DRAFT
BRISBANE PLANNING COMMISSION
Summary Minutes of April 14, 2016
Regular Meeting

A. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Anderson, Munir, Parker, and Vice Chairperson Reinhardt.
Absent: Chairperson Do.
Staff Present: Community Development Director John Swiecki and Associate Planner Julia Capasso.

C. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Commissioner Parker moved and Commissioner Munir seconded to adopt the agenda. The motion was approved 4-0.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

None.

E. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS (limit to a total of 15 minutes)

None.

F. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Vice Chairperson Reinhardt acknowledged written communications from the Bay Area Monitor, HEART of San Mateo County, and Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County.

G. OLD BUSINESS

1. **PUBLIC HEARING**: 124 San Bruno Avenue; Design Permit DP-1-16, Use Permit UP-1-16; Design Permit and Use Permit to allow construction of an approximately 28-foot tall, 2-story residential building to accommodate three condominium units ranging between 1,100-1,300 square feet in size, and an attached 5-car garage, altogether totaling approximately 4,044 square feet in floor area, to replace an existing single-family home on a 5,679 square foot lot in the R-3 residential district; Jerry Kuhel, applicant; Robin Hubinsky and Brendan Frost, owners; APN 007-282-020.

Commissioner Anderson recused himself as he lives within 500 feet of the subject property and left the dais.

Associate Planner Capasso presented the agenda report.

Commissioner Munir asked if the project addressed sustainability criteria. Associate Planner Capasso replied the project was not subject to the city's Green Building Ordinance due to the number of units proposed. She said the project must comply with the California Green Building Code (CALGreen) at the building permit stage, and the project incorporated passive solar design techniques.

Commissioner Munir asked if solar panels were considered. Associate Planner Capasso deferred to the applicant.

Commissioner Munir asked how the tandem parking spaces in the garage would be managed to ensure the different households' cars were not blocked. Associate Planner Capasso stated the conditions, covenants, and restrictions (CC&Rs) assigned the two pairs of tandem spaces together to Units 1 and 2, respectively.

Commissioner Munir asked why staff recommended remote control garage access. Associate Planner Capasso said it was intended to avoid queuing of cars in the street when entering the driveway.

Commissioner Munir moved to open the public hearing. Commissioner Parker seconded and the motion was approved 3-0.

Jerry Kuhel, applicant, said the guest parking in the driveway would be deeded to individual units. He said he had worked with the Department of Public Works previously at 875 Humboldt Road, which also features a wider curb cut. The wider curb cut allows for additional off-street guest parking.

Commissioner Parker asked about trash storage.

Mr. Kuhel said the trash area would be screened from the street but would not be enclosed and each unit would have their own receptacles.

Commissioner Munir asked whether solar panels had been considered.

Mr. Kuhel said they had not considered solar at this point.

Robin Hubinsky, property owner, said they had not considered solar panels as the project has a flat roof and they would need to do a study to see what would work there. She is interested in energy efficiency measures, such as water heaters. Commissioner Munir asked if she was interested in a green roof. Ms. Hubinsky said she had not considered it, but the roof deck could be planted by the homeowners.

Commissioner Parker asked if there was space on the roof for panels if the homeowner's association decided they wanted rooftop solar.

Ms. Hubinsky said there was space, but she didn't think rooftop solar would be efficient at this location due to the shadowing of the adjacent buildings and the orientation of the lot.

Mr. Kuhel said he had lowered his energy usage by efficiency measures such as insulation, LED lights, and appliances. He said if the potential homeowners were interested in electric cars, they could choose to install the required electrical hookups.

Ms. Hubinsky said she lived in San Francisco and had views of her neighbor's solar panels from her windows. Rooftop solar would visually impact the adjacent structures. She said their goal was to get more efficiency out of the building, and rooftop solar would be an option in the future.

Commissioner Munir asked if hookups for electric cars would be provided.

Mr. Kuhel said that would be initiated by the homeowners who buy the units, as it's a significant cost to install those features and they may not be needed.

Vice Chairperson Reinhardt asked whether the homeowners would be encouraged to park in the garage or if they could potentially park in the guest parking.

Mr. Kuhel said providing storage areas for each unit at 126 cubic yards per unit would encourage use of the garage for parking. He added that he had visited neighboring properties to review the project and answer their questions.

Commissioner Munir moved and Commissioner Parker seconded to close the public hearing. The motion passed 3-0. Commissioner Munir moved adoption of Resolution DP-1-16/UP-1-16 to approve the project. Commissioner Parker seconded the motion and it passed 3-0.

H. OLD BUSINESS

1. Baylands Planning Applications (Baylands Concept Plans, Brisbane Baylands Specific Plan, General Plan Amendment Case GP-01-06) and related Final Environmental Impact Report Universal Paragon Corporation, applicant; Owners: various; APN: various.

Commissioner Anderson rejoined the Commission at the dais. Director Swiecki introduced Debbie Kern and Tim Kelly of Keyser Marston Associates to present the findings of the fiscal analysis and economic feasibility study.

Debbie Kern began the presentation. [Note: The presentation is available online here: http://brisbaneca.org/sites/default/files/Revised%20Baylands%20Power%20Point%2004%2013%2016.pdf]

Commissioner Munir asked Ms. Kern if the fact that there was a specific plan for the Developer Sponsored scenarios made a difference in the fiscal analysis as compared to the conceptual plans put forth by the community.

Ms. Kern said the fiscal impact analysis treated each scenario equally. It assumed that each scenario was supported by the marketplace, financially feasible, and would reach full buildout. The analysis should be updated once a final project has been reached, based on the final project components. She continued the presentation.

Commissioner Parker asked if the analysis considered affordable housing requirements.

Ms. Kern replied it did not. She continued the presentation.

Commissioner Parker asked if slide 7 factored in all services such as police and infrastructure that would need to be maintained.

Ms. Kern said ongoing municipal service costs were included, but capital costs were not as they were assumed to be funded privately. She concluded her portion of the presentation on fiscal impacts analysis and turned the presentation over to Tim Kelly of Keyser Marston Associates to review the economic feasibility considerations.

Mr. Kelly presented the economic feasibility considerations which were prepared for the Developer Sponsored Plan (DSP) only (slides 13 through 23 of the presentation).

Following Mr. Kelly's presentation, Vice Chairperson Reinhardt announced a five minute break.

The meeting reconvened and Vice Chairperson Reinhardt opened the floor for Commissioner questions.

Commissioner Anderson referenced the eight-page memorandum that mentions the solar farm in the DSP, but said the 59-page report did not mention solar at all. He asked if any analysis was done in terms of cost and revenue for acre in the feasibility analysis for solar.

Mr. Kelly said solar could be a potential land use. He said they were coming from a point of view of getting the land value above the infrastructure cost, and solar would not finance $100 million in infrastructure costs required to ready the site. Solar could be attached to the primary land uses. The context of what Keyser Marston analyzed was what land uses would make it feasible to open up the site.

Commissioner Anderson said if the primary use could not be solar, he would be interested to see the analysis related to that. He referenced a previous economic feasibility study prepared on behalf of CREBL that showed solar was feasible on the site.

Mr. Kelly said they did not have data specific to solar power generation as a primary use. It is difficult to find a comparable site for solar power generation at the scale of the developer's plan and with the high cost threshold. One million square feet of retail is also an "old-school" kind of number for retail, like Hillsdale Shopping Center, and he doesn't feel there is a market for that level of retail here. Retail in general is a challenged market and there will be additional retail development to the north at Candlestick.

Commissioner Anderson said the fiscal impact assumed full buildout and asked if a probability curve was determined for different buildout amounts.

Mr. Kelly said the data available at this stage is very high-level. To calculate a probability analysis, the first line would be high up on the page, flat, as a fixed cost to be funded, and the land value must go above that line. It's challenging to have high fixed costs that have to be incurred up front for any development to occur.

Commissioner Anderson asked if phase metering could be tied to revenue. He assumed in the DSP each phase was a mixture of residential and commercial, a mixture of positive and negative balancing. He asked if all the housing was built prior to retail, would it generate a deficit?

Ms. Kern said the city could adopt a metering system to avoid that type of scenario; e.g., the city could require that residential be built in concert with retail, office, or hotel to offset the residential, unless a study is prepared showing those other uses are not needed. She referred to the phasing program for the Schlage Lock development in Visitacion Valley that requires a grocery store to be built in the first phase regardless of whether there is market demand for it. The developer is also required to renovate an historic office building in the first phase, before they can pull more residential development permits. The city could set a metering metric on a certain level of retail sales or if they actually exist.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the applicant was paying for the grocery store or if a third party was constructing the grocery store.

Ms. Kern said the benefit of mixed-use projects is the grocery store is bought and paid for, and the value of the residential is subsidizing the grocery store. The developer is currently looking for a tenant to occupy the space at buildout. The city could have a menu of public benefits in place as a condition, such as affordable housing, in order to proceed with other economic generated uses.

Commissioner Anderson said he understood from Ms. Kern and Mr. Kelly's presentation that all costs for residential could be covered by an assessment district at about $500 a month per homeowner, and he wondered if there was an analysis of how that affects the value of the commercial and residential units as they're burdened with these expenses. He asked if there were disclosure requirements. He heard some of the fees at the Ridge were not made clear to homebuyers.

Ms. Kern said over time there has been a lot of press about Mello-Roos districts, and developers must be very careful about disclosing those costs to potential buyers. The impact on home prices is a function of the market. In a soft market, a developer could not impose a high burden, as people would buy houses elsewhere with a lesser burden. The developer would also have to consider the HOA dues and Mello-Roos dues. In this case, there would probably be a CFD burden as well for infrastructure and municipal services. At Bay Meadows in San Mateo, the overall tax burden there is 1.5 to 1.7%. There is a sweet spot where these additional tax burdens can be imposed without affecting the market price. It's a very standard mechanism.

Commissioner Parker asked for clarification.

Ms. Kern said property taxes, HOA dues for maintenance, and any other relevant tax or fee burdens must be disclosed to homebuyers. If there's an assessment district, it could be a parcel assessment established by voters. The likely fund is a Community Facility District (CFD) maintenance tax. That burden may be 0.25%, so the overall property tax burden could be 1.25%.

Commissioner Parker asked if the CFD was assessed for a defined number of years.

Ms. Kern said it appears on the property tax bill, and bonds are issued that are secured by that property tax revenue. The bond revenue would be used to reimburse the infrastructure cost. The developer has to advance all the funds for constructing infrastructure. Once the infrastructure is in place, the developer sells building pads to vertical builders who then build and sell finished homes. The horizontal builders sell infrastructure bonds secured by the tax levy and that pays them back for a portion of the infrastructure cost. That is commonly done for large projects with a lot of infrastructure. There are various standard for residential projects. CFD's are also used sometimes for commercial projects.

Commissioner Parker asked how the analyses factored in costs to the school districts.

Ms. Kern said school district impacts were not considered in the feasibility or fiscal impact studies.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the property tax revenue included the portion going to the school district.

Ms. Kern said tax revenues to the schools were excluded from the analysis; only revenues to the city were considered.

Commissioner Parker said with the number of homes proposed, she assumed there would be a certain number of children going to school. Schools are expensive to maintain and they are not mentioned at all.

Commissioner Munir asked if the library costs were considered.

Ms. Kern said library costs were considered because it was a municipal service, but school district impacts were not analyzed since the district is not affiliated with the City. The school impact fees in place are not sufficient to cover the cost of school construction. For some projects, the developers provide additional compensation to schools to help fund construction of a new school in order to get entitlements. She said she was working on a project in Cupertino where a developer is required to make significant contribution toward schools in addition to the impact fees obligated by law.

Commissioner Parker asked if there was any analysis on school district impacts.

Ms. Kern reiterated the fiscal analysis did not include impacts to the school districts.

Mr. Kelly said a development agreement could require the developer to dedicate a site for a school or build a new school. It would be a capital cost borne by the developer and could be tied to metering of building phases.

Ms. Kern said to determine school district impacts, a school generation rate would be applied to the number of housing units proposed to estimate how many children at what ages would result. The school district capacity would then be compared to the anticipated number of children to determine if and how the district could accommodate that growth. Mitigating impacts to schools can be addressed in the development agreement. This can be done for any other service districts of concern as well.

Commissioner Parker asked what else is not included in the analysis.

Director Swiecki said the scope of work for Keyser Marston was to look at the impacts to the City of Brisbane's general fund only. The school district is a separate entity from the City of Brisbane, so it was not included in Keyser Marston's scope of work.

Mr. Kelly said it's hard to predict the future. Development agreements can be used to break the development into phases. The applicant has to meet certain tests to proceed with each phase and meet certain requirements, so the City doesn't have to guess now what the future holds. The thresholds could be schools, fiscal impacts, or any other reasonable threshold the City wants to require. The fiscal impact report details tools to manage the process so the City has oversight at each phase to ensure there will be no general fund burden.

Commissioner Munir said the infrastructure for a solar farm alone is not very extensive.

Mr. Kelly said Keyser Marston are not solar farm experts.

Commissioner Munir said a solar farm could be developed without the high upfront costs.

Mr. Kelly agreed.

Commissioner Munir asked if a solar farm combined with a hotel would be more manageable in terms of the upfront cost.

Mr. Kelly said no. Even if the costs were scaled down, a solar farm could not pay for the cost of remediation and infrastructure. Landfill closure and remediation are very high costs that have to be managed. Keyser Marston believes only a major project can support those costs.

Commissioner Munir asked if the ongoing cost of monitoring the environmental concerns like natural gas were considered in the analysis.

Mr. Kelly said the developer would be responsible for the cost of long-term monitoring, not the City. Long-term monitoring would be part of the vertical real estate development and private sector funding.

Commissioner Munir said long-term monitoring would be a long-term cost.

Mr. Kelly said that point reinforces how expensive it will be to open the site up, but reiterated its funding would be the private sector's responsibility, not the City's.

Commissioner Munir said that would have to be spelled out in the development agreement so that subsequent developers would still be subject to the requirements.

Mr. Kelly said the private sector will not fund a project that doesn't have a State-approved remediation plan.

Commissioner Munir asked if Keyser Marston's scope of work included the cost of people getting sick or pollution generation?

Mr. Kelly said the fiscal report assumed that there would be proper environmental clearances for residential development. Residential development could not move forward without environmental clearance.

Commissioner Munir asked how future illnesses would be considered fiscally.

Mr. Kelly reiterated that the State agencies would have to clear the site for residential and commercial and would have to address health and safety issues.

Commissioner Munir said the long-term health impacts of site development would be a long-term development cost and analysis was needed.

Ms. Kern said the project should not be built if there would be long-term health impacts. Keyser Marston was not scoped for that kind of analysis.

Director Swiecki said the City Council had discussed analyzing the cost and benefits of economic sustainability measures, and how to capture externalities or the societal costs of development. The Council subcommittee was in the process of scoping that out and finding a consultant to conduct an analysis. He reiterated that kind of analysis was not part of Keyser Marston's scope of work.

Commissioner Munir said he was looking for overall fiscal impact.

Director Swiecki said societal costs did not have a direct implication on the City's general fund.

Vice Chairperson Reinhardt asked for a brief description of what factors Keyser Marston used to identify comparable projects in their analysis.

Mr. Kelly said comparable projects were military base closures, due to the size of the site. He said despite the site contamination, the property was a strong site for redevelopment.

Vice Chairperson Reinhardt asked about the hotel revenues and why hotels could not be the first phase of development.

Mr. Kelly said hotel development could not open the site because it could not fund the infrastructure cost. A major corporate tenant, however, could make hotel development work in the first phase. He encouraged the Planning Commission to look at the project as a vision. A million-square foot campus for a tenant like Facebook is a much more attractive site for a hotel. Hotel development could be a secondary land use but not a primary land use. As the project evolves and becomes more of a reality in the marketplace, secondary uses become more attractive. This site is not Sierra Point; it's the next century generation of infill project.

Commissioner Anderson asked for the net revenue companies received in order to generate the estimate tax income to the City represented in the fiscal analysis.

Ms. Kern said the calculations were separated by land use in each scenario, so the net is the same as the table that shows each project.

Commissioner Anderson clarified he was referring to the net profit the businesses made that the tax revenue was then based on.

Ms. Kern asked for further clarification.

Commissioner Anderson said slide 15 showed $9.7 million in transient occupancy tax. He asked for the revenue pulled in by the hotel from which the taxes are assessed.

Ms. Kern said the room rate was assumed at $150/night and an average occupancy rