Costa Career Fair on February 18, 2026; City of Hercules Lunar New Year Parade and Festival on March 1, 2026; and State of the Cities Breakfast, with the Mayors of Pinole, Hercules and the Supervisor who covered the Rodeo area on March 12, 2026.

Council member Toms also planned to attend the January 23, 2026 League of California Cities Policy Committee for Housing, Community and Economic Development to review legislation, and reiterated the Pollinator Garden event sponsored by the Pinole Garden Club and Friends of Pinole Creek Watershed on February 7, 2026 at 10:00 a.m. at Fernandez Park.

Council member Martinez-Rubin reported she met with the City Clerk and the Deputy City Clerk as part of the City Council Procedures Subcommittee, where an update on the subcommittee discussions and review of procedures was provided, including an overview from the City Clerk on Senate Bill (SB) 707, which updated the Brown Act for 2026, and modernized open meeting laws which she highlighted in-depth. The next subcommittee meeting had been scheduled for March 18, 2026.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy reported he attended the Finance Subcommittee meeting and detailed the discussions for expanding community opportunities for the budget process. He thanked staff for starting the budget process earlier, particularly thanking the Finance Department, and also thanked staff for the launch of the Budget Dashboard tool. He also attended a Marin Clean Energy (MCE) Executive Board meeting and provided an update on the approval of a Standing Committee and members, and while not a member of the Standing Committee, he would continue to provide strong financial oversight as a full Board member, through his role on the Executive Committee, and as the Chair of the Technical Committee. He provided an overview of the role of MCE, reported the City of Pinole had received funds in the past from MCE for certain programs and infrastructure, and emphasized the importance at the regional level to continue to maintain that fiscal responsibility and technical accountability.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy added with respect to the WCCUSD, one of his priorities had been to work on education and literacy initiatives. He looked forward to working with Friends of Pinole Library to expand literacy efforts and support additional educational opportunities, especially while the Pinole Library was closed for a period of reconstruction. He encouraged anyone interested in supporting literacy, tutoring and enrichment programs to reach out to him via email, telephone or at City Hall, to allow them to continue to strengthen the community together. He also planned to continue his quarterly tours of WCCUSD school sites.

D. Council Requests for Future Agenda Items

Council member Toms requested a future agenda item to include a memorandum from the Community Development Department with a report on the PMC for expanding bee hives, pollinators and honey bees in residential areas and what that would involve.

Mayor Tave suggested a memorandum be presented to the City Council, and then go back to the Municipal Code Ad-Hoc Subcommittee to review the ordinance with a recommendation to the full City Council.

Council member Toms agreed.

Council member Sasai pointed out the Municipal Code Ad-Hoc Subcommittee was no longer meeting.

City Attorney Eric Casher confirmed the Municipal Code Update Ad-Hoc Subcommittee no longer convened but if there was an interest bringing the item forward, it could be brought back as a Council level workshop and the memorandum could serve as the staff report. The City Council could provide direction on the types of regulations it would like to see in the ordinance. The City Council could also appoint a subcommittee to take on this one particular ordinance and allow staff to work with the subcommittee before bringing back recommendations to the full City Council.

Mayor Tave recalled the City Council had considered updates to the PMC regarding roosters and chickens, and a particular number a resident could have on-site, which was why he thought this topic could go through the Municipal Code Ad-Hoc Subcommittee. He asked if Council member Toms wanted to see it go through a subcommittee or whether a memorandum would suffice.

Council member Toms suggested starting with a memorandum and learning the staff capacity and what would be involved and possibly provide copies of the materials Ms. Moriarty had provided to staff. After the memorandum was presented, she suggested the City Council could consider a request for a future agenda item.

Council member Martinez-Rubin offered a motion, seconded by Council member Toms, that staff bring to the City Council an update of the Pinole Municipal Code relative to apiaries and bees to reflect current beekeeping practices and regulations that supported agricultural sustainability, while also protecting the health, safety and general well-being of the Pinole community, and in so doing allow the City Council and the public to consider regulations associated with that.

City Attorney Casher commented that the direction sounded like a workshop item that staff would bring the information forward at a future City Council meeting, and receive direction from the City Council on what it wanted to see in an ordinance, if at all.

On the discussion, Council member Martinez-Rubin wanted an update to the PMC, with references available from nearby cities that could serve as potential models and rely on the City Attorney's expertise on updating the PMC, along with internal discussions between the City Attorney and staff on issues related to regulations.

City Attorney Casher explained that he could present the current PMC, how the issue was currently being regulated and examples from other cities that had incorporated regulations related to beekeeping and offer those examples as options. The City Council could then provide direction whether or not to make any updates to the PMC.

Council member Sasai supported the motion but emphasized there were benefits to having the Municipal Code Ad-Hoc Subcommittee discuss the issue and return to the City Council with a staff report and recommendations.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy fully supported agendizing the item and for Council members Martinez-Rubin and Toms to take the lead. He understood there was some urgency around the item and perhaps it should get on the agenda as soon as possible.

ACTION: Motion by Council members Martinez-Rubin/Toms to direct staff to bring to the City Council an update of the Pinole Municipal Code relative to apiaries and bees to reflect current beekeeping practices and regulations that support agricultural sustainability, while also protecting the health, safety and general well-being of the Pinole community, and in so doing allow the City Council and the public to consider regulations associated with that.

Vote:	**Passed**	**5-0**
	Ayes:	**Tave, Murphy, Martinez-Rubin, Sasai, Toms**
	Noes:	**None**
	Abstain:	**None**
	Absent:	**None**

E. City Manager Report / Department Staff

Acting City Manager/Police Chief Melissa Klawuhn provided an update on the Art Reception at City Hall held prior to the City Council meeting and hosted by Pinole Artisans. She thanked Pinole Artisans for the exhibit which had been on display for the past couple of months and for hosting the Art Reception. She also reported the City had received 20 proposals from the City Manager Executive Search services, and the City Council Subcommittee identified three top firms for the City Council to interview at an upcoming date.

Acting City Manager/Police Chief Klawuhn reported the Police Unity Tour, a 300-mile ride to honor fallen law enforcement officers, would include the participation of retired Acting Chief Matt Avery who would be riding in honor of fallen officers, including three officers who had made the ultimate sacrifice serving the Pinole community.

Officers included Constable Arthur McDonald, whose end of watch was in 1929; Officer John Sellers, whose end of watch was in 1972; and Officer Floyd "Bernie" Schwartz whose end of watch was in 1980.

Acting City Manager/Police Chief Klawuhn also reported the Road Repair and Rehabilitation Town Hall would be held on January 22, 2026 in the Council Chambers from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m., and would include a presentation on upcoming road improvements and maintenance efforts with City staff to be present to share an overview of planned projects, funding, timelines and a brief Q&A session. Anyone may participate through Zoom and livestream, which would include multilingual translation and closed captioning. She also announced she would be moving City Manager Office hours to Wednesdays from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m. starting January 21, 2026, and that schedule would continue for subsequent weeks.

F. City Attorney Report

City Attorney Casher provided an update on SB 707, which required City staff to provide the City Council and City Committee/Commission members copies of the Brown Act. He confirmed copies would be provided to the City Council and all City Committee/Commission members.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED (Items 7A through 7F)

Deputy City Clerk Stone reported there were no comments from the public.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

8. RECOGNITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / COMMUNITY EVENTS

A. Proclamations

1. Recognizing Police Officer of the Year

The City Council read into the record a proclamation recognizing Andre Roberts as the City of Pinole Police Officer of the Year.

Pinole Police Officer Andre Roberts thanked the City Council for its leadership and members of the PPD and his partner for their support. He looked forward to serving the City of Pinole for years to come.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Deputy City Clerk Stone reported there were no comments from the public.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

2. Recognizing Firefighter of the Year

The City Council read into the record a proclamation recognizing Captain Brian George as the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) Firefighter of the Year.

CCCFPD Captain Brian George thanked the City Council for the recognition and also thanked Officer Roberts. He commented that the members of Fire Stations 73 and 74 could also be standing in this position to receive recognition for doing a great job including other members of the CCCFPD. He was happy to receive the recognition on their behalf. He was also pleased to be put in the position of having great mentors and people who could continue to make the CCCFPD better.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Deputy City Clerk Stone reported there were no comments from the public.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

B. Presentations

1. Glow Pinole Presentation – Community Services Director, Andrea Dwyer

Community Services Director Andrea Dwyer provided an overview of Glow Pinole 2025, the second year for the holiday decorating contest, and reported there had been over 5,300 views of the community map and for this year community members were allowed to vote for the winners.

2025 Category winners included:

Residents:	Category
Stephen Tilton	Holiday Showstopper
Angelina Gutierrez	Best Theme Display
Johanna Jimenez	Glow and Go
Businesses:	
The Treasure Hunt Shop Derek McKindles	Winter Wonderland Window
Mike's Appliances Mike Murphy	Glow Getter
House of Lilith Hair Designers Angel Schneider	Dazzling Display

Certificates would be presented to all winners.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Deputy City Clerk Stone reported there were no comments from the public.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy thanked the Community Services Director for the program, the opportunity for residents and businesses to dazzle for the holidays and setting the mood for cheer in the community. He thanked the Community Services Director and her team for the various City programs and efforts to make new holiday traditions.

Council member Toms thanked staff for developing the program, congratulated the winners, commented she also participated and recognized the work of everyone who had participated.

Mayor Tave also thanked staff and found the program to be a hit. He commented that Glow Pinole was catching on in the community, had encouraged him to decorate more, and he asked staff to keep up the great work and effort.

9. CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters under the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and noncontroversial. These items will be enacted by one motion and without discussion. If, however, any interested party or Council member(s) wishes to comment on an item, they may do so before action is taken on the Consent Calendar.

Following comments, if a Council member wishes to discuss an item, it will be removed from the Consent Calendar and taken up in order after adoption of the Consent Calendar.

A. Approve the Minutes of the Regular City Council Meeting on December 16, 2025 and the Special City Council Meeting of January 13, 2026.

B. Receive the December 13, 2025 – January 16, 2026, List of Warrants in the Amount of $1,194,412.47, the December 19, 2025 Payroll in the Amount of $583,493.46, the January 2, 2026 Payroll in the Amount of $596,329.70, and the January 16, 2026 Payroll in the Amount of $663,767.06.

C. 2026 Regular City Council Meeting Schedule. **Action: Approve the 2026 Schedule of Regular City Council Meetings by Minute Order (Roxane Stone).**

D. Approve the 2026 Council Committee Assignment List. **Action: Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (Roxane Stone)**

E. Approval of Resolution Allowing the Submittal of a Request to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for the Allocation of Fiscal Year 2026/27 Transportation Development Act Article 3 Pedestrian/Bicycle Project Funding. **Action: Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (Heba El-Guindy)**

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy asked that Item 9E be pulled for discussion.

Council member Martinez-Rubin asked that Item 9D be pulled for discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Rafal Menis, speaking to Item 9C, commented on the challenges for people to get to the City Council Chambers by 5:00 p.m. on Tuesdays. He asked whether it would be possible for the City Council to consider an adjustment as part its 2026 Regular City Council Meeting Schedule, to change the start time of City Council meetings from 5:00 to 5:30 or 6:00 p.m., so that the meetings could be readily accessible to the public.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

For Item 9E, Mayor Pro Tem Murphy highlighted the item and stated while it had been posted on the Consent Calendar, it was a big item. He thanked the Public Works Director and her team for prioritizing the submittal request to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for the allocation of Fiscal Year 2026/27 Transportation Development Act Article 3 Pedestrian/Bicycle Project Funding. While a lot of people were excited about new developments on San Pablo Avenue, there were also concerns with pedestrian and bicycle safety. He explained the resolution would ensure roads were safe and repaved and offered a creative approach for new funding for roads. He urged staff to continue to push the City Council's priorities.

ACTION: Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Murphy/Council member Sasai to approve Consent Calendar Items 9A, 9B and 9E, as shown.

Vote:	**Passed**	**5-0**
	Ayes:	**Tave, Murphy, Martinez-Rubin, Sasai, Toms**
	Noes:	**None**
	Abstain:	**None**
	Absent:	**None**

For Item 9D, Council member Martinez-Rubin referenced Page 63 of 516 of the agenda packet, and noted the 2026 Council Committee Assignments for the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority (WCCIWMA/"RecycleMore") had shown Mayor Pro Tem Murphy as the delegate with the Mayor as the alternate, and with the group meeting the second Thursday of the month at 6:15 p.m. There was a conflict since the Mayor Pro Tem had also been shown as the alternate for the Western Contra Costa Transit Authority (WCCTA/"WestCat"), which also met on the second Thursday of each month at 6:30 p.m. While the Mayor Pro Tem had been shown as the alternate position, one could not be in the same place at the same time. She asked whether the Mayor Pro Tem would agree to Council member Toms serving as the alternate to WestCat due to that conflict, and if the appointed delegates were to need an alternate, there would actually be a representative from the City of Pinole present at the meetings.

Council member Toms was willing to serve as the alternate to WestCat.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy supported the item per the staff recommendation and as the Committee Assignments had been previously discussed.

Council member Martinez-Rubin reiterated her concern with the potential for a conflict.

Council member Toms emphasized the importance of the City having representation at the various bodies and she too shared the concern being raised by Council member Martinez-Rubin.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy commented that traditionally this was the time for individuals to assess their own availability. He emphasized he had been pretty great at ensuring Pinole had representation on the committees he served, and he brought back information to the City Council time and again. In terms of his timing and availability, those were not questions that needed to be asked, but they had been asked, and he had been generous in saying the 2026 Council Committee Assignment List was okay, as shown.

Council member Toms clarified her concern was not with the Mayor Pro Tem's availability, but the availability of the alternate to step up and cover RecycleMore, if needed.

Council member Sasai commented on the alternate structure for the Council Committee Assignmnts, and asked whether it would be possible to have two representatives and two alternates from the City Council on those Boards, and whether that had been done in the past.

City Attorney Casher explained there was nothing to prohibit that practice. It would just require a level of coordination between the alternates to decide who would cover and that would not be a Brown Act issue.

Council member Sasai asked if the Committee Assignment List could be amended to allow for two alternates, and Deputy City Clerk Stone confirmed that was possible.

Council member Sasai suggested that change could be considered in the future and he would like to discuss the logistics about that. He mentioned it because the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) had two representatives and two alternate positions.

For Item 9C and whether the start time for City Council meetings should be changed, Mayor Tave acknowledged 5:00 p.m. was a difficult start time. He personally recommended a change to 5:30 or 6:00 p.m. He also reported he had spoken with the Acting City Manager about allowing for a break for dinner, or some type of break before rolling into the City Council meetings.

Council member Sasai agreed a 5:00 p.m. start time was challenging for those who worked, although a later start time may result in completing fewer agenda items, coupled with a very long Closed Session where the City Council may have to consider extensions to the meeting length.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy was open to either suggestion and commented the City Council had discussed this topic in the past. He also understood a change in the meeting date would require an amendment to the PMC. He preferred a start time of 5:00 p.m., which had been discussed as a way to ensure there was enough time to complete the agenda and with the aim to end meetings at an appropriate time. He suggested the City Council was doing great thus far, but also understood the challenges for some who had 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. jobs.

Council member Martinez-Rubin suggested a start time of 5:30 p.m. was reasonable but with that later start time, the City Council must also acknowledge the need to be more efficient with the amount of time for discussions. Perhaps this was where the Procedure Subcommittee could offer recommendations on the changes to be made with regard to efficiency, to ensure items to be covered in 30-minutes or less were actually covered and the number of items on the agenda to be coordinated with the City Manager. She suggested a start time of 5:30 p.m. could result in the same adjournment times as if starting at 5:00 p.m. if the Council conscientiously limited discussions without minimizing the significance of comments about any particular item.

Mayor Tave agreed with the need to be more efficient as the City Council set up the Committee Assignments, which was forthcoming. He asked the City Attorney about the procedure to change the meeting start time to 5:30 or 6:00 p.m.

City Attorney Casher confirmed the PMC would have to be amended. This part of the PMC had been amended in June 2023 and a change to the PMC would require a first read of that chapter of the PMC to reset the meeting start time from 5:00 to 5:30 or 6:00 p.m., and would involve a second read as would a typical ordinance. The change would go into effect 30-days after the second read. This could be brought to the City Council for the first and second meetings of February and the change could go into effect at the end of March 2026, and with the first City Council meeting in April with a new start time. The City Council may still approve Item 9C and staff would return with an amendment to the PMC and also look at the Council Procedures, which may also require amendment to reflect a time change. He recommended approving Item 9C, as is, and then there could be a separate motion to amend the meeting start time to the time the City Council decided and provide direction to staff to bring back an ordinance to effect that time change.

For Brown Act purposes, City Attorney Casher recommended the City Council take separate actions on Items 9C and 9D, and any direction to staff to amend the PMC to change the meeting start time.

ACTION: Motion by Mayor Tave/Mayor Pro Tem Murphy to approve Item 9D, as is.

Vote:	**Passed**	**5-0**
	Ayes:	**Tave, Murphy, Martinez-Rubin, Sasai, Toms**
	Noes:	**None**
	Abstain:	**None**
	Absent:	**None**

Mayor Tave offered a motion, seconded by Council member Sasai to approve Item 9C and amend the PMC to change the City Council meetings to a 5:30 p.m. start time.

Council member Sasai supported the motion but would like the City Council, including himself, to be mindful of the time when commenting on particular items, while still getting points across, and he did not want the change to result in shortened agendas. If there were issues with the change, it could be discussed in the future.

ACTION: Motion by Mayor Tave/Council member Sasai to approve Item 9C and amend the Pinole Municipal Code to change the City Council meetings to a 5:30 p.m. start time.

Vote:	**Passed**	**5-0**
	Ayes:	**Tave, Murphy, Martinez-Rubin, Sasai, Toms**
	Noes:	**None**
	Abstain:	**None**
	Absent:	**None**

10. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Conduct a Public Hearing, Tabulate Ballots, and Consider Adoption of a Resolution Confirming Assessments for the Appian Village Residential Lighting Assessment District for Fiscal Year 2026/27. **Action: Adopt Resolution Confirming Assessments for the Appian Village Residential Lighting Assessment District (Lilly Whalen, David Hanham)**

Planning Manager David Hanham presented the staff report dated January 20, 2026, and recommended the City Council conduct a public hearing, receive and tabulate Proposition 218 ballots, and, if a majority of weighted ballots were submitted in favor of the proposed assessment, adopt a resolution confirming assessments for the Appian Village Residential Lighting Assessment District for Fiscal Year 2026/27.

Responding to questions from the City Council, Mr. Hanham and Public Works Director Heba El-Guindy clarified:

- The Appian Village Lighting Assessment District was designed to fund the ongoing operation, maintenance, and servicing of public streetlighting, traffic signal equipment and associated utilities located within the public right-of-way (ROW) along Appian Way and Canyon Drive, with the landscaping within the subdivision to be privately maintained and not included in the District. If new improvements raised the costs, the City also had the ability to adjust the levy to accommodate the new costs to finalize the improvement. (Mayor Pro Tem Murphy)

- The Appian Village Residential Project installed new streetlights along the frontage of the roadway on Appian Way as well as on Canyon Drive. Since the streetlights were on the back of the sidewalk, it was unlikely they could be hit from passing vehicle traffic on Pinole Valley Road. Streetlights that had been impacted by vehicles along Pinole Valley Road in the past were located in the center median. The developer also replaced the traffic signals at the intersection of Mann Drive and Appian Way and implemented some upgrades at the signal at Canyon Drive and Appian Way. The calculation of the share of the individual parcels took into account the maintenance activities as well some funding for the capital replacement over time. Given the devices were newer, it would take some time for replacement and the calculations had included some reserves. Clarified the annual Engineer's Reports from the Assessment District would be provided, and the assessment would be increased based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI). (Mayor Pro Tem Murphy)

- Lighting that was currently down on Appian Way and down toward San Pablo Avenue was not part of the Development Agreement (DA) for the Appian Village development, and had not been integrated into the Assessment District, but the City Council had approved Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) projects for streetlighting upgrades, with each streetlight on average costing around $15,000. Within Pinole Valley Road, the streetlights were different and with an average cost of $20,000. Depending on the location, staff was planning to progress with replacements and the addition of streetlights in addition to working with PG&E to upgrade some of its lighting. (Mayor Pro Tem Murphy)

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Deputy City Clerk Stone reported there were no comments from the public.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Mr. Hanham announced the results of the balloting and reported at this time he had only one ballot, and while signed, the ballot had not been checked yes or no and there was no representative from the developer present to provide clarification.

City Attorney Casher reported staff had been in contact with the property owner/developer who was very much in support of the Appian Village Residential Lighting Assessment District. He suggested that was an error on their part not checking the box, and suggested they could move forward assuming they were supportive, and staff could confirm that was their intent, unless staff was able to contact the applicant via email. The item could be postponed until after the remaining agenda items.

Community Development Director Lilly Whalen confirmed the developer/applicant had been very supportive of the Proposition 218 process and she would do her best to reach the developer/applicant. The City Council could proceed on the assumption the developer/applicant was supportive and if for some reason that was not the case, the item could be brought back at the next City Council meeting.

Council member Toms clarified this was a condition of approval for the project to annex into the Landscape and Lighting District, and if this was not approved, it would simply delay the filing of the Final Map and ability for the developer/applicant to sell condos. The developer/applicant had every incentive to vote in the affirmative, but because there was nothing on record or in writing, she recommended the item be continued until that information was available to avoid conflicts.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy agreed and suggested continuing the item until there was some resolution from the developer/applicant.

City Attorney Casher agreed the City Council may continue the item to allow staff to reach the developer/applicant, and after the conclusion of Item 12A, the item could be reconsidered for approval. As to whether the developer/applicant should appear on Zoom, he asked the Community Development Director to see if that could be done. Part of the reason he suggested moving forward was that the developer/applicant had been adamant the item be approved since the sale of the units would be delayed without that approval.

ACTION: Motion by Mayor Tave/Council member Martinez-Rubin to move item 10A to be heard after Item 12A.

Vote:	**Passed**	**5-0**
	Ayes:	**Tave, Murphy, Martinez-Rubin, Sasai, Toms**
	Noes:	**None**
	Abstain:	**None**
	Absent:	**None**

B. Adoption of the Safety Element and Health and Environmental Justice Element.
Action: Adopt Resolution per Staff Recommendation (David Hanham)

Planning Manager Hanham reported Noelle Anderson, Michael Baker International (MBI), would provide a presentation on the Safety Element and Health and Environmental Justice and Health Elements, and also reported the City Council had been provided a correction memo dated January 20, 2026 in response to comments from the City Council on the draft documents.

Noelle Anderson, Project Manager, Michael Baker International (MBI) provided an extensive PowerPoint presentation on the Safety Element Update and Environmental Justice and Health Elements, which included an overview of the work program history; Safety and Environmental Justice Elements statutory requirements and General Plan Element contents. She also highlighted key updates to the Safety and Environmental Justice Elements; additional hazards, goals, policies and actions covered in the Safety Element Update; and key topics, impacted community identification, impacted communities' population data and the goals, policies and actions in the Environmental Justice Element.

Both elements reflected feedback provided during the public outreach process and comments provided from a public workshop held in August 2025, which were also highlighted.

Ms. Anderson also appreciated the comments provided by the City Council with the responses provided in the January 20, 2026 correction memo.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Deputy City Clerk Stone reported there were no comments from the public.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy thanked staff for putting the information together given the regulatory changes in the landscape over the last couple of years and for the January 20 correction memo that was provided with recommended revisions to the Draft Safety Element. He asked for clarification of the neighborhoods that had fewer than two points of egress, particularly the area of Galbreth Road where the City had worked in 2023 to open the area up for emergency operations; however, changes had been reflected in the January 20 correction memo and he asked for clarification as to what was being reflected.

Ms. Anderson explained she had spoken with the Community Development Director and the attempt they were trying to make with the redlines, as shown in the January 20 correction memo, was to reflect that a gate existed on Galbreth Road but the road itself was not a formal paved road. This was sufficient for access purposes, but could be improved to be safer and more viable in an emergency scenario.

Mr. Hanham added there was an easement on the Galbreth Road property for the access road to go through but it was not improved and was something to consider in the future, if the City wanted to improve to a road status. The area was currently grass and dirt between the two fences on Galbreth and Rancho Roads.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy clarified the Galbreth Road side of the road was located in the City of Pinole, whereas the South Rancho Road was not within the City's boundaries, and Mr. Hanham explained the City boundary was close, right on the boundary, not really the City's and there was a need to coordinate with the County to get the other side improved. Galbreth and North Roads were within the City limits but the property in between was not in the City limits.

Community Development Director Whalen confirmed the unimproved egress road was located in unincorporated Contra Costa County and was the reason it was not appropriate for the City of Pinole to take the lead on creating an improved road in the County's jurisdiction. Action SE 1.9.10 of the Safety Element had been refashioned to coordinate with the County.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy was motivated to support the document but the way that Action SE 1.9.10 read, it was if the City was doing the action and taking the action to deal with South Rancho Road. He wanted to ensure that what staff was saying today was reflected in the modified change. He referenced the north-west side of Pinole, with two to three hundred households, and he wanted to be clear in the language and be clear to Galbreth Road residents that residents had an evacuation route on the map.

Mr. Hanham clarified the route under discussion was not a major roadway and something that would be considered in an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP). The Fire Department would consider whether to open that route in the event of an emergency. The Safety Element was showing the major evacuation routes from the City, with other evacuation routes that people were aware in other parts of the City to be opened during an emergency, depending on the location of the emergency. The Safety Element identified the major evacuation routes, north, south, east and west with the knowledge that there would be evacuation routes that could be opened, and with residents directed to major evacuation routes first.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy commented even with the recommended modification to Action SE 1.9.10, staff would not suggest the route on Galbreth Road be identified as an evacuation route.

Mr. Hanham reiterated Galbreth Road could be an evacuation route, but it was not a major thoroughfare, just a way to get out of the community. The City had to control its access, and if and when the County stepped up and improved it to a full-blown road with access, the language in Action SE 1.9.10 of the Safety Element states: *Coordination with the County to evaluate the feasibility of constructing an emergency access and egress road connecting Galbreth Road to South Rancho Road. Ensue the existing fire access gate remains accessible and operable by emergency responders. Additionally, assess the potential for converting this access route into a permanent public roadway.*

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy commented one of the issues that had come up over the years about fire safety and during conversations with residents and electeds, was the need for more evacuation routes, which was a qualitative statement. He asked about the number of evacuation routes the City should increase given the map had shown the east side of Pinole with fewer numbers of two points of egress. He wanted to know the quantification of some of the tasks and what it would look like for the City to reach a metric around evacuation routes in those areas.

Ms. Anderson explained the quantification had been established by the state and establishing those residential areas with less than two points of egress, with two points of egress the standard for new development. It did not mean the City needed to bulldoze everything and build a secondary evacuation route, but was assessed from a land use perspective. The information could be used by Fire and Police when directing evacuations and if there was danger in one of the zones, residents should be notified as early as possible and coordination needed to happen based on the known number of points of egress. As part of yearly coordination with residents, the City needed to be aware of the limited egress should it receive evacuation notices, which was something residents needed to heed seriously since it would take residents longer to evacuate and residents needed to follow City direction at that time.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy thanked everyone for the hard work defining the City. He looked forward to the completion and adoption of the EOP which would fall in line with the Safety Element and the timing of this effort with the EOP. He suggested it would be cleaner for the City Council to wait another meeting to adopt the Safety Element with the proposed changes in the correction memo. He asked if the item could return to the City Council on consent with the modified changes since they were not part of the original staff report.

Mr. Hanham confirmed the correction memo changes were not part of the original packet. He suggested staff could return after implementing all of the changes in the document.

Mr. Hanham clarified changes proposed by the Planning Commission had been included in the document. The only changes not inserted into the document were those changes requested by the City Council, as reflected in the January 20, 2026 correction memo.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy suggested it would offer an opportunity to be concise to include all of the information together in one package if the item were returned and he highlighted the comments in the correction memo. It would also allow staff the opportunity to incorporate any other comments provided by the City Council at this meeting.

Community Development Director Whalen clarified that if the item returned to a future City Council meeting as a public hearing discussion or presentation, a budget amendment would be required with the consultant because the item was out of budget. She had no concern if the item came back on consent.

Council member Toms asked if the City Council offered a motion to adopt the documents, with the modifications in the correction memo, then staff would make the modifications before a final was posted as part of the General Plan. Since many members of the City Council provided their comments in writing, staff could respond in writing. She suggested the correction memo worked.

Mayor Tave reopened the public hearing.

Deputy City Clerk Stone reported there were no comments from the public.

The public hearing was again closed.

ACTION: Motion by Council members Toms/Martinez-Rubin to adopt a resolution to approve the Updated Safety Element and new Health and Environmental Justice Element, for the City of Pinole, General Plan and a Notice of Exemption, subject to the modifications identified in the January 20, 2026 memo from staff to the City Council.

Vote:	**Passed**	**5-0**
	Ayes:	**Tave, Murphy, Martinez-Rubin, Sasai, Toms**
	Noes:	**None**
	Abstain:	**None**
	Absent:	**None**

11. OLD BUSINESS: None

12. NEW BUSINESS

A. Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2025. **Action: Receive and Accept the Report (Markisha Guillory)**

Finance Director Markisha presented the January 20, 2026 staff report and introduced Mark Hu, The Pun Group, to provide a PowerPoint presentation. She also took the opportunity to express her appreciation to Finance Department staff including Senior Accountant Maria Mata and Account Specialist Anthony Colden.

Mark Hun, Auditor/Assurance Services Manager, The Pun Group, provided a PowerPoint presentation that included an overview of required communications, management responsibilities and auditor responsibilities in accordance with professional standards. He highlighted the City's Government-wide Condensed Statement of Net Position for the period of June 30, 2025 and 2024; Government-wide Summary and Statement of Activities for the years ended June 30, 2025 and 2024; General Fund Condensed Balance Sheet, June 30, 2025 and 2024; General Fund, Condensed Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance, for the years ended June 30, 2025 and 2024; Restatement of Beginning Net Position and Fund Balance – Government-Wide Statements for the year ended June 30, 2024; and the audit results. He advised that unmodified opinions had been issued to all opinion units, the financial statements were fairly presented in all material respects, accounting policies had been consistently applied, estimates used were reasonable and the disclosures properly reflected in the financial statements. No communicating internal control related matters had been identified in the audit.

In terms of 2006 Measure S Fund and 2014 Measure S Fund, Mr. Hun stated no unmodified opinions had been issued, and no findings for internal control over financial reporting of compliance found. In terms of the 2024 Measure I Fund, no unmodified opinions issued, no findings for internal control over financial reporting of compliance found. There had also been no disagreements with management, no material weaknesses or significant deficiencies identified in internal control over financing reporting or compliance, no accounting issues where there was question on authoritative guidance noted and no inappropriate activities noted.

Mr. Hun acknowledged a typographical error in the PowerPoint presentation and commented the reference to the City of Fairfield should read *City of Pinole*.

Finance Director Guillory recommended the City Council receive and accept the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2025.

Responding to questions from the City Council, Mr. Hun and Finance Director Guillory clarified the following:

- Clarified Slide 13 of the PowerPoint presentation, Government-Wide, Condensed Statement of Net Position, June 30, 2025 and 2024, the net position represented the City could allocate funds when needed, with three categories identified as Net Investment and Capital Asset, Restricted and Unrestricted and with each category defined; and clarified Slide 15, General Fund, Condensed Balance Sheet, June 30 2025 and 2024, particularly the Deferred Inflows of Resources, as shown. (Mayor Pro Tem Murphy)

- Acknowledged appreciation for all of the tables and useful information provided, with the report a wonderful reference, with appreciation for all of the information on fund balances over the years. (Martinez-Rubin)

- Clarified Slides 13 and 14, of the PowerPoint presentation and clarified the numbers shown for the Government-Wide Condensed Statement of Net Position June 30, 2025 and 2024, and Government-Wide Summary, Statement of Activities for the Years Ended June 30, 2025 and 2024. (Mayor Tave)

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Rafael Menis offered the following comments on Item 12A:

- Page 327 of 516 of the agenda packet, the total assets decreased but the depreciation increased and asked for clarification.

- Page 342 of 516 of the agenda packet, the liability for accounts payable in the General Fund as of June 30, 2025 was $1.262 million, and asked if that was typical or unusually high in that given period.

- Page 345 of 516 of the agenda packet, noted a moderately substantial decrease in other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) expenses and asked of the cause.

- Page 350 of 516 of the agenda packet, there was an adjustment of $1 dollar for other receivables and asked the cause for the adjustment.

- Page 389 of 516 of the agenda packet, only one category out of the several listed had a real return rate above 6.90 percent, California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) expected rate of concern, and a point of concern for the future.

- Page 391 of 516 of the agenda packet, asked if the measurement date was June 30, 2024 or June 30, 2025.

- Page 392 of 516 of the agenda packet, noted the expected increase in the deferred outflows of resources for both the Miscellaneous and Safety Plans for the year ending June 30, 2027, and asked for more detail.

- Page 392 of 516 of the agenda packet, noted the substantial increase in assumed expenses for OPEB and asked for the cause of the increase in OPEB expenditure assumptions.

Mr. Menis concluded his comments and stated he would provide the rest in writing.

Finance Director Guillory asked that she be able to get back to Mr. Menis with a response to his questions, in writing, which would allow her the opportunity to ensure responses were accurate.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy offered a motion, seconded by Mayor Tave to accept the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2025.

On the motion, Mayor Tave asked that the reference to the City of Fairfield in the PowerPoint presentation be corrected to read *City of Pinole*.

Finance Director Guillory apologized for not catching the error when the document was printed, but commented the language in the PowerPoint presentation where the reference to the City of Fairfield was made, was standard and not specific.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

ACTION: **Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Murphy/Mayor Tave to accept the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2025.**

Vote:	**Passed**	**5-0**
	Ayes:	**Tave, Murphy, Martinez-Rubin, Sasai, Toms**
	Noes:	**None**
	Abstain:	**None**
	Absent:	**None**

The City Council returned to Item 10A, Confirming Assessments for the Appian Village Residential Lighting Assessment District for Fiscal Year 2026/27, at this time.

City Attorney Casher reported a representative from the property owner was present online. He asked that the public hearing be reopened to allow clarification of the ballot submitted by the property owner. The public hearing could then be closed and a motion taken on the item.

Mayor Tave reopened the public hearing for Item 10A.

City Attorney Eric Casher reiterated a ballot had been timely submitted by the property owner, but when the ballot was opened there was an omission in the ballot, and a duly authorized representative of the property owner was now present on Zoom. He asked the speaker to state her title and confirm she was a duly authorized representative of the property owner.

Dana Tsubota, Chief Legal Officer, for the managing member of the property owner, identified herself as a duly authorized representative of the property owner and authorized to sign any ballots on behalf of the property owner, Civic Pinole LLC. When asked by the City Attorney, she confirmed the affirmative vote in support of the Assessment District.

Mayor Tave closed the public hearing.

ACTION: **Motion by Council members Toms/Sasai that the City Council having tabulated the Proposition 218 ballots, and as confirmed, adopted a Resolution confirming assessments for the Appian Village Residential Lighting Assessment District for Fiscal Year 2026/27.**

Vote:	**Passed**	**5-0**
	Ayes:	**Tave, Murphy, Martinez-Rubin, Sasai, Toms**
	Noes:	**None**
	Abstain:	**None**
	Absent:	**None**

13. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD (Continued from Item 6) (Public Comments)
Only open to members of the public who did not speak under the first Citizens to be Heard, Agenda Item 6.
***Citizens may speak under any item not listed on the Agenda**. The time limit is 3 minutes and is subject to modification by the Mayor. Individuals may not share or offer time to another speaker.*

Pursuant to provisions of the Brown Act, no action may be taken on a matter unless it is listed on the agenda, or unless certain emergency or special circumstances exist. The City Council may direct staff to investigate and/or schedule certain matters for consideration at a future Council meeting.

Rafael Menis commented on the overall presence of COVID-19 in the community which continued to be at a low level pursuant to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) data with a slight increase in a couple of sites in Alameda County that were High or Moderate, with all sites in Contra Costa County still in the Very Low category. There was also a slight decline on the national level. He encouraged people to get vaccinated or boosted and wear masks in crowded indoor areas.

Mr. Menis also commented there were parts of the country that were effectively being occupied by federal law enforcement forces acting in a questionably legal fashion, and he cited the actions of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in Minneapolis, Minnesota, acting to break into citizen and non-citizen homes without appropriate warrants, seizure of citizens and non-citizens, their detention and on occasion deportation in defiance of law along with the killing of Renee Nicole Good, by an ICE agent, which as of today the President of the United States acknowledged was a tragedy. He encouraged those concerned to reach out to representatives and Senators, to call for no increase in funding to DHS and ICE, and ideally to reform those agencies. He also invited everyone to join him at a protest on January 24, 2026 at the corner of Tennent and San Pablo Avenues from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Anthony Vossbrink, asked the Mayor, City Council and staff to address a concern that had been raised months ago regarding the attack of a couple at Bay Front Park, which area was highly trafficked for park use and recreation for pedestrians and bicyclists throughout Pinole and neighboring cities. He urged the City to do more to provide security in the park area. While two cameras had been installed, the City had yet to address new or updated signage or provide lights in and around the parking lot area. He suggested the use of solar lights and pointed out there would be no impacts to wildlife or people near the railroad tracks if additional lighting was installed.

Council member Sasai asked that the meeting adjourn in memory of Renee Nicole Good, who was murdered by ICE in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

14. ADJOURN to the Regular City Council Meeting of February 2, 2026 in Remembrance of Amber Swartz and Renee Nicole Good.

At 8:19 p.m., Mayor Pro Tem Tave adjourned to a Regular City Council Meeting on February 2, 2026 in Remembrance of Amber Swartz and Renee Nicole Good.

Submitted by:

Roxane Stone, CMC
Deputy City Clerk
Approved by City Council: February 3, 2026