

**JOINT CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MINUTES  
July 13, 2022**

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

The Joint City Council and Planning Commission Meeting was held via Zoom videoconference and broadcast from the Pinole Council Chambers, 2131 Pear Street, Pinole, California. Mayor Salimi called the Special Joint Meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission to order at 6:03 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

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

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

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

**A. COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT**

Vincent Salimi, Mayor  
Devin Murphy, Mayor Pro Tem  
Norma Martinez-Rubin, Council Member  
Maureen Toms, Council Member

**COUNCILMEMBERS ABSENT**

Anthony Tave, Council Member

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Ann Moriarty, Chairperson  
Frankie Martinez, Vice Chairperson  
Adam Benzuly, Commissioner  
Dave Kurrent, Commissioner  
Rafael Menis, Commissioner

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

Tim Banuelos, Commissioner

## B. STAFF PRESENT

Neil Gang, Acting City Manager/Police Chief  
Alex Mog, Assistant City Attorney  
Lilly Whalen, Community Development Director  
David Hanham, Planning Manager  
Roxanne Stone, Deputy City Clerk

Deputy City Clerk Roxane Stone announced the agenda had been posted on Thursday July 7, 2022 at 4:00 p.m. with all legally required written notices. No written comments had been received in advance of the meeting.

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

### 4. **CITIZENS TO BE HEARD (Public Comments)**

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

Christy Lam-Julian, Pinole, spoke to women and children and members of the LGBTQIA community in domestic violence situations and asked whether those community members would be part of the planning process as the City moved forward in terms of creating a safe space or protocol given the lack of local resources.

Tony Vossbrink, Pinole, suggested the City Council and Planning Commission should take a few minutes at the beginning and end of each meeting to reinforce the importance of adhering to health protocols related to the increase in COVID-19 cases, with most new cases attributed to the Omicron variant. He also requested an update on the Pinole Valley Bowl shooting incident given the suspect remained at-large, the incident had occurred over three months ago and the public should be kept informed. In addition, the City Council and the Planning Commission had not recognized the victims of the Uvalde, Texas school shooting at any recent meetings and he stated that should be rectified with this meeting.

Mayor Salimi understood the incident at Pinole Valley Bowl was still under investigation. He emphasized Pinole remained a safe community and the incident was not a reflection of Pinole but a reflection of society.

## 5. **WORKSHOP ITEMS**

- A. Receive Progress Update on Land Use Planning for Pinole Project (Update to Housing and Health & Safety Elements and New Environmental Justice Element of General Plan) and Provide Direction as Appropriate [**Action: Receive Report and Provide Direction to Staff (Whalen)**]

Community Development Director Lilly Whalen reported this meeting would focus on the work currently underway for the Land Use Planning for the Update to the Housing and Health & Safety Elements and the new Environmental Justice Element (EJ) of the General Plan. Pinole staff had been working closely with a strong technical team of eleven Housing, Safety, and Environmental experts from consultant Michael Baker, Michael Baker International, to prepare an updated housing plan for the City of Pinole and to update the Health & Safety and new EJ Elements of the General Plan. All experts were present and would be sharing the progress made to date.

Surabhi Barbhaya, Project Manager, Health & Safety Element Specialist, Michael Baker International, introduced the Michael Baker team including Dan Wery, Housing Element Specialist; Emily Elliott, Community Outreach Specialist; Noelle Steele, Environmental Justice Element Specialist; and Veronica Tam, Housing Element Strategy Advisor.

Emily Elliott, Community Outreach Specialist, started a PowerPoint presentation and provided an overview of the Community Engagement Activities to date, which included a project specific website, live community survey, stakeholder focus groups and community workshops. Engagement activities also included twelve banners hung around the City, postcards mailed to all postal customers, posts on Facebook and Instagram, notifications in the City's biweekly administrative report and interested parties added to a contact list of communications.

A City Council Study Session had been held in March and public hearings for the draft elements would be scheduled for both the City Council and Planning Commission.

The online survey to date included 132 respondents. The results were anonymous and the survey was available in different languages. Two community workshops had been held on May 11 and June 9, 2022. While stakeholder focus group sessions involved limited attendance, follow-up would be provided with those stakeholders who had not attended the sessions via one-on-one interviews to encourage the submittal of written comments.

An overview of the survey results on the level of concern regarding issues facing Pinole to date was provided with the top three concerns identified as water supply, homelessness and employment opportunities. Results of the level of concern about groups of people being able to obtain housing resulted in the most concern for the lower and middle income workforce groups. Results of the level of concern about housing issues in Pinole resulted in the top three concerns of overcrowding, homelessness and poor neighborhood infrastructure. Results on the level of support for various housing income categories in Pinole, the level of support for different housing programs and the rankings in response to the question: *Which natural hazards are you most concerned* were all highlighted.

Ms. Barbhaya provided an overview of the Safety, Health and Noise Elements and noted that the current Health & Safety Elements would be reorganized since the Health Element overlapped with the EJ Element and shared common topics of discussion. The Health Element discussion goals and policies would be recommended to be moved to the EJ Element to avoid duplication to some of the goals and policies. The Noise Element may become part of the Safety Element or be a standalone element. New information and mapping would be added to the Safety Element in addition to several new topics of discussion including climate resiliency, evacuation routes, drought, dam inundations, impacts of tsunami and emergency preparedness.

The Safety Element would address Senate Bill (SB) 99, General Plans, Safety Element, Emergency evacuation routes, with evacuation routes to be identified and neighborhoods that did not have access to more than two evacuation routes to be mapped. SB 379, Residential solar energy systems permitting would also be addressed with an assessment of critical facilities in the City as part of climate resiliency policies. An evacuation/drought study would be conducted to evaluate the capacity and viability of the evacuation routes in compliance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 747, Planning and zoning; General Plan Safety Element.

Examples of the maps of the existing conditions analysis was provided and included the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Plains, Shake Potential, Wildfire Hazard Zones and Proposed Evacuation Routes. Changes would also be made to the goals, policies and actions section of the Health & Safety Element. The proposed changes were highlighted at this time.

In terms of the engagement activities for the Health & Safety Element, as previously identified the City Council had held a Study Session in March 2022, there had been engagement via two community workshops and there had been initial contact with the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection related to SB 1241, State Park System Annual Reports. A workshop had been conducted with Public Works, Fire and Police to confirm evacuation routes and to discuss evacuation scenarios. Focused interviews with Public Works, Fire and Police on existing conditions and policy discussions had yet to be conducted.

Noelle Steele, Environmental Justice (EJ) Element Specialist, provided an overview of the newly required EJ Element, intended to identify impacted communities or areas disproportionately affected by environmental burdens or other environmental hazards, with the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) recommending several data sources to comprehensively research and identify those areas of concern. Policies had then been created to reduce the compounded health risks to promote civic engagement and prioritize improvements and programs. Some policies would be focused on specific areas of the community and others would be applicable citywide. The primary tool that OPR recommended to identify disproportionately burdened communities was a data mapping tool, CalEnviroScreen, to be maintained by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

Exhibits of CalEnviroScreen were provided to show the socioeconomic score, pollution burden score and the composite score (socioeconomic and pollution scores combined). The impacted community in Pinole had shown up in a census tract that was only partially located within the City of Pinole, which was the only impacted community that exceeded the OPR guidelines. Policies would address the disproportionate burden in this area likely associated with historical land uses and industry that had occurred largely outside of the City of Pinole, but there were also policies that addressed the City in its entirety.

Ms. Steele explained that OPR regulations had identified data resources covering additional topical areas outside of the CalEnviroScreen, which she walked through at this time and which had resulted in the policy framework organization and policy requirements recommended by the state. That included the creation of five topical areas such as equity in access, medical care, environment, civic engagement and generations. She added that Health Element policies from the Safety Element would be incorporated into the EJ Element, with the EJ policies having been evaluated for best practices including recommendations from OPR that would be tailored specifically to the needs of Pinole. Examples of policies were provided.

Dan Wery, Housing Element Specialist, provided an overview of the purpose of the Housing Element, which ensured the availability and fair distribution of housing throughout the City and which included a plan to accommodate the City's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation. He identified the six chapters of the Housing Element including Review of Accomplishments, Needs Assessment, Housing Resources, Constraints, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) and Implementation Plan.

The City of Pinole's RHNA was 500 units within the next eight-year period. The City was obligated to provide sufficient land zoned appropriately to accommodate the RHNA but was not obligated to construct any housing. The income categories for the different housing types and the RHNA allocation were identified. Pinole was required to provide 121 Very Low Income units, 69 Low Income units, 87 Median Income units and 223 Above Moderate Income units, with the area median income figures to be updated in the PowerPoint presentation based on recently released 2022 data.

