

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

5
6 **September 22, 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:** 7:00 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, Lam-Julian, Martinez, Uch, Vice-Chairperson Menis,
27 Chairperson Sandoval

28
29 Commissioner Excused: Huey

30
31 Staff Present: David Hanham, Planning Manager
32 Justin Shiu, Senior Planner

33
34 **E. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

35
36 There were no comments from the public.

37
38 **F. MEETING MINUTES**

39
40 1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for September 8, 2025

41
42 Commissioner Bender requested the following amendments to the September 8, 2025
43 Planning Commission meeting minutes:

44
45 Page 14 of 165 of the agenda packet, Lines 41 through 43:

46
47 *Commissioner Bender reported the Brandt Court historic house that was to be relocated from*
48 *the City of Hercules to property in Pinole had disappeared and the property had been for sale*
49 *for some time.*

1 Page 8 of 165 of the agenda packet, Lines 42 through 49:
2

3 *Exhibit A, Design and Development, No. 27, acknowledged agreement with the statement*
4 *in principle, although a developer looking at the site would entertain providing a parking*
5 *structure, such as ground floor parking for a residential multifamily building, with the*
6 *benefits of that approach being reduced surface parking and allowing for more housing*
7 *development and more public/private amenity spaces, all with the knowledge that the*
8 *status of retail would be unknown. (Bender)*
9

10 **MOTION** with a Roll Call vote to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for
11 September 8, 2025, as amended by Commissioner Bender.
12

13 **MOTION: Sandoval**

SECONDED: Martinez

APPROVED: 6-0-1

ABSENT: Huey

14
15
16 **G. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

17
18 **1. Adoption of a Resolution to Recommend the Safety and Environmental**
19 **Justice Elements Updates to the General Plan**
20

21 Planning Manager David Hanham presented the staff report dated September 22, 2025,
22 and introduced Consultant Noelle Anderson, Project Manager, Community Planning
23 Resilience Lead, Michael Baker International (MBI), who provided an extensive
24 PowerPoint presentation on the Updates to the Safety and Environmental Justice
25 Elements of the General Plan.
26

27 Mr. Hanhan asked the Planning Commission to adopt Resolution 25-09 recommending
28 approval to the City Council of the Updates to the Safety and Environmental Justice
29 Elements of the City of Pinole General Plan.
30

31 Responding to questions from the Planning Commission on Exhibit A, Safety Element, Mr.
32 Hanham and Ms. Anderson clarified the following:
33

- 34 • Hazardous material pipelines had not been included in the Safety Element but had
35 been addressed in the Contra Costa County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation
36 Plan (HMP). Clarified in the context of Safety Elements, data about the exact
37 location of pipelines was not available making it challenging to derive policy
38 objectives from them in addition to the fact they were owned by third-party entities
39 making it further challenging to include policy directives. They had been included
40 by reference with a link to the HMP. (Bender)
41
- 42 • Page 79 of 165 of the agenda packet, clarified a statement in the first paragraph
43 under Fire Services, that references Station 74 “will be reopened” because at the
44 time of the preparation of the Safety Element updates, the Contra Costa County
45 Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) had not yet reopened Station 74.
46 Acknowledged Station 74 was now open and the statement could be so amended.
47 (Uch)
48
49
50

- 1 • Page 79 of 165 of the agenda packet, acknowledged a typographical error in the
2 first full paragraph which should be amended to read: *Pinole currently doesn't*
3 *have a community emergency response team (CERT) program, but the City of*
4 *Pinole Strategic Plan 2020 – 2025 Implementation Action Plan, adopted in August*
5 *2020, has called out to exploring restoring the CERT program and conducting*
6 *annual tabletop exercises and community drills as one of its strategies to satisfy*
7 *the goal of safe and resilient Pinole.* (Uch)
8
- 9 • Clarified the Community Emergency Response Team (CERT), was a regional
10 organization that operated on a community basis, with the Federal Emergency
11 Management Agency (FEMA) and other public safety agencies offering directives
12 on training as to how one could be certified. CERT empowered local residents to
13 take charge of their neighborhoods and provide first aid and/or preliminary
14 emergency response in the absence of a formal public safety agency in the event
15 of a major disaster. (Uch)
16
- 17 • Clarified the City would have to rely on Contra Costa County, the State of
18 California, and the federal government to create a CERT since the City had not
19 implemented a CERT plan. There were policies and programs in the Safety
20 Element to help Pinole become more fire safety and fire smart. Noted building
21 codes were ever changing making the City more fire safe and smart. Clarified the
22 Safety Element did not specifically reference Firewise or other programs in which
23 the City may participate to become certified or be designated as a community that
24 was actively working to reduce fire risk. The Safety Element included policies
25 related to wildfire preparedness under Wildfire, Policy SE 1.8, as shown on Page
26 90 of 165 of the agenda packet, with the majority of the policies written prior to the
27 changes in the Wildfire Severity Hazard Maps. Policy SE 1.10, as shown on Page
28 91 of 165 of the agenda packet, would coordinate and cooperate with regional
29 agencies on wildfire preparedness and programs with action measures included,
30 which were also outlined. (Martinez)
31
- 32 • Page 81 of 165 of the agenda packet, Figure 18: Evacuation Routes, clarified the
33 connection between Galbreth and Rancho Roads was currently locked but could
34 be unlocked in the event of an emergency. This route had not been included or
35 identified in Figure 18 with only major thoroughfares considered. While there were
36 a couple of access points that could be used in the valley between the cities of
37 Hercules and Pinole, they also had not been included given the unknown status of
38 the condition of the routes in an emergency since the routes may not be able to
39 accommodate a large volume of vehicles, or there could be possible third-party
40 property ownership. In the event of an emergency, all first responder agencies
41 would be involved and an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) would be put in
42 place.
43

44 From a policy perspective, the Safety Element identified only the major evacuation
45 routes along Pinole Valley Road and I-80, with the smaller connections not
46 included, not only because everyone may not know where they were located, but
47 since the Fire Department determined which routes to be used as part of an EOP.
48 Acknowledged a recommendation that the routes of Galbreth Road and the area
49 north of the City of Hercules should be included in the identified evacuation routes.
50 (Martinez)

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

- The PowerPoint presentation was the same presentation provided to the public during the most recent public workshop, with the exception of the last few pages outlining responses from the surveys. (Lam-Julian)
- Page 76 of 165 of the agenda packet, Table 7, Hazardous Materials Sites, clarified the database was a snapshot in time as reported by GeoTracker and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and was not meant to be an exhaustive or inclusive list of every past, current or future release within the City. As cited, on March 15, 2022 when the data had been pulled, it was intended to provide some context on the typical hazardous materials users in the City and also meant to acknowledge the types, not the specific locations of hazardous materials use. Clarified as an example that not every dry cleaner was identified as an issue in either of the databases and it was possible there were dry cleaners in Pinole that had not been flagged. (Lam-Julian)
- Acknowledged the area of Tara Hills was looking for volunteers to participate in CERT. Acknowledged a recommendation to amend Policy SE 3.1, as shown on Page 96 of 165 of the agenda packet. Rather than start or create a CERT program from scratch, recommended partnering with local CERT programs and highlighting that for the community as an ongoing conversation. Staff clarified the intent of Policy SE 3.1 was that it be broad and not identify a specific program or name and not reference the creation of something from scratch, and rather highlight existing CERT programs as a good idea. Language had been included about participating in Contra Costa County programming and resource sharing, with community sharing and educational awareness programs to be included under that umbrella. (Lam-Julian)
- Page 45 of 165 of the agenda packet, Figure 6: Landslide Areas and Page 87 of 165 of the agenda packet, Policy SE 1.2, which reads: *Require appropriate control measures to control and minimize the impact of flooding and erosion*, with staff clarifying these policies were not intended to prohibit development but prohibit development where it was objectively unsafe to do so, with a multitude of mitigation actions that could be integrated into design and development at the project proposal phase to make it safe to develop in any hazard zone, with the exception of flooding, and which the policy language was trying to outline. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Page 63 of 165 of the agenda packet, clarified the last sentence of the full paragraph on this page, which reads: *The CAAP is fully integrated into Safety Element*, and which meant the CAAP would be incorporated by reference in the Safety Element, similar to the HMP. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Page 79 of 165 of the agenda packet, and the last sentence of the first paragraph under Fire Services, which reads: *It should be noted that Fire Station 74 is located in the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone*, and acknowledged this was no longer accurate. There were other instances in the document that referenced the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, although CAL FIRE recently redesignated most of Pinole into the Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)

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 the policies and action measures, as stated, would remain, with the narrative and background to be revised to indicate that Fire Station 74 was now open and operational and identify some areas of the City that had been moved from the Very High to Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone. (Vice- Chairperson Menis)
- Clarified some of the data sources in the document were linked to 2022 data and the consultant explained that due to the timing of the document preparation and contract scope of services, the original scope of work had not anticipated the pause for the HMP, and the data was unable to be revised from 2022 without additional scope and fee. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Page 88 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action SE 1.3.5, which reads: *Pursue funding for adequate protection from sea-level rise and subsidence*, and acknowledged a request for the term “adequate” to be defined. The consultant suggested the term be defined at a later date by specific infrastructure projects directed by the Public Works Department. Clarified the term used was intended to be broad and not provide specific direction since sea-level rise was the most expensive to structurally engineer and plan for. This term had been left intentionally broad. While sea-level rise had not affected Pinole too much, it may in the future and had been included in some operational plans, particularly for the Hercules-Pinole Wastewater Treatment Plant, which was near the Bay. Clarified the City had prepared no studies as yet on the impacts of sea-level rise. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Page 61 of 165 of the agenda packet, Table 3, California Coastal Commission Sea Level Rise Projections, was clarified as it related to Action SE 1.3.5, and it was noted the City of Pinole was seeing impacts from sea-level rise at the 66-inch level, as compared to the lower estimations in Table 3. Tables provided from the Coastal Commission had not included the definition of the term “adequate” since it could mean different things for different infrastructures. Based on current projections, sea-level rise would not be seen until reaching the 66-inch level. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Page 91 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action SE 1.9.10, which reads: *Construct an emergency access road extending Galbreth Road to South Rancho Road and a fire access gate to be opened by emergency responders and explore the possibility of making this a permanent public road*. Clarified staff could check on the status of this action measure and it may be possible to modify the action measure to reflect the status of construction of the remainder of the access road. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Page 92 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action SE 1.11.14, which reads: *When feasible, require all development to be located outside of the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). Should development be located in VHFHSZs, then they must maintain certain defensible space through specific fuel modification (brush clearing) requirements as outlined in Government Code Sections 51175-51189 and required to be built to the current California Building Code and Fire Code.*

1 Clarified this action measure could be eliminated or the language modified to
2 reflect the “Moderate” Fire Hazard Severity Zone and removal of the reference to
3 the Government Code section. (Vice-Chairperson Menis and Commissioner
4 Martinez)
5

- 6 • Page 94 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action SE 2.1.3, which reads: *Maintain and*
7 *expand, where feasible, the network of surveillance cameras in the community to*
8 *discourage and help investigate criminal activity based on Pinole Police*
9 *Department advice and experience.* The consultant clarified Crime Subsection
10 Policy SE 2.1, which reads: *Reduce the risk of crime through site planning,*
11 *surveillance, and information* was not statutorily required, per the Safety Element.
12 Existing policies had been retained in working with the Pinole Police Department
13 but it was not primarily the focus of the scope of work. The Safety Element’s
14 primary goal was to address natural hazards, not human costs. Staff
15 recommended Action SE 2.1.3 could be revised to read: *Maintain, expand, secure*
16 *where feasible, the network of surveillance cameras in the community to*
17 *discourage and help investigate criminal activity based on Pinole Police*
18 *Department advice and experience.* (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
19

- 20 • Page 97 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action SE 3.1.5, which reads: *Explore*
21 *restoring the CERT program and conducting annual tabletop exercises and*
22 *community drills.* Clarified CERT was a nationwide program with a pre-set
23 curriculum which inherently relied on the basis of the nationwide curriculum that
24 was already produced and recommended, including tabletop exercises and other
25 drills practiced as part of the certification process. Clarified there were some cities
26 that facilitated partnerships through their CERT programs and it was not unusual
27 for multiple cities to host a program where participants could come from the
28 jurisdictions as part of the partnership. Keeping the policy as is allowed for
29 maximum flexibility. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
30

- 31 • Page 82 of 165 of the agenda packet, Figure 19: Neighborhood Access to
32 Evacuation Routes, acknowledged concerns with limited evacuation routes from
33 the Pinole Valley. Clarified any route possible would be used depending on the
34 nature of the incident, with the primary routes having been identified. Clarified the
35 City’s evacuation zones, as reflected on Table 8: Travel Times Estimates
36 Summary, and as shown on Page 83 of 165 of the agenda packet. (Chairperson
37 Sandoval)
38

- 39 • Page 86 of 165 of the agenda packet, acknowledged a request to revise Scenario-
40 1, as written, to update the information related to the status of improvements for
41 the connection on Galbreth Road. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
42

43 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED (Safety Element)

44 There were no comments from the public.

45 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED
46
47
48
49

1 Vice-Chairperson Menis referenced Page 63 of 165 of the agenda packet, and asked that
2 the last sentence of the full paragraph under 2.5.6 Climate Action and Adaptation Plan, be
3 revised to read: *The CAAP is fully integrated into the Safety Element. He also referenced*
4 *Page 79 of 165 of the agenda packet, and asked that the first full paragraph on the page*
5 *be revised to read: Pinole currently doesn't have a community emergency response team*
6 *(CERT) program, but the City of Pinole Strategic Plan 2020 – 2025 Implementation Action*
7 *Plan, adopted in August 2020, has called out exploring the restoration of the CERT*
8 *program and conducting annual tabletop exercises and community drills as one of its*
9 *strategies to satisfy the goal of safe and resilient Pinole. Also, on the same page, he*
10 *asked for a revision to the second sentence of the first full paragraph under Fire Services,*
11 *to reflect that Fire Station 74 will not be reopened, but “has opened.”*
12

13 Commissioner Bender referenced Page 56 of 165 of the agenda packet, and the second
14 sentence of the second paragraph under Section 2.4.2, Dam Inundation, which reads:
15 *Maloney Reservoir is a recreational, artificially impounded body of water located near the*
16 *intersection of Appian Way and Mann Drive. He stated, as discussed during the Planning*
17 *Commission Ad Hoc Committee meeting, Maloney Reservoir was not recreational, but a*
18 *covered facility with locked gates and did not show up as a recreational opportunity or*
19 *facility in the East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD) website. He also found it ironic*
20 *that the Hayward Fault reminded everyone this morning due to a recent earthquake what*
21 *this was all about.*
22

23 Chairperson Sandoval referenced Page 92 of 165 of the agenda packet, and Action SE
24 1.11.4. He asked that the intent of the language remain given CAL FIRE and the
25 CCCFPD could change how the City was categorized. He was open to an amendment to
26 reflect that the City could encourage fire mitigation or defensive space for parcels or areas
27 that were at a higher fire risk in the valley. If a wildfire were to come through that part of
28 the City, a number of the parcels between the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) should have
29 strict fuel breaks and mitigation.
30

31 Chairperson Sandoval also referenced Page 94 of 165 of the agenda packet, and Action
32 SE 2.1.3, and suggested the language change staff had recommended for a secure
33 network would be acceptable.
34

35 Vice-Chairperson Menis suggested further revision to Action SE 2.1.3, as shown on Page
36 94 of 165 of the agenda packet, to read: *Maintain and expand, and secure, where feasible,*
37 *the network of surveillance cameras in the community to discourage and help investigate*
38 *criminal activity based on Pinole Police Department advice and experience.*
39

40 Chairperson Sandoval found the revision too wordy and recommended a further revision
41 to Action SE 2.1.3, as follows:
42

43 *Maintain and expand, where feasible, the secure network of surveillance cameras*
44 *in the community to discourage and help investigate criminal activity based on*
45 *Pinole Police Department advice and experience.*
46

47 Commissioner Martinez commented he had worked with a number of agencies throughout
48 the years and he was appreciative of the concern with the language. He recommended
49 additional revision to Action SE 2.1.3, for consideration, as follows:

1 *Maintain and expand, and secure, the network of surveillance cameras in the*
2 *community to discourage and help investigate criminal activity based on Pinole*
3 *Police Department advice and experience ensuring the appropriate security*
4 *protocols are administered.*
5

6 Chairperson Sandoval agreed with the revision.
7

8 Vice-Chairperson Menis found that adding the language about security protocols would be
9 helpful. He expressed concern with the revision in that if the Planning Commission was
10 saying “secure network” it was implying several things, that a network existed and implying
11 the network was secure to some standard, which standard was not stated. There was a
12 difference in saying something was secure and making something more secure, one was a
13 state of being and the other an action. He suggested if the Commission was looking for
14 action, it was appropriate to maintain the action focus of security, particularly if under a crime
15 element, and he offered more scenarios to explain his position. He found that the revision
16 did not provide the suggested security, as his suggested wording would have done.
17

18 Chairperson Sandoval suggested the secure network was implied in the language since the
19 Commission expected the City would have a secure network.
20

21 Vice-Chairperson Menis again disagreed in that if the Commission was just speaking of City
22 controlled cameras he may have agreed, but the language in Action SE 2.1.3 was broader.
23

24 The Commission debated the language in Action SE 2.1.3, and Ms. Anderson explained the
25 City’s security cameras were implemented by the Pinole Police Department, monitored by
26 the Police Department, with policies and protocols already in place that were likely applicable
27 to such an action and did not usually derive directives for action based on the City’s Safety
28 Element. As previously mentioned, this crime section was completely optional, and not
29 statutorily a required component of the Safety Element. The focus of the Safety Element
30 was to address natural hazards and not human caused hazards where crime would be
31 included. She understood the nuance of wanting to be as correct as possible, but cautioned
32 being too specific in this policy and stepping on the toes of other directives that the
33 Commission may not be aware of since the security of these systems did not derive their
34 security directives from the Safety Element.
35

36 Vice-Chairperson Menis noted that part of the goals, policies and actions in the Safety
37 Element were to be aspirational, and offered some examples from the stated policies and
38 actions. As such, he suggested the Commission should not just discuss “maintaining and
39 expanding the network” but also discuss “securing” the network.
40

41 Chairperson Sandoval agreed with the security, but security should be used as a descriptor
42 of the network.
43

44 Vice-Chairperson Menis noted part of the reason security was to be added onto the list of
45 tasks was that in his opinion, the network, as it existed, was not most likely secure.
46

47 Mr. Hanham suggested since the action measure was causing some issues, if language
48 could be added a vote from the Commission could determine which language being
49 proposed would be acceptable. He recommended a straw vote, or a vote be considered for
50 the language revision to Action SE 2.1.3.

1 **MOTION** with a Roll Call vote to amend Action SE 2.1.3, to read:
2

3 *Maintain and expand, a secure network of surveillance cameras in the community*
4 *to discourage and help investigate criminal activity based on Pinole Police*
5 *Department advice and experience.*
6

7 **MOTION: Sandoval** **SECONDED: Bender** **APPROVED: 5-1-1**
8 **NOES: Menis**
9 **ABSENT: Huey**

10 **MOTION** with a Roll Call vote to amend Action SE 2.1.3, to read:
11

12 *Maintain, expand, and secure the network of surveillance cameras in the*
13 *community to discourage and help investigate criminal activity based on Pinole*
14 *Police Department advice and experience while ensuring security protocols are*
15 *administered.*
16
17

18 **MOTION: Menis** **SECONDED: Martinez** **FAILED: 2-4-1**
19 **NOES: Uch, Lam-Julian, Bender, Sandoval**
20 **ABSENT: Huey**
21

22 Commissioner Lam-Julian referenced Page 94 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action SE 2.1.8,
23 which reads: *Work with law enforcement to guide and educate the public on active shooter*
24 *scenario public responses through employer/school staff training and public education.*
25 She asked whether the City had any jurisdiction over school staff in public education or
26 whether the recommendation was to work with the West Contra Costa Unified School
27 District (WCCUSD). The last she checked, and pursuant to the parent handbook, the
28 WCCUSD did not have Resource Officers on-site but had assigned liaisons from the
29 Pinole Police Department to different campuses. She asked for clarification.
30

31 Mr. Hanham clarified that Action SE 2.1.8 was intended for the City to work with the
32 WCCUSD and work with law enforcement to guide and educate the public on active
33 shooter scenarios. The City was not dictating to the WCCUSD, which had protocols in
34 place and the intent was that the City and the WCCUSD would work together.
35

36 Vice-Chairperson Menis referenced Page 92 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action SE 1.11.4,
37 and clarified with Mr. Hanham this action measure would be deleted entirely unless the
38 Planning Commission wanted to keep some portion of the action measure.
39

40 Chairperson Sandoval was open to retaining some modified version of Action SE 1.11.4.
41

42 Mr. Hanham recommended Action SE 1.11.4 could be revised to read:
43

44 *Should development be located in Moderate, High, Fire Hazard Severity Zone,*
45 *then they must maintain certain defensible space through specific fuel modification*
46 *(brush clearing) and required to be built to the current California Building Code and*
47 *Fire Code.*
48

49 The Planning Commission agreed with the staff recommended revision to Action SE 1.11.4.
50

1 Vice-Chairperson Menis referenced Page 97 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action SE 3.1.5
2 and recommended it be revised to read:

3
4 *Explore restoring the CERT program and conducting annual tabletop exercises*
5 *and community drills and partner with other jurisdictions in the County on the CERT*
6 *program.*
7

8 Mr. Hanham recommended Action SE 3.1.5 be further amended to read:

9
10 *To explore restoring the CERT program within the City of Pinole and coordinate*
11 *with other outside agencies and conducting annual tabletop exercises and*
12 *community drills.*
13

14 The Planning Commission agreed with the staff recommended revision to Action SE 3.1.5.

15
16 Vice-Chairperson Menis referenced Page 91 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action SE 1.9.10,
17 and confirmed staff would modify this action measure to identify the current state of the
18 construction of an emergency access road extending Galbreth Road to South Rancho Road
19 before the Safety Element was presented to the City Council.
20

21 The Planning Commission moved onto Exhibit B, updates to the Environmental Justice
22 Element, and Mr. Hanham and Ms. Anderson responded to questions from the Planning
23 Commission, as follows:

- 24
- 25 • Page 136 of 165 of the agenda packet, acknowledged a recommendation that the
26 Walk Score for downtown Pinole be identified. (Uch)
27
 - 28 • Page 128 of 165 of the agenda packet, and the third sentence of the first paragraph
29 under Other Census Tracts, which reads: *The unemployment indicator represents*
30 *the percentage of the population over the age of 16 that is unemployed and eligible*
31 *for the labor force*, and clarified the upper age limitation was 65-years. (Vice-
32 Chairperson Menis)
33
 - 34 • Clarified most of Census Tract 3601.02 was located in the City of Richmond. (Lam-
35 Julian)
36
 - 37 • Page 135 of 165 of the agenda packet, Figure 11: USDA Low-Income and Low-
38 Access Food Atlas, had been based on 2013 data and before Safeway closed. MBI
39 could look into updating the data, particularly after Safeway closed, although the
40 frequency of the data being updated was unknown. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
41
 - 42 • Page 144 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action EJ 1.5.6, which reads: *Encourage the*
43 *development of a medical center, emergency room, urgent care, or other hospital*
44 *uses in the previous Doctors Hospital building.* Staff recommended eliminating the
45 language reading: *in the previous Doctors Hospital building.* (Vice-Chairperson
46 Menis)
47
48

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

- Page 145 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action EJ 2.1.3, which reads: *Prohibit development in areas that are particularly susceptible to erosion and sediment loss.* Clarified the intent of this action was not to link to landslides, with the landslide map in the Safety Element specific to deep seeded landslides, where the underlying bedrock was causing structural instability with the landslide risk, whereas this policy was intended to give the City the ability to integrate mitigation measures in a proposed development in an area where there was known erosion risk causing a water quality pollution issue. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Acknowledged reference to Figure 6: Landslide Areas, as contained in the Safety Element (Page 45 of 165 of the agenda packet) and request to account for and reference Figure 6 into Action EJ 2.1.3, although staff noted there could be erosion loss and not necessarily a landslide and offered examples within a development area. Clarified areas susceptible to erosion due to sediment loss were identified in a site-specific investigation, not a regional map, and again clarified the intent of Figure 6 in the Safety Element. Suggested Action EJ 2.1.3 could be modified to read: *Prohibit development in areas that are particularly susceptible to erosion and sediment loss that can't be mitigated through standard engineering practices.* (Vice-Chairperson Menis).
- Page 146 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action EJ 2.2.4, which reads: *Establish protocol for reducing the use of pesticides and other public spaces maintained by the City.* Clarified this was an action item to ensure the City complied with this action measure. The Public Works Department used non-hazardous pesticides for places maintained by the City and with the establishment of a protocol to be done through the Public Works Department. Staff recommended this action measure could be amended to read: *Establish protocol for reducing the use of pesticides within public spaces maintained by the City.* (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Page 150 of 165 of the agenda packet, Policy EJ 4.1, which reads: *Strengthen existing relationships with the Ohlone people* and following action measures Action EJ 4.1.1., EJ 4.1.2 and EJ 4.1.3, as shown on Pages 150 and 151 of 165 of the agenda packet. Staff clarified the Ohlone would have 90-days to respond to the Environmental and Justice Element Updates. Normally, when the City conducted projects they were required by Assembly Bills (AB) 52 and 18, to notify the tribes of different development projects. The Ohlone may provide comments on these documents and the Ohlone had provided comments on projects in the past which staff highlighted. The City was already following the action measure shown and the City needed to maintain what it was already doing. Whether the City could reach out to the Ohlone for suggestions on actions to these policies, the Ohlone would have the opportunity to provide comment on the Environmental Justice Element prior to the document going to the City Council for consideration. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Page 151 of 165 of the agenda packet, acknowledged a typographical error in Action EJ 4.4.3, with this action measure to now read: *Action EJ 4.4.3: Ensure that future improvements in the Impacted Community will not produce negative impacts on existing residents, such as increase in pollution exposure, net loss of affordable housing, or displacement of residents.* (Vice-Chairperson Menis)

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 these policies only applied within the City of Pinole and not actions outside the City that would impact the Impacted Community. The net loss of affordable housing was already a component of the Housing Element along with the displacement of residents, with policies in place to address the net loss of affordable housing and replacement that needed to be constructed. The net increase in pollution exposure would be in what the City had control over. Clarified the statutory requirement was to include a policy that ensured any additional disproportionate pollution burden would not be placed on the Impacted Community. Whether a distribution center was located near the City, as a possible scenario, the City would be notified of such development and the City would provide feedback on the need to mitigate the Impacted Community. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- In terms of a proposed warehouse on San Pablo Avenue, staff clarified most of the area was to the west with most of the distribution and truck traffic not near the Impacted Community in terms of wind flows off of the Bay. In that case and for that project, an air quality analysis had been prepared which included conditions of project approval. In most cases, for projects proposed in and around the impacted communities, the City would provide mitigations with environmental review to be required to ensure the project did not create a significant impact. Staff also clarified the City would not displace affordable housing. Areas that allowed warehouses in Pinole did not allow housing. (Vice-Chairperson Menis).
- Page 113 of 165 of the agenda packet, Figure 3: Census Tract 3922.02 Detail, clarified Block Group 2000, as shown in Figure 3, was probably more towards the Del Monte Shopping Center and about a mile to the west from Pinole Shores, with the cement plant a bit closer; the only two industrial projects in the City at this time. Confirmed the Pinole Shores project included air quality mitigation measures. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Page 151 of 165 of the agenda packet, acknowledged Action EJ 4.4.3, could be revised to read: *Ensure that future improvements in the Impacted Community will not produce negative impacts unless mitigated, on existing residents, such as increase in pollution exposure, net loss of affordable housing, or displacement of residents.* (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Page 142 of 165 of the agenda packet, Policy EJ 1.2, which reads: *Ensure adequate and equitable access to recreational opportunities, including access to parks, open space, natural spaces, and trails, to promote healthy lifestyles and prevent obesity,* and clarified the Senior Center owned by the City was run by a third-party. Acknowledged a recommendation to include a statement that the Senior Center was run by a third party. Clarified there were broader policies included in the document that talked about promoting equitable access to recreational opportunities that could be expanded to include comparable activities for all ages, but senior center funding may be the component for age restrictions and it was noted the City provided youth activities. Staff would have to look into what could be done in terms of staffing for recreational activities and there was discussion about programming and whether a program paid for itself, with staff to defer to the Administrative Services Director on how the City's recreational programs were run. (Lam-Julian)

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

- Page 142 of 165 of the agenda packet, acknowledged a recommendation to modify Action EJ 1.2.1 to read: *Collaborate with school districts and other entities to form joint use of facility agreements for the use of pools, sports, and recreation facilities*, or add an action statement to have recreational opportunities available for all ages including the 18-64 range. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
 - Clarified all of the City’s recreational programs offered come from a funding source, and given the City’s limited budget acknowledged concern with putting forth requirements. Clarified programs for those 65 years and older may involve funds from the State, a regional funder or national funding grant system, and if the City had other means to offer other services those services would have been provided, with the City’s limited funding and staffing acknowledged. Acknowledged the preference that Action EJ 1.2.1 remain as written. (Martinez).
 - Acknowledged the suggestion one of the advantages of targeting the 18-64 age group was that it could potentially be done in an equitable way without needing much or any subsidy that was not feasible for those on fixed incomes like seniors or Tiny Tots from disadvantaged populations. Recognized this was not a suggestion for the City to subsidize the programs, but as part of the aspirational and environmental justice goals, provide adequate and equitable opportunities, which included access to all age groups. Staff was of the opinion the action measures being discussed offered a broader range of access to the community whether 18-64 or 65 years or older and the policies were not limiting age groups. Clarified the reason the Environmental Justice Element had provided so much focus on those 65 years and older and children, was because those were categories the CalEnviro Screen 4.0 Tracker specifically identified as socially vulnerable. It was not intended to ignore the 18-64 age group and the recreational opportunities provided to them, but responded to the social vulnerability definitions set forth by the State as related to those age groups, and it was widely acknowledged by the State that there were funding resources for those recreational programs for those age groups, and where most recreational programs were funded through the City.
- MBI had not been scoped to provide an in-depth analysis to study the gaps in the City’s current recreation services offerings and rather focused on the services currently being offered and wanted to enhance the ability of the City to make those offerings as equitable and as feasible within the frameworks provided. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Acknowledged the suggestion as a matter of equity that the City should at least address all groups, not just those highlighted by the CalEnviro Screen. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED (Environmental Justice Element)

There were no comments from the public.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

1 Commissioner Lam-Julian clarified that MBI's scope of services had not included an in-
2 depth analysis whether the City was, in fact, optimizing all of its City-owned facilities,
3 whether the facilities were rented or included a managerial company that oversaw the
4 facility, which was something she would like to see analyzed in the future. She would like
5 to know whether the City was optimizing its current resources with the knowledge the City
6 used a managerial company to oversee the Senior Center. She was curious as to whether
7 that was the best option moving forward and whether the City was, in fact, following Policy
8 EJ 1.2, which reads: *Ensure adequate and equitable access to recreational opportunities,*
9 *including access to parks, open space, natural spaces, and trails, to promote healthy*
10 *lifestyles and prevent obesity.*

11
12 Commissioner Lam-Julian commented the community members she had spoken to had
13 limited time and resources and she found the City had not explored all options or addressed
14 the gap in the community. While she realized the focus on the CalEnviro Screen, it had not
15 taken into account children and younger seniors.

16
17 Vice-Chairperson Menis referenced Page 114 of 165 of the agenda packet, and
18 recommended the following revision to the paragraph on this page as follows:

19
20 *Because CalEPA has established CalEnviroScreen 4.0 data as regulatory*
21 *authority in determining Impacted Communities, this Environmental Justice*
22 *Element is required to prioritize mapping and findings from this data resource.*
23 *Using aerial imagery from Google Earth 2022, it is estimated that 62 residential*
24 *units are located within the Census Tract 3922.02 portion highlighted above.*

25
26 Vice-Chairperson Menis referenced Page 144 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action EJ 1.5.1,
27 and recommended the following revision:

28
29 *Encourage local health care providers to locate health care services and facilities*
30 *and provide adequate staffing to ensure equitable accessibility to such facilities.*

31
32 The Planning Commission accepted the change to Action EJ 1.5.1.

33
34 Vice-Chairperson Menis referenced Page 145 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action EJ 2.1.3,
35 and recommended the following revision:

36
37 *Prohibit development in areas that are particularly susceptible to erosion and*
38 *sediment loss unless mitigated.*

39
40 Vice-Chairperson Menis referenced Page 151 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action EJ 4.4.3,
41 and recommended the following revision:

42
43 *Ensure that future improvements in the City that would have an impact on the*
44 *Impacted Community are mitigated to a less than significant level unless mitigated*
45 *on existing residents, such as increase in pollution exposure, net loss of affordable*
46 *housing, or displacement of residents.*

47
48 Mr. Hanham explained that staff may further wordsmith Action EJ 4.4.3 to ensure
49 consistency with the language in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

50

1 Commissioner Bender referenced Page 105 of 165 of the agenda packet, and requested
2 the first sentence of the second paragraph under 1.4.1 Native American Tribes be revised
3 to read:
4

5 *The Ohlone people are the primary group of Native Americans on the Northern*
6 *California Coast, with a reach from present-day San Francisco through Monterey*
7 *Bay.*³
8

9 Commissioner Bender referenced Pages 136 and 137 of 165 of the agenda packet, the last
10 sentence of the last paragraph under 2.6.4 Medical Care Access, to be revised to read:
11

12 *The physical structure was demolished; no similar hospital, emergency room, or*
13 *urgent care facilities have opened in the City since closing Doctor's Medical Center.*
14

15 Commissioner Bender referenced Page 130 of 165 of the agenda packet, and the second
16 sentence of the paragraph under Other Census Tracts, which reads: *Generally, white*
17 *populations represent the followed by Hispanic, Asian American, African American and*
18 *then Other.* He asked and staff confirmed the reference to white populations would be
19 clarified.
20

21 Chairperson Sandoval referenced Page 144 of 165 of the agenda packet, Action EJ 1.5.6,
22 and recommended it be revised to read:
23

24 Encourage the development of a medical center, emergency room, urgent care, or
25 other hospital uses in the community.
26

27 Vice-Chairperson Menis referenced Page 135 of 165 of the agenda packet, Figure 11: USDA
28 Low-Income and Low-Access Food Atlas, and confirmed with staff the figure would be
29 modified, as previously discussed.
30

31 **MOTION** with a Roll Call vote to adopt Planning Commission Resolution 25-09 with Exhibit
32 A: Safety Element and Exhibit B: Environmental Justice Element, a Resolution of the
33 Planning Commission of the City of Pinole Recommending to the City Council Approval of
34 General Plan Amendment 25-01 for Adoption of the Safety and Environmental Justice
35 Elements to the City of Pinole General Plan and Approval of the CEQA Exemption Pursuant
36 to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3), as amended by the Planning Commission.
37

38 **MOTION: Sandoval**

SECONDED: Menis

APPROVED: 6-0-1

ABSENT: Huey
39
40

41 Chairperson Sandoval identified the 10-day appeal process of a decision of the Planning
42 Commission in writing to the City Clerk.
43

44 Commissioner Martinez left the meeting prior to the discussion of Item H.
45

46 **H. OLD BUSINESS:**
47

- 48 1. **Discussion of Redevelopment of Appian 80 Shopping Center – Compiled**
49 **Ideas Resolution – Second Revision**

1 Mr. Hanham provided the staff report dated September 22, 2025. The Planning
2 Commission was asked to adopt the draft resolution contained in Exhibit A, to the staff
3 report.
4

5 The Planning Commission walked through the Second Revision of the Compiled Ideas
6 Resolution page-by-page, as contained in Exhibit A to the staff report, with the following
7 comments and/or revisions as follows:
8

- 9 • Mixed Use Development, 1, no changes.
- 10
- 11 • Mixed Use Development 2, noted some spacing issues with the formatting as
12 compared to Mixed Use Development 2 and 3.
- 13
- 14 • Mixed Use Development 3, no changes.
- 15
- 16 • Design and Development 4, 5, 6 and 7, no changes.
- 17
- 18 • Design and Development 8, recommended the last sentence be restructured or
19 hyphenated to flow better, and staff noted the margins could be expanded to better
20 space the text.
- 21
- 22 • Design and Development 9 and 10, no changes.
- 23
- 24 • Access and Transportation 11 and 12, no changes.
- 25
- 26 • Markets and Commercial Opportunities, 13, revised to read: *Development should*
27 *consider the need for an affordable grocery option. Markets should consider the*
28 *price point and needs of the community in the area, in particular seniors and*
29 *persons on fixed-incomes.*
- 30
- 31 • Markets and Commercial Opportunities, 14, 16 and 17, no changes.
- 32
- 33 • Markets and Commercial Opportunities, 15, expand Footnote 5, to read: *Examples*
34 *may include Yard House and Whole Foods and prepared foods being a sales tax*
35 *benefit.*
- 36
- 37 • Community Enhancement and Partnerships, 18, 19, 20, no changes.
- 38
- 39 • Other Topics for City Council, 21, revised to read: *Planning Commission further*
40 *suggests City Council give consideration to a nexus study in developing a Citywide*
41 *commercial land vacancy fee.*
- 42

43 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

44
45 Anthony Vossbrink, asked that landscaping requirements be included in the ideas for
46 consideration. He cited the blight along the back perimeter of the shopping center property
47 and a large ravine in the back, which collected debris from I-80 and other properties.
48 There was also a grove of tall dead pine trees that were a fire hazard.
49

1 Mr. Vossbrink asked who would draw the property lines for the property in terms of whether
2 the County, Caltrans or the City was responsible for maintenance. He also asked whether
3 there had been any discussion of color coordination for the buildings to ensure the existing
4 tenants were all on board and required to coordinate with similar paint colors for the
5 exterior of the shopping center.
6

7 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED
8

9 In response to the public comment, Mr. Hanham explained once the new property owner
10 decided what they want to do with the project, they would have to submit design review to
11 the City. As to the debris in the ravine, that property was Caltrans property and Caltrans was
12 responsible for maintenance but code enforcement could be asked to inspect the area. The
13 City had an area fenced off due to issues with trucks and it may be possible to fence the back
14 side as well. The City could work with the property owner on that issue working with code
15 enforcement.
16

17 Commissioner Bender hoped the area would become something more than a strip mall but
18 he recognized there was no project at this time.
19

20 Commissioner Lam-Julian also recognized there were no plans currently for the property but
21 hoped something would come through since the community deserved it.
22

23 Vice-Chairperson Menis suggested there was room for aesthetics and recommended a new
24 point could be added under Design and Development to read: *Development should strive to*
25 *have a unified color scheme.*
26

27 Commissioner Bender disagreed with adding the statement since there was as yet no
28 proposal and only concepts were being discussed as to what the Planning Commission
29 wanted to see planning-wise, which was different from what the buildings would look like.
30 There was no guarantee the property owner would pay attention to the proposed ideas
31 resolution, which expressed the aspirations and hopes of what the Planning Commission
32 hoped the property could be from a macro picture, and he suggested leaving it at that. He
33 recognized the Planning Commission had spent a great deal of time on the document that
34 had evolved to become more succinct. He wanted to keep the document short, sweet and
35 aspirational.
36

37 Chairperson Sandoval thanked staff and the Planning Commission for all the work on the
38 document which involved three separate meetings. He hoped the developer was listening
39 and would consider something new and beautiful the City deserved or if the current developer
40 chose not to and decided to sell, he looked forward to another developer considering the
41 aspirational ideas the Planning Commission had offered.
42

43 **MOTION** to adopt Resolution 25-08 with Exhibit A, Development Ideas and Concepts, a
44 Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Pinole, County of Contra Costa, State
45 of California, Expressing Desirable Ideas and Concepts for Consideration for Future
46 Redevelopment of the Appian 80 Shopping Center Recommended to the City Council of the
47 City of Pinole, as amended by the Planning Commission.
48

49 **MOTION:** Sandoval **SECONDED:** Bender **APPROVED:** 5-0-2
50 **ABSENT:** Huey, Martinez

1 **I. NEW BUSINESS:** None

2
3 **J. CITY PLANNER'S/COMMISSIONER'S REPORT**

4
5 Mr. Hanham reported he would be attending the American Planning Association (APA)
6 Conference in Monterey in the next week. He and Senior Planner Justin Shiu offered the
7 following updates:

- 8
9
- 10 • Staff was waiting for the Fire Department to provide comments on the Pinole Shores
11 II project.
 - 12 • Appian Village was moving forward fairly quickly on the first three buildings and staff
13 was working to have the Lighting and Landscaping Assessment District (LLAD) for
14 the property completed and conditions of approval completed prior to issuance of
15 Certificates of Occupancy (COOs).
 - 16 • Pinole Vista was entitled through October 2026, with a one-year extension.
 - 17 • Staff was working on a couple of Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) applications.
 - 18 • A public workshop was being considered for the month of October for the Parklet
19 Program and outdoor dining, date to be determined to be held in the Council
20 Chambers. It was hoped the regulations would be brought to the Planning
21 Commission prior to the end of the year and the City Council in January.
 - 22 • Staff continued to work on the Objective Development Design Standards (ODDS),
23 with changes currently being made based on recommendations from the Planning
24 Commission Ad Hoc Committee. Staff hoped to have the ODDS presented to the
25 Planning Commission in the next 60 days.
 - 26 • Staff with assistance from interns was working on a Planning Division webpage to
27 collect information on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).
 - 28 • The Planning Department was hosting the third workshop in a series of workshops
29 for the Pinole Accessible Living Program (PAL) to be held at the Senior Center.
- 30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Commissioner Lam-Julian asked that staff remind the Appian Village developer to be good
38 neighbors since several community members had reached out to express concern trucks
39 were driving reckless and she had witnessed a cement truck driving the wrong way during
40 drop-off to enter the lot. Given the proximity of schools with the area already congested, it
41 was getting hostile between community members and the workers for the project.

42
43 Mr. Hanham advised a gentle reminder could be provided.

44
45 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported during a recent Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Committee
46 (TAPS) meeting a public commenter had provided comments along similar lines, that there
47 were issues around drop-off time and lanes being closed off. There had been an inquiry
48 whether there had been any conditions imposed on the project to constrain the hours of
49 operation to avoid overlay with the pickup and drop-off times for the schools.

1 Mr. Hanham understood there were a thread of emails between the Public Works Specialist
2 and the principal of the middle school about drop-offs and when the developer, DeNova
3 Homes, could access the roadway. It was clear the developer had to be reminded to be
4 mindful about drop-off and pickup times. He suggested once the striping was completed on
5 the roadway that may solve some of the problems. He added once the developer started
6 with the curb and gutter work there could be some lane closures. He would relay the
7 concerns to the Public Works Department. He added, when asked, that the road should not
8 be closed by the developer unless there was approval from the City, and the only time the
9 City approved the closure of the road was for slurry seal work.

10 Vice-Chairperson Menis asked whether the City had an explicit condition of approval on the
11 project to state that the work could only be done between certain hours, and Mr. Hanham
12 confirmed there were conditions related to construction and again if any road closures were
13 needed approval from the Public Works Department was required. He recalled that work
14 could only occur on weekends.

15 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported that when he tried to find information on the City website
16 about conditions of approval for undeveloped projects he could find no information for the
17 subject project. He asked whether a hyperlink could be provided for the project which could
18 be helpful, and Mr. Hanham confirmed that could be done.

19
20
21
22 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

23 Anthony Vossbrink, referenced the overpass on Appian Way which crossed over I-80 and
24 asked whether the City or the public had any say over the type of structure Caltrans was
25 working on given concerns it could become an eyesore similar to other Caltrans structures
26 in other communities. When the issue was raised at a recent TAPS meeting, staff was
27 unclear as to what kind of concrete safety wall would be installed and the details about the
28 structure were unclear. He wanted more information on the structure including the status of
29 the pedestrian path. He added there was a lot of AT&T work on the lines and poles up and
30 down Pinole Valley Road and asked whether the work was related to promises made by
31 AT&T and/or PG&E that old poles and lines up and down Pinole Valley Road would be
32 underground. He also reported there remained a problem at the corner of Granada Court
33 and Shea Drive where double poles had been strapped together in violation of the Americans
34 with Disabilities Act (ADA) for the pathway, which had been there for several years, was an
35 eyesore and a possible safety hazard leaving the City liable.

36
37
38 Mr. Vossbrink further asked about the status of the vacant lot next to the storage center at
39 the corner of Ramona Street and Pinole Valley Road, across from the high school. The
40 landlord sign had been removed and he asked whether it would be replaced. He also asked
41 how property lines were defined and reported on the number of dead trees that lined the
42 sides of City streets, in particular there was a large tree in the middle of Galbreth Road that
43 was a fire hazard and should be remediated. There were also dead trees along I-80 and the
44 Adobe Road Trail behind the dog park and caretaker's house.

45
46 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

47
48 Mr. Hanham responded to the public comment and explained he would have to check with
49 the Public Works Department on the status of the AT&T work.

1 Mr. Hanham clarified the I-80 overpass work, was the purview of Caltrans and was a safety
2 project. He also confirmed the City had interest in the vacant lot at Ramona Street and
3 Pinole Valley Road, but most of the uses proposed required a Conditional Use Permit (CUP)
4 or were unpermitted uses. As to the status of ownership of the trees on public sidewalks and
5 along the trails, he would have to check with Joe Bingaman, Public Works Manager.
6

7 In response to the Chair, Mr. Hanham advised the vacant lot near the high school was zoned
8 Commercial Mixed-Use (CMU).
9

10 **K. COMMUNICATIONS**

11 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported on the ex-parte communications to his email list about the
12 topics on the meeting agenda and various other items. He announced the following
13 community events: Senior Food Distribution at the Senior Center on September 23, 2025
14 from 10:00 to 11:00 a.m. for seniors in the City of Pinole only, with evidence of residence and
15 age required; Street Eats from 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. on September 26, October 10 and 24, 2025
16 at the Community Corner in downtown Pinole; Coffee with the City Manager on September
17 26, 2025 from 8:30 to 9:30 a.m.; and a rally at the intersection of Tennent Avenue and San
18 Pablo Avenue on Saturday, September 27, 2025. He also reported the County had a
19 community survey available through the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA)
20 website as part of phase two of an update to the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP).
21
22

23 **L. NEXT MEETING**

- 24
25 1. Planning Commission Regular Meeting on October 27, 2025 at 7:00 p.m.
26

27 **M. ADJOURNMENT: 10:48 p.m.**

28
29 Transcribed by: Sherri D. Lewis
30
31 Reviewed and Edited by: City Staff
32 Transcriber