

From: Nwm Sfb
Sent: Monday, August 07, 2017 6:55 PM
To: Padilla, Ingrid
Subject: Brisbane Baylands - 8/7/2017 Special Meeting

Honorable Mayor and City Council:

I'd like to thank you as well as many others for the extensive public input, staff efforts and well thought out discussions for over a decade.

It looks like it is heading toward a conclusion, as there are many wonderful proposals since 2011 and before. As well as many alternatives and research.

But since there are many missing pieces to this puzzle still to be analyzed, I'd recommend that you continue to proceed *without* making any decisions this month.

In fact some of these puzzle pieces are so big (High Speed Rail) that the developer, UPC, is justifiably concerned that the project will experience significant delays.

At the end of the day we still have cultural expectations of small town and desires akin to the "Petaluma Plan" from the 1970s and those that feel the intensity and development should can could be much higher than UPC has proposed. Even though most surveyed by UPC do not want the higher densities.

There are amazing views now and there is a great way of life in Brisbane. I'd hope that we can delve into this even more to see if we have missed anything that can allow Brisbane to keep the small town character, values and yet still play a small part in helping regionally over the next twenty plus years.

I would also welcome design charrettes that could attempt to weave the various competing proposals that are on the table. Perhaps also with those that are discussed by Bioregional "One Planet Living" as well as any other proposals that could be amazing.

Note that it is unfortunate that the California High Speed Rail Authority have not been in serious discussions with the City of Brisbane over the last ten years. IF the CA HSR wants to have approximately 100 acres for their facility, it seems difficult to obtain most of the other goals that the various plans have sought. CA HSR inserting itself more than a decade late is not just unfortunate, it is incredibly problematic. However building a platform similar to what Related Development Companies is constructing at "Hudson Yards" in New York City could be a model. However, that is 28 acres, not 100 acres.

Regarding the environmental remediation, I'd suggest that the level of remediation be more carefully discussed. Many felt that the remediation plan should have been further along than it has been to date. The land must be remediated fully, even to residential standards even if corporate use, use by CA HSR with a platform over it or for natural restoration. I do not believe we should allow the remediation to be accomplished to the lowest standards possible.

Note: If San Francisco feels that they want to help or influence what happens in Brisbane at the Brisbane Baylands, may I suggest that since much of the remediation necessary is to clean up a former San Francisco trash site... then it is not entirely unreasonable that San Francisco pays a significant amount toward the remediation that was due to their trash over many decades.

Lastly, I would like to thank the developer (UPC) for their twelve years of efforts on this. But perhaps UPC should have mixed up the developments to include densities and heights from their other regional sites. This variety may have made for a much more interesting proposal. But could potentially help with other issues from wind on the bay to more hotel rooms/convention space to even more open space and many other items on the wish list of those in Brisbane.

It is not too late for a 21st century development that a small community could really be proud of. But this will take many more meetings and much more detailed executable ideas. I look forward to helping in this regard any way that I can.

(My apologies for not making it to tonight's meeting as I intended. I had a bit of an accident over the weekend)

All the best,

Scott Lane