

1  
2  
3 **MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**  
4 **PINOLE PLANNING COMMISSION**

5  
6 **June 9, 2025**

7  
8 **THIS MEETING WAS HELD IN A HYBRID FORMAT**  
9 **BOTH IN-PERSON AND ZOOM TELECONFERENCE**

10  
11  
12 **A. CALL TO ORDER:** 7:02 p.m.

13  
14 **B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

15  
16 **C. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:** *Before we begin, we would like to acknowledge the*  
17 *Ohlone people, who are the traditional custodians of this land. We pay our respects to*  
18 *the Ohlone elders, past, present and future, who call this place, Ohlone Land, the land*  
19 *that Pinole sits upon, their home. We are proud to continue their tradition of coming*  
20 *together and growing as a community. We thank the Ohlone community for their*  
21 *stewardship and support, and we look forward to strengthening our ties as we continue*  
22 *our relationship of mutual respect and understanding.*

23  
24 **D. ROLL CALL**

25  
26 Commissioners Present: Bender, Huey, Lam-Julian, Uch, Vice-Chairperson Menis,  
27 Chairperson Sandoval

28  
29 Commissioners Absent: Martinez

30  
31 Staff Present: David Hanham, Planning Manager  
32 Heba El-Guindy, Public Works Director  
33 Justin Shiu, Senior Planner

34  
35 **E. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

36  
37 There were no citizens to be heard.

38  
39 **F. MEETING MINUTES**

40  
41 1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for April 28, 2025

42  
43 Commissioner Lam-Julian requested the following revisions to the Planning Commission  
44 meeting minutes of April 28, 2025:

45  
46 Page 19 of 89 of the agenda packet, Lines 12 through 14:  
47  
48  
49

1 She [Commissioner Lam-Julian] also referenced 812 Kitchens, a small business  
2 incubator, where they could take it a step further and create pop-ups and space  
3 where food could be tested and where the space could be converted for use for  
4 multiple events.  
5

6 And Page 21 of 89 of the agenda packet, Lines 43 through 45:  
7

8 St. James Square, also in San Jose, was comprised of an odd-shaped piece of  
9 land that had been proposed to be converted to small micro-businesses and  
10 community space to serve as a destination location.  
11

12 Commissioner Bender requested amendments to Page 17 of 89 of the agenda packet,  
13 Lines 35 through 38:  
14

15 He [Commissioner Bender] had concern with the demand for more commercial  
16 space while he is interested in the movement in England to reuse buildings to  
17 reduce environmental impacts.  
18

19 And Page 22 of 89 of the agenda packet, Lines 4 through 9:  
20

21 He [Commissioner Bender] cited a mixed-use development in the City of  
22 Sunnyvale, which involved commercial on the ground floor with a major tenant on  
23 the bottom and housing above, a good project in terms of its size; however, when  
24 entering into negotiations with the project lenders, the lenders required the grocery  
25 store as a standalone building with the housing separate, which he found to be  
26 unfortunate but which showed the power that lenders had to dictate what would be  
27 built.  
28

29 **MOTION** with a Roll Call vote to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for April  
30 28, 2025, as amended by Commissioners Bender and Lam-Julian.  
31

32 **MOTION: Sandoval**

**SECONDED: Bender**

**APPROVED: 5-0-2**

**ABSTAIN: Huey**

**ABSENT: Martinez**

33  
34  
35  
36 **G. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None**

37  
38 **H. OLD BUSINESS: None**

39  
40 **I. NEW BUSINESS**

41  
42 **1. Review of Proposed Preliminary Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Fiscal Year**  
43 **(FY) 2025/26 through FY 2029/2030 for Consistency with the General Plan**  
44

45 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported on ex-parté communications with his email list about the  
46 agenda in general. He also had some discussions at the City's Pride/Juneteenth event with  
47 some members of the Pinole Police Department about Item I.1.  
48  
49  
50

1 Public Works Director Heba El-Guindy provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Draft  
2 Capital Improvement Plan for FY 2025/26 through FY 2029/30 and Priority FY 2025/26  
3 Capital Projects. The FY 2025/26 to FY 2029/30 CIP included 45 projects and five  
4 infrastructure assessments under six categories. Priority FY 2025/26 projects included  
5 three facilities, two parks, six sanitary sewer, two stormwater, eleven street and roads  
6 projects and two infrastructure assessments, which were all highlighted.  
7

8 Ms. El-Guindy stated the Final Budget and CIP would be approved by the City Council at  
9 its June 17, 2025 meeting. The City Council proposed no changes to the CIP at this time.  
10

11 Ms. El-Guindy recommended the Planning Commission review the Proposed Preliminary  
12 Five-Year CIP and adopt Resolution 25-07, as contained in Attachment A, finding the projects  
13 proposed in the CIP for Fiscal Years (FY) 2025/26 through 2029/30 were consistent with the  
14 General Plan.  
15

16 Responding to questions from the Planning Commission, Planning Manager David Hanham  
17 and Ms. El-Guindy clarified the following:  
18

- 19 • Project #FA1901, Senior Center Auxiliary Parking Lot, clarified the project had been  
20 put on hold and may be used for different purposes for redevelopment other than  
21 establishing a parking lot. (Bender)  
22
- 23 • Project #RO1710, San Pablo Avenue Bridge over BNSF Railroad, clarified  
24 construction funding to be sought through federal and state funds; \$28 million had  
25 currently been allocated for construction. Staff was uncertain if that amount would  
26 be sufficient, with the cost to be clarified through the design phase. (Bender)  
27
- 28 • Project #RO2506, Traffic Calming Program, clarified how some projects could be  
29 combined. Any agreements through consultants and contractors required City  
30 Council approval. Combinations may depend on the functionality and scope of the  
31 project. As an example, the Pavement Management Program for FY 2025/26  
32 planned to cover Pinole Valley Road, Shea and Sarah Drives and was planned as a  
33 Complete Streets Project, not just pavement rehabilitation, given safety issues in the  
34 vicinity of schools and a soccer field. Some pavement markings, signage  
35 improvements and physical traffic calming devices were planned. Staff planned to  
36 utilize funds for more than one project if the project under the Pavement  
37 Rehabilitation Project was insufficient. For Tennent Avenue, there were also plans  
38 in the future for a Complete Streets project to include pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle  
39 improvements. (Uch)  
40
- 41 • If Project #RO2506, Traffic Calming Program, was adopted by the City Council, it  
42 would start in FY 2025/26. Project #RO2505, Safe Routes to Schools, had initially  
43 been planned to start in FY 2025/26, but due to financial constraints and since it was  
44 funded by Measure S, the amount out of the General Fund had been reduced and  
45 the project had been pushed back one year. Whatever was not used as part of the  
46 Pavement Rehabilitation project, the City would continue working on throughout the  
47 year to meet the community needs. Staff had a list of requests from the community  
48 for school and traffic calming-related needs mainly in areas surrounding schools in  
49 residential neighborhoods and not arterials. (Uch)

- Staff wanted to address the transportation system on a broader perspective and extend as much as possible throughout the year, although limited staff and financial resources required the maximization of the use of funds and bundling projects to make them more efficient. (Uch)
- Project #SS2407, Private Sewer Lateral Program, acknowledged concern the program did not apply to Median-Income households in Pinole, which would affect a number of residents in Pinole and a request to work with PG&E to expand the program for homeowners. Acknowledged concerns PG&E cut off residents when switching to gas lines and oftentimes PG&E cut into the roadway and sidewalks to access equipment, with the sidewalks repaired with asphalt, which was not up to code. It was also acknowledged that PG&E provided no response to residents' repeated requests for updates on repair. Clarified per state law, it was the property owner's responsibility to maintain sidewalks even if there were trees to be removed.

The City has not yet prepared the guidelines for the program, to be clarified when establishing the program. The program was intended to help the community in need first as a priority and it was hoped a significant number of property owners would be helped by the program. The City recognized many property owners would not be able to afford such an improvement, remove trees and rebuild sidewalks, which was the intent for establishing the program. Staff acknowledged concerns with impacts to the roadway network due to work by PG&E and the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) and staff was working with those agencies. (Lam-Julian)

- In terms of updates to City Parks, acknowledged reference to Health and Safety Code Section 1157251, which stated tan bark should be about 12-inches underneath structures to soften falls from the play structures, although the tan bark at Nob Hill Park had been pushed up around the base of the play structure with several residents expressing concerns the tan bark had not been refilled for some time and the City had been asked to address that situation. Clarified the City was checking on current grant funds to determine whether that improvement could be targeted soon without having to include it in park upgrades. Reported the Community Services Director was actively working on seeking community partnerships, particularly for the dog park. Interested organizations could reach out to the Community Services Director. (Lam-Julian).
- Clarified staff would continue to seek grants to supplement the funds for proposed projects. Staff was confident grants the City was currently receiving were not at risk due to the current political climate. As an example, the San Pablo Bridge project had been placed on hold but the City submitted environmental documents and other receipts to take the project off the inactive list. While some projects that were federally funded were being targeted, the City had already made its case for ongoing projects. Acknowledged funding under the various grant programs was less than had been provided in the past, but opportunities remained and staff continued to seek funds from the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and various transportation funding opportunities. Admittedly, grants had become more competitive since funding was less and although the City was competing with cities that had disadvantaged areas, staff continued to pursue the opportunities. (Huey)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

- Project # #RO2505, Safe Routes to Schools, clarified concerns had been expressed from the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD) and parents related to traffic issues in the public right-of-way (ROW) or within the site. As an example, the City was working with Pinole Middle School to redesign the parking lot to better accommodate staff parking away from drop-off and pick-up areas to make it more efficient. Clarified schools involved a different approval process pursuant to State Architect requirements, but the City was supporting the WCCUSD in this matter. There had been a request for a new crosswalk in front of the school, which was in a mid-block location but could not be approved absent a traffic control device to ensure safety. Improvements to signage, pavement markings, sidewalk conditions and accessibility were other issues that had been raised by the community depending on the area. Those concerns were being raised by the schools, WCCUSD and community members via email, reporting on the City website and from various avenues.

Staff was unaware whether the WCCUSD had conducted a Walk Audit, but City staff had the expertise to do this type of work to support the WCCUSD. There was also a group out of U.C. Berkeley that assisted with Walk Audits and the City needed to be ready to implement the improvements, which was why there was a level of managing expectations with improvements to be established gradually. The City was not usually notified of those studies but notified after the WCCUSD had already completed the studies. The City was not involved in the WCCUSD studies other than when the WCCUSD found it could not fund all of the projects, particularly off-site improvements, when the WCCUSD reached out to the City for assistance. There were plans to team with the Pinole Police Department for an Office of Traffic Safety Grant, for traffic education in the various schools to enhance what could be offered to the community. (Huey)

- Project #RO2503, City Streetlights Upgrade, clarified the City followed state standards for street lights but planned to develop its own standards, to be established whether for PG&E or City lights. Clarified placement of PG&E lights was dictated by the location of the utility poles, and street lighting would be updated through development projects such as the Appian Way project, which would install new lights with 150-feet of spacing on Appian Way and Canyon Road on the border of the project site. Reported that quarterly coordination meetings had been held with PG&E since PG&E had its own programs where the City could benefit to improve lighting conditions, save on the charges paid monthly for energy usage, benefit from the various programs and categorize usage differently. (Huey)
- While each CIP project had been given a priority score in the past that had not been followed as much this year. Unfunded projects had been prioritized in the past as well. Factors used when prioritizing include funding, funding source and level of need for the project; however, the projects had not been scored with a short list of projects to start sooner than later in FY 2025/26. Projects that had been grant funded had to remain on schedule to secure those funds. Staff tried to minimize any projects funded by the General Fund since Measure S was housed in the General Fund. Reiterated there would be six sewer-related projects to be funded by Sewer Enterprise fees, with sufficient funds available for the projects. (Huey)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

- Clarified staff decided not to use priority scoring for this fiscal year since it had not been followed in past years and some unfunded projects had a high priority scoring but had not been pursued. Some projects had stayed on the books year after year even with a high score. Projects were really dictated by staff resources and available funding. Again, highlighted the CIP projects planned for this year and reported an Associate Engineer position had been approved by the City Council to help the Public Works Department implement the projects identified. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Project #PA1901, Pinole Valley Park Soccer Field Rehabilitation, clarified grant funding for the project had covered specific improvements such as the turf improvement. While the soccer field had been renovated, the irrigation system had not been rehabilitated and was part of the reason the turf had deteriorated quickly since the park was heavily used by various groups and community teams. Some sections of the turf and rehabilitation of the irrigation system was now being done. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Project ##SS2407, Private Sewer Lateral Program, clarified staff had not yet discussed the guidelines for this program, but for equity purposes may place a cap on improvements. Staff had not progressed far in the process as yet, but would soon work on it and could bring it forward for review, if desired. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Project #RO2403, Old Town Traffic Calming, clarified the project would start in FY 2026/27 due to staff capacity limits. Improvements to San Pablo Avenue in general would mainly follow the San Pablo Avenue bridge construction, which would create a significant amount of truck traffic. Staff did not want to implement improvements now that could be impacted later. Also, the main configuration of the roadway may be considered in different cross sections in the future and the City was working with Caltrans to build a four-lane bridge and did not want to do anything to affect Caltrans's decision. Staff planned to tackle this project after the bridge project. In the meantime, there may be improvements to the overall environment in the downtown area such as string lighting, curb/ramp improvements and possibly some street furnishings. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Project #RO2301, Road Rehabilitation, clarified Vehicle Impact Fees (VIFs) had been listed for FY 2025/26 only and not moving forward in future years and whether that was due to debt financing had not been determined since the amount of debt financing had currently been estimated for FYs 2027 and 2028, and the amount would go down each year after that. Measure I was not mentioned since staff wanted sufficient funding to pay for the debt financing to be assessed in more detail in the future. Staff was pushing for VIFs in the first year since the scope of rehabilitation was too limited based on input from the City Council and insufficient to achieve as much as desired in the first fiscal year. VIFs could be included in future years, but would either be dedicated towards payments of the debt financing, or directly for the payments of the project. Use of VIFs had just been approved by the City Council on June 3, 2025, and the actual details of how VIFs would be used in the future remained to be worked out in future years, although they would be dedicated for roadway improvements. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)

- 1 • Project #RO1710, San Pablo Avenue Bridge over BNSF Railroad, clarified again \$28  
2 million had been planned for the project from HSIP with the exact cost and estimate  
3 not yet known. While there could be additional sources of funding, they had not been  
4 listed since it would have skewed the overall table for funding. (Vice-Chairperson  
5 Menis)  
6
- 7 • Project #IN2301, Facilities & Real Estate Master Plan, clarified the project had been  
8 pushed back due to availability of funding. Of the five infrastructure assessment  
9 projects, this project had been pushed back one year with the two infrastructure  
10 assessments that had been selected for the upcoming fiscal year due to the fact they  
11 would be funded by enterprise fees and not from the measure funds, which had been  
12 a factor in the selection process. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)  
13
- 14 • Clarified much of the funding would go towards sewer, sanitary and roads. Pursuant  
15 to the budget, there was an accumulation of over \$20 million in the City's enterprise  
16 fees, which was why the City was trying to catch up. (Chairperson Sandoval)  
17
- 18 • Pavement rehabilitation work would depend on the condition of the roadway. Pothole  
19 repair was typically the first step and depending on the condition it could involve a  
20 slurry or cape seal or full rehabilitation. The work would be contracted out but  
21 managed by the City. Regardless of the treatment, even if a slurry seal, it would  
22 cover the width of the roadway. Reconstruction would not occur in the first year given  
23 the cost and the amount of funding would not cover one road and that work may be  
24 pushed out depending in what the City could afford. The cost per mile to repair roads  
25 varied, but could cost several million dollars. (Chairperson Sandoval)  
26

27 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

28  
29 There were no comments from the public.  
30

31 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

32  
33 Commissioner Huey referenced Project #RO2505, Safe Routes to Schools and commented  
34 she had worked for a City on the peninsula with Safe Routes to Schools, a program that was  
35 under her Department's purview. While she understood the WCCUSD engaged in Walk  
36 Audits, she advocated for the City to bring it to the WCCUSD's attention. She was pleased  
37 to learn of the collaboration between the City and the WCCUSD and noted there was a group  
38 that did Walk Audits. Given the City's budget constraints and since the project had been  
39 pushed back another fiscal year, she suggested there was plenty of time to gear up for a  
40 Walk Audit if that was an option. Walk Audits helped to strengthen the partnership with the  
41 school district and invited community members to raise concerns. She recognized the City  
42 of Pinole was heavily engaged with the community. She had seen the results of a Walk Audit  
43 that could strengthen the relationship with the WCCUSD, invite community members to the  
44 table and supplement competitive applications for grants.  
45

46 Vice-Chairperson Menis referenced Page 31 of 89 of the agenda packet, and commented  
47 the font size was barely legible. He recommended separating out streets and roads to a  
48 separate column or turning the table sideways to be more visible given it was challenging to  
49 read.

1 Vice-Chairperson Menis also referenced Project #FA2302, Plum Street Parking Lot  
2 Improvements and commented the design of the fence in the project had been described as  
3 a chain link fence with security gates. He had discussed this with members of the Police  
4 Department during the Pride event and had asked whether a chain link fence would be  
5 sufficiently secure to meet General Plan Policy CS2.6.  
6

7 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported that it was the opinion of the members of the Police  
8 Department he had spoken to that a chain link fence would not be secure, could be bypassed  
9 and people could cut through it and climb over it, and perhaps wrought iron would be superior.  
10 He asked if the City still planned to use chain link fence for the project.  
11

12 Ms. El-Guindy explained that the parking lot was part of the reason the project had been  
13 pushed back. The Police Chief was well aware a chain link fence was not an adequate plan  
14 and a redesign of the parking lot would be required, and that the pavement conditions and  
15 different fence would cost more resulting in an almost completely different scope for the  
16 project than provided. The project had been pushed back for a more detailed assessment.  
17 She otherwise agreed with the comments about the formatting of the CIP document. In terms  
18 of the comments about Walk Audits, she advised she was the former Vision Zero Program  
19 Manager for the City of San Jose and she fully supported Walk Audits. Walk Audits did not  
20 have to be initiated by a school or the WCCUSD, it was mostly initiated by a city and she  
21 would like to see the City of Pinole pursue that for Pinole schools.  
22

23 Vice-Chairperson Menis again referenced Project #FA2302, and commented that in the  
24 previous General Plan CIP cycle, the Planning Commission had stricken General Plan Policy  
25 CS2.6 as not being applicable to the proposed project. Now it was back and he noted while  
26 General Plan Policy CS2.6 fit, Goal CS.2 did not since it did not maintain a high level of public  
27 safety with the way the project had currently been designed. Absent Goal CS.2, the Planning  
28 Commission could not make the finding for General Plan Policy CS2.6. He added the project  
29 may meet Goal CE.5, as written, but he was unsure how to define "adequate" in this case  
30 and noted the Commission had stricken some of the General Plan goals and polices later  
31 on. He appreciated the Community Development Department for finding a General Plan  
32 finding that actually fit with the project as opposed to prior years and he was pleased to see  
33 the project would be redesigned.  
34

35 Ms. El-Guindy acknowledged she had not listened to the Planning Commission meeting to  
36 learn of the concerns with the project in 2024, which was why the goals and policies had  
37 been carried forward.  
38

39 Vice-Chairperson Menis also referenced Project #RO2503, City Streetlights Upgrade, and  
40 asked, as an example, whether the City required one street light every 150-feet and whether  
41 that would create an obligation for the City or for PG&E.  
42

43 Ms. El-Guindy explained that the standard plans and specifications would be developed to  
44 be consistent with the state standards to establish specifications for the downtown area with  
45 different types of illumination, spacing between trees and the like, with the obligation on the  
46 City not PG&E, unless there was an opportunity to work with PG&E on some of their  
47 programs. As the City redeveloped and pursued capital projects, it would follow the approved  
48 standard plans and specifications at that time.  
49

1 Vice-Chairperson Menis also referenced Project #IN1703, Storm Drain Master Plan. He was  
2 glad to see the City was finally moving forward with the project due to state requirements on  
3 storm drain capture.  
4

5 Chairperson Sandoval asked if the Planning Commission found one of the projects was not  
6 consistent with the General Plan whether that project would return to the Planning  
7 Commission or be stricken from the CIP.  
8

9 Mr. Hanham explained a recommendation would be made to the City Council, with the City  
10 Council to make the final decision. The Planning Commission may recommend a specific  
11 project or policy was not consistent with the General Plan and that would be forwarded on to  
12 the City Council.  
13

14 Commissioner Bender again referenced Project #FA2302, Plum Street Parking Lot  
15 Improvements, and noted that he was the early advocate that the chain link fence as part of  
16 the project was not going to provide real security and the aesthetics were a bad look. The  
17 other issue he had with the project was that only 25 parking spaces would available for City  
18 use. He was concerned with halving a third of the parking, which would disappear in an area  
19 that was one of the most congested areas in the downtown. He frequented the area often  
20 and could attest to the limited parking in the downtown, which raised concerns based on the  
21 numbers he had seen. If the parking lot was, in fact, reconfigured it would trigger C.3  
22 requirements and that was another issue.  
23

24 Commissioner Bender also referenced Project #FA1901, Senior Center Auxiliary Parking  
25 Lot, and as someone who lived close to the area, and as he had mentioned in 2024 to the  
26 City Council, he passed the area 24/7, had jogged through the area, and had seen the main  
27 parking lot full; however, the auxiliary parking lot was rarely full and he was pleased to see  
28 the project had been pushed out. In addition, again speaking to Project #FA2302, Plum  
29 Street Parking Lot Improvements, he reported Council member Toms had stated during a  
30 recent City Council meeting that rather than a chain link fence, she asked why cameras had  
31 not been installed. He was unsure whether or not that could be a solution but it was an  
32 interesting point.  
33

34 Commissioner Bender thanked the Public Works Director for tackling a real prioritization of  
35 the CIP projects from the list of projects that had been added on to the CIP year after year,  
36 with some overlapping, and with the prioritization now based on fiscal and reality conditions.  
37 He was pleased the City of Pinole was finally trying to move into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century on some  
38 important issues, such as accessibility and levels of safety on City roads.  
39

40 Chairperson Sandoval found the City was spending a lot of money on roads but only filling  
41 lots of pot holes. He hoped with Measure I funding, the City could repave the entire City and  
42 while he recognized that was a tall task, the work could be broken up and possibly the City  
43 could have a pavement team that was constantly working. He again recognized that may  
44 not be feasible at the moment. but could be something to consider in the future to ensure that  
45 paving work was done on a regular basis, which was important to think about since Safe and  
46 Complete Streets Projects allowed the opportunity to reengineer the streets and possibly  
47 completely repave the streets and include modifications rather than spending money twice.  
48  
49

1 Chairperson Sandoval also recognized there had been a lot of opinions about what should  
2 happen with the San Pablo Avenue Corridor, such as protected bicycle lanes and  
3 engineering something to slow the speed of traffic. He was a proponent that streets needed  
4 to be engineered to slow down vehicles.  
5

6 Commissioner Lam-Julian referenced Project #RO1902, Pedestrian Improvements at  
7 Tennent Avenue near RXR, and asked that the project scope be broadened to include safety  
8 in light of a fatality that occurred in the area, and given there were concerns whether the  
9 nearby park was a safe place for families to access as pedestrians.  
10

11 Ms. El-Guindy advised that Project #RO1902, Pedestrian Improvements at Tennent Avenue  
12 near RXR, had been placed on hold, but staff had recently worked with Caltrans and  
13 reactivated the project. She emphasized that safety was a priority for San Pablo Avenue,  
14 and acknowledged the speeds on the road were a concern, but there were concerns with the  
15 timing of the improvements. The intent was to change the overall environment with some  
16 improvements such as Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant improvements until  
17 the City could tackle a Complete Streets project on both sides of the corridor.  
18

19 Ms. El-Guindy added the Public Works Department did not have all of the expertise required  
20 for pavement rehabilitation, some equipment was quite expensive and staff was currently  
21 going through different types of training on different treatments. Staff was also in the process  
22 of purchasing a \$30,000 roller and were looking at means of improving the way things were  
23 done and doing them in a cost-efficient way. As a result, the work would be contracted out  
24 for a while.  
25

26 Ms. El-Guindy also clarified with respect to Project #FA2302, Plum Street Parking Lot  
27 Improvements, that there were existing cameras in the lot but they were not doing the job  
28 fully, data had not been maintained for some time and the system required upgrading. As to  
29 Project #FA1901, Senior Center Auxiliary Parking Lot, the future of the project was unknown  
30 at this time.  
31

32 Commissioner Bender asked the Public Works Department to also consider impacts to  
33 residents who lived in the downtown, not just the businesses, when considering future  
34 improvements. He reiterated there were issues with the speed of traffic on the road, which  
35 had shown up in roadway surveys and needed to be taken into consideration.  
36

37 **MOTION** to adopt Resolution 25-07, Finding that the projects proposed in the Capital  
38 Improvement Plan for Fiscal Years (FY) 2025/26 through 2029/30 were consistent with the  
39 Pinole General Plan, with modification to Project #FA2302, Plum Street Parking Lot  
40 Improvements, to strike Goal CS.2 and Policy CS2.6 from the list of General Plan Goals and  
41 Policies that the project conformed with.  
42

43 **MOTION: Menis**

**SECONDED: Bender**

**APPROVED: 6-0-1**

**ABSENT: Martinez**

44 Ms. El-Guindy looked forward to future collaborations with the Planning Commission.  
45

46  
47  
48 **J. CITY PLANNER'S/COMMISSIONER'S REPORT**

49 Mr. Hanham provided the following updates:  
50

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

- A public workshop would be scheduled during the month of July for the Safety and Environmental Justice Element before coming to the Planning Commission.
- Public workshops were being planned for the Parklet Program.
- Staff was in the process of filing for the Final Map for Appian Village.
- Staff was working with the new owners of the Pinole Vista Project. A Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) had been approved for the prior owner but never recorded. Staff was working with the current property owners to have the LLA recorded as part of the new ownership.
- Staff hoped to have a recommendation for the Planning Commission to consider forwarding to the City Council based on comments related to the Appian 80 property during the April 28, 2025 Planning Commission meeting, at a meeting in July.

Vice-Chairperson Menis asked about the status of the request for a presentation on the Pinole Accessible Living (PAL) Program, and Mr. Hanham stated he had planned to provide an update under Item K. Communications. At this time, he provided information on the Draft Schedule for the PAL Program, to be launched in August 2025, hosted by the Building Department and intended to provide a series of free educational workshops through the months of August and November 2025 to help older adults and people with disabilities to make their homes safer, easier to live in and easier to navigate the permitting process.

Commissioner Bender encouraged people to contact the State Licensing Board when hiring contractors, which was a way to protect oneself with smaller scale construction.

Vice-Chairperson Menis thanked staff for the information and the infrastructure planned around the PAL Program process.

Commissioner Lam-Julian reported the City of Concord would be hosting a Safety Fair on Emergency Preparedness in the month of July and the State Department of Developmental Services provided emergency preparedness, tutorials and presentations and was another possible resource.

Commissioner Bender asked whether Pinole Shores II had filed for a building permit, to which Mr. Hanham reported the developer was in the process of working with the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) since there were issues with fire flow. He planned to meet with the developer this week. Building plans had not been submitted since there could be changes to the building plans after discussions with the CCCFPD.

Vice-Chairperson Menis commented the Los Angeles region allowed one to travel 40 miles from LAX to Anaheim for \$1.75 with caps on the overall pricing. He asked whether it was feasible for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and various public transit agencies under its purview to consider a shift away from higher fare box collection rates to a different funding system given the decline in ridership at the BART level.

Chairperson Sandoval reported there had been discussions at the state level to move to a more subsidized system but there was no funding for that at this time.

1 Mr. Hanham added that due to State funding limitations, transit agencies wanted to maintain  
2 the 10 percent fare box ratio, which was needed to get the other 90 percent of funding, but  
3 there were problems with funding at the state level, helping to make trips more expensive.  
4

5 Chairperson Sandoval confirmed public transit agencies were very reliant on fare boxes more  
6 than they should be to be sustainable, which was why they were in a fiscal cliff now. New  
7 York used a completely different model and subsidized the New York City Subway and was  
8 not reliant on fare boxes. California could not consider that since it did not have the money.  
9

10 Commissioner Lam-Julian reported East County was working on a pilot program to explore  
11 caps for those fares for those with disabilities and for seniors and there were discussions to  
12 expand the program to all of Contra Costa County.  
13

14 Commissioner Uch commented that BART now had a \$90 million deficit, and if reducing fare  
15 boxes to a flat rate across the board may require funding from federal, regional and state  
16 resources. BART was a unique system based on other metro systems. BART tracks were  
17 a little over the standard gage of 6-feet, further increasing costs and maintenance making it  
18 more expensive to operate. New York recently passed congestion pricing which helped a lot  
19 with their transit system, whereas the Bay Area had studies from MTC which were mostly  
20 restricted to San Francisco. Systems in London and Denmark and most European cities had  
21 more funding for transit. Congestion pricing may be possible in the Bay Area in the future  
22 but would likely only be in San Francisco or possibly the use of the Bay Bridge.  
23

24 Commissioner Bender described how the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)  
25 had been set up through the voters with financing via property taxes. VTA as an agency was  
26 not facing the fiscal cliff yet but had ridership problems.  
27

28 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

29  
30 There were no comments from the public.  
31

32 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED  
33

34 **K. COMMUNICATIONS**  
35

36 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported he had attended the Pride/Juneteenth celebration and staff  
37 did a great job putting it together. The event was well attended.  
38

39 **L. NEXT MEETING**  
40

- 41 1. Planning Commission Regular Meeting on June 23, 2025 at 7:00 p.m.  
42

43 **M. ADJOURNMENT: 9:16 p.m.**  
44

45 Transcribed by:

46 Sherri D. Lewis

47 Transcriber  
48