In terms of the housing sites inventory, the City of Pinole was ahead of schedule with 84 percent of its RHNA units pending approval. Pinole only needed 81 Low Income units and had plenty of good sites to consider, which would not require rezoning to meet the requirements. Existing sites as zoned and in accordance with the General Plan may be used as potential housing sites

Mr. Wery also previewed the Housing Plan comprised of goals, policies and actions and summarized the five major goals from the current 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Housing Element to monitor housing needs, protect existing character and heritage, provide adequate services and facilities, meet housing needs and energy-efficiency, conservation and sustainable residential development. The likely 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle Housing Goals could include housing production, constraint removal, preservation and improvement, housing assistance, special housing needs and AFFH. He walked through a number of possible modifications to existing programs and actions.

Mr. Wery also summarized the options for housing production which may include zoning for adequate sites, minimum densities, an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and partnerships or collaboration with and assist housing developers. Constraint removal programs would include permit streamlining, objective development standards and preapproved ADU plans. Housing Preservation Programs could include preservation of at-risk below market rate housing, a residential rehabilitation loan program or maintenance assistance. Housing Assistance Programs could include increased housing for vulnerable populations through housing choice vouchers and landlord tenant mediation.

Special Housing Needs Programs included senior center funding, Low Barrier Navigation Centers, transitional and supportive housing, residential care facilities, emergency shelters and a reasonable accommodation process, all of which with the exception of senior center funding, would be required as a result of changes to recent state housing laws.

Fair Housing Programs included education of new fair housing laws, requirement to accept housing choice vouchers and place-based improvements generally to ensure the older areas of the community that did not have the same facilities had equal access and opportunities.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED**

Debbie Long, Pinole, reported that zip code 94803 was also a City of Pinole zip code and there were around 50 residents who were always forgotten when information from the City was disseminated to the community. Speaking specifically to SB 99 and its impacts on a community, she explained that she resided on Rancho Road, which dead-ended at Galbreth Road, and both neighborhoods had only one access in and out and were faced with the highest fire danger in the City. She hoped that a comprehensive report would be provided by the Pinole Fire Department and Contra Costa County since she was also surrounded by the community of El Sobrante, and hoped the Health & Safety Element would be closely evaluated. She noted that Galbreth Road, was a wide road and could accommodate emergency access and while Rancho Road was open for emergency access over the years the City and County had allowed trees to grow, fences to be built and split lot development to occur. She hoped the Planning Commission would take a look at this area of concern at the time of its review.

When considering development, Ms. Long also asked that the maximum requirements in terms of size, density and parking be clarified and not be considered an entitlement, but that a development would be required to keep within the spirit of the law and ensure development was not bunched into one place with associated traffic and walkability issues. She also hoped the PowerPoint presentation would be posted on the City website.

Deputy City Clerk Stone confirmed the updated PowerPoint presentation had been posted on the City website.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED**

Council member Martinez-Rubin inquired of the housing inequities that had occurred over time since she understood there was the one census tract in Pinole that had been found to be disproportionate, to which Ms. Steele explained the inequities were related to pollution burden from heavy industry, not housing. Some socioeconomic data had shown some higher poverty rates, linguistic isolation and higher challenges. The pollution burden was being evaluated to see how it may carry over into the City in terms of air quality impacts but significant inequities had not been found in that tract.

Mr. Wery added there were differences throughout the City and the one census tract area in Pinole had identified pollution burden and if there were areas of inequities in the City, he encouraged anyone to point them out.

Council member Martinez-Rubin asked of the differentiation between the older and newer parts of the City and the cut-off criteria used to delineate an older area of the City.

Mr. Wery explained it was not a hard criteria but an observation. Pinole's rate of housing production in the past had been almost static, and while there had been some new development they were focusing on areas that may be lacking facilities or amenities or which had inequities such as a lack of good lighting, sidewalks, access to parks and recreation.

Council member Martinez-Rubin understood that spotting inequities in different parts of the City had not been necessarily aligned with the age of a particular neighborhood and identifying those areas would require feedback to the consultants. She found that Pinole was not a food desert but some residents may have a different opinion. She asked of the acceptable standards to determine whether or not a food inequity existed.

Mr. Wery stated there was no hard and fast rule to identify inequities. It was qualitative and subjective and they looked for input from the surveys, stakeholder input, public workshops and comments from the public as part of the input on the project website. The intent was to focus on areas where there was a consensus.

Ms. Steele added that information had been folded into the existing conditions report as part of the EJ Element that had found no food deserts in Pinole pursuant to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) resources, which combined Low Income groups further than a mile in urban areas from a supermarket. The outreach engagement efforts also registered no comments on this topic.

Council member Martinez-Rubin also expressed concern with the special housing needs and looked forward to future discussions between staff, City Council, Planning Commission and the public.

Due to technical difficulties, Mayor Salimi declared a recess at 7:17 p.m. The Joint City Council and Planning Commission meeting reconvened at 7:35 p.m. with all Council members, Planning Commissioners and City staff present with the exception of Council member Tave and Planning Commissioner Banuelos.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy commented on the public policies that had created racial disparities and a possible Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance for Pinole. He asked what data was needed for that to occur, and Mr. Wery explained that no data was needed. An Inclusionary Housing Ordinance was a tool that many communities considered to encourage and incentivize below market rate and affordable housing. If Pinole were to consider an Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance, it would have to ensure the inclusionary portion was feasible without constraining overall housing production, and a separate technical financial analysis would be required.

Community Development Director Whalen clarified the City of Pinole had an Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance in place which required 15 percent of the proposed for-sale units and greater to be affordable to Low and Very Low Income households. She understood that Mr. Wery was speaking of possibly increasing that affordability level.

Mr. Wery reiterated that Pinole had already met 84 percent of its RHNA for units pending approval and only needed 81 Low Income units. He was confident the City would meet its target in the next eight years and may not have to change anything.

Community Development Director Whalen noted the City was lagging in providing Moderate Income units and it was possible the percentage of Moderate Income units in the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance could be modified to allow that target to be reached quicker.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy asked whether or not a racial impact study would be prepared as part of this process to determine the effects of City housing and land use policy on people of color in Pinole.

Mr. Wery was uncertain a racial impact study would be prepared but the AFFH chapter would review a range of protected classes and categories to ensure equal access to housing.

Council member Toms spoke to the portion of the census tract that met the qualifications of the EJ Element and asked the size of the population impacted and was informed by Ms. Steele the census tract was quite large and the population was a little over 11,000 individuals, with a sliver located in the City of Pinole.

Council member Toms referenced the housing site inventory, specifically the Pinole Valley Shopping Center, which was being counted and asked of the impact of potential development to meet the RHNA.

Mr. Wery confirmed the Pinole Valley Shopping Center site included the former Kmart property, which he understood involved pending development and which had been included in the site inventory and would potentially yield 200 units to the inventory. If that site had to be removed from the inventory, it could be replaced elsewhere in the community. He also described the required buffer in the event a site may not be developed as expected.

Council member Toms commented that folding the Health Element into the EJ Element should be considered the other way around since the Health Element encompassed the entire population of Pinole whereas the EJ Element encompassed a smaller segment of the population, and the policy impacting the greater population should be the main element. She thanked everyone for a very complete presentation.

Planning Commissioner Benzuly referenced the top three concerns as part of the survey including water supply, homelessness and employment opportunities and also concerns with wildfire. He asked how the items were interrelated and Ms. Barbhaya explained that all items were related to each other. She noted the previous Safety Element had not included drought as a topic. The Sustainability Element would address many drought-related issues including water conservation, drought resistant landscaping and the like. The Sustainability Element would be tied to the Health & Safety Element. Also in terms of wildfire, adequate water supply during wildfire would be addressed as part of the policies.

Planning Commissioner Menis commented that a comparison to the existing housing goals and likely housing goals seemed to be removed from the 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle Housing Element. He asked if they would all be under the Sustainability Element or other elements, and was informed by Mr. Wery the goals had not been removed but would be worked around and tucked in since they did not always fit into the categories shown. Existing programs, such as energy efficiency, would also not be removed as an example, unless there were programs that were finite in nature. Also, energy efficiency was a requirement of the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and would not be eliminated.

Planning Commissioner Menis spoke to the AFFH and how it tied into subjective and objective standards. He expressed concern that the groups they would want to address through AFFH may be less engaged and less interested in reaching out. He asked whether or not there had been input from the second workshop or from non-English speakers in the community.

Ms. Elliott reported there had been no non-English speakers at the second workshop. The survey had included a question asking respondents whether or not English was the primary language in the home or whether translation services were required and there had been no request for translation services. As part of the engagement process, the intent was to reach everyone in the community.



Through the stakeholder engagement process, those groups included people affiliated with organizations that may provide services to protected classes or fair housing service providers, as examples, with an effort to reach those people through the organizations that provided the services.

Mr. Wery again provided an overview of the AFFH and noted they would be reviewing the housing sites relative to a series of maps, filters and criteria with direct input from those with specific issues and/or recommendations, which was valuable for the process and that input was oftentimes sought from community-based organizations and the community members who represented them.

Planning Commissioner Menis was pleased the AFFH had more particular criteria. In terms of the EJ Element, while it was primarily required due to the one census tract, the overall policies and ideas linked with that Element didn't just apply to that one part of the City but applied more broadly to the entire City providing benefits to the entire City. He understood the EJ Element policies, procedures and goals to be applied would benefit the entire City and the Health & Safety Element should be attached.

Ms. Steele agreed and commented it was the hope to respond to both the specific community and encompass policies that applied citywide.

Planning Commissioner Kurrent asked whether or not other shopping centers would be considered as housing opportunity sites, to which Mr. Wery explained that generally they would look for the "low hanging fruit," such as vacant properties with appropriate zoning first and then underdeveloped properties which could be opportunities for infill development. If needed, shopping centers such as an older center with a lot of vacancies could be considered as possible housing opportunity sites in the next eight to nine years.

Planning Commissioner Kurrent also clarified with Mr. Wery the project schedule. There would be additional meetings with the City Council and Planning Commission and the schedule for submittal of the document to HCD for review typically involved several rounds with HCD. The first submittal of the first draft of the document to HCD involved a 90-day review and the second round of review involved a 60-day review. Subsequent reviews would also involve a period of public review. It was likely this process would go into 2023. The goal was for the document to be completed and certified by HCD around March/April 2023.

Planning Commissioner Kurrent referenced the charts in the Health & Safety Element and the potential for housing sites, which were unclear. He suggested when presented in the document it would be helpful to describe what the criteria meant. He had the same concern with the socioeconomic score and suggested it was imperative to actually include an understanding of how the criteria had been developed. He thanked the consultants for the presentation and was eager to see what transpired.

Planning Commission Vice Chairperson Martinez spoke to the safety tools that had classified residents in the Pinole Valley as living in a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. He noted the fire station in that region had been closed since 2010, and now in 2022 the results were that friends and family were increasingly exposed to fire dangers. He asked what solutions, options and tools were being communicated to the community to address those issues.

Planning Commission Vice Chairperson Martinez suggested strategies should be created to engage the public to ensure a focus on finding a solution to improve this challenge and provide details on evacuation in the event of an emergency, improve egress on Pinole Valley Road and I-80 and that all Pinole residents be made aware of evacuation routes.

Ms. Barbhaya reiterated a workshop had been held with the Fire Chief to consider evacuation routes and to identify those neighborhoods that did not have more than two evacuation routes. There were also various policies that CAL FIRE would like to see in the Safety Element and some of those tools included drought-resistant landscaping and fuel breaks. Fire safety equipment would also have to be evaluated on a regular basis to ensure adequate fire equipment and water supply to combat any wildfires in the region.

Planning Commission Vice Chairperson Martinez also referenced the housing communication tools, RHNA requirements and state legislation on housing and asked what tools would be used to educate the community on the state housing crisis, state legislation on housing and RHNA allocation requirements. He suggested it would be helpful to educate the community on the various housing income categories given the amount of misinformation in the community, particularly as it related to the proposal to develop the former Kmart property. He wanted to see tools in place that better partnered with the community, recognized the diversity in Pinole and recommended how to bring new families and friends into the community in a thoughtful and concise way.

Mr. Wery explained that the information from this and prior workshops had been or would be recorded and could be posted on the City website where the public would be directed to gather information. Other resources could be provided on request. When the Draft Housing Element was presented, additional information and analysis would be available for review and well explained in the document itself. The PowerPoint presentation only offered snapshots of the information being discussed. He again walked through the RHNA allocation, and the required housing units based on the different income categories as depicted in the PowerPoint presentation, and reiterated that new data had come out and the median income numbers would be updated. There were also resources available through the County Collaborative (C4).

Planning Commission Chairperson Moriarty spoke to energy efficiency which had not been included in the 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle Housing Element. She asked how climate resiliency would be folded in to the process and what tools the Planning Commission could consider to bring in energy conservation and efficiency options, such as solar panels and the like.

Mr. Wery stated some cities provided subsidies, incentives or requirements to provide energy efficiencies and other approaches could be to require a larger development to offer energy efficiency automatically as a service, such as units that were designed to accommodate disabilities. A variety of different tools could be considered to find what fit Pinole best. There could also be educational components where the City could help to be the mediator/connector between other programs that provided assistance and funding putting the resource together with the developer for that energy efficiency.

Planning Commission Chairperson Moriarty commented that if the Pinole Vista project, as an example, were to be approved and Pinole met the requirement for the 81 Low Income units in the next eight years, she asked whether the City still had a responsibility to provide more housing and was still subject to all of the state housing legislation.

Mr. Wery explained that if Pinole met its RHNA requirements it would be free of any penalties or restrictions and would be eligible for grant funds from the state; however, the City would still be morally responsible to meet the needs of the community. He was confident Pinole would meet its RHNA allocation but also hoped the City would continue to provide more housing that served the community well and allowed the community to grow and prosper.

Veronica Tam, Housing Element Strategy Advisor, provided further clarification and stated the RHNA was actually considered a minimum not a maximum, and even if the RHNA was met, the City was still subject to all requirements of Housing Element law to meet the development environment to be feasible for additional housing to occur and how much of that housing would be based on the market.

Mayor Salimi further clarified the RHNA allocations for the different income categories as previously discussed and noted that many people made less than the median income and were classified as Low Income. He asked the consultants where they saw growth in terms of the demographics given that many could not afford homes in Pinole and were actually moving out of the Bay Area into more affordable communities.

Mr. Wery suggested the trend of people moving further out and away was due to affordability, but the pandemic had allowed people to telecommute and work remotely. While that may help with keeping residents in Pinole, he was uncertain how that would play out in the long term. He agreed that exorbitant prices had outpaced incomes and many people could not afford to live in their own communities, which was why it was important to provide a range of housing opportunities and housing types in Pinole and consider housing needs tools such as ADUs.

Mayor Salimi asked what policies could be considered to attract young families and again Mr. Wery highlighted the potential tools that could be considered along with the programs and policies that could encourage a different range of housing types and possible incentives.

Mayor Pro Tem Murphy suggested it would be helpful to have a document with leading data points, such as a list of assumptions being made based on the data points and how the process was being led based on the data points or a landing page could be posted on the City website, which would be valuable to those who had yet to participate in the conversation.

Mayor Salimi asked for the consideration of adding a policy that could invite young families to come to the City of Pinole as it related to the size of the unit, mixed units and incentives for large families.

The City Council thanked staff and the consultant team for the information provided and the Planning Commission for its feedback.

The Deputy City Clerk advised there was a public comment waiting on Zoom but the Mayor reported public comment had been received at the beginning of the meeting and during the discussion and would not be re-opened at this time.

Planning Manager David Hanham thanked staff and the consultants for the team effort and the Planning Commission for its input.

Planning Commission Chairperson Moriarty thanked the Mayor and City Council for the collaborative discussion. She looked forward to future joint sessions to discuss the City's future. She too thanked staff and the consultants for all their hard work.

Community Development Director Whalen also thanked everyone involved in the process and the public for its participation and she too looked forward to future discussions.

Ms. Barbhaya and Mr. Wery offered their thanks to everyone involved in the process and the public for its participation, which would help to build a better Housing Element and reflect the future of the community.

Ms. Elliott advised the survey would remain open through mid-August with invitations extended to many stakeholders and with interested parties encouraged to provide input at [LandUsePlanningForPinole.com](http://LandUsePlanningForPinole.com).

13. ADJOURNMENT to the Regular City Council Meeting of July 19, 2022 in Remembrance of Amber Swartz. .

At 8:40 p.m., Mayor Salimi adjourned the meeting to the Regular City Council Meeting of July 19, in Remembrance of Amber Swartz.

**Submitted by:**



---

**Heather Bell, CMC**  
**City Clerk**

**Approved by City Council:**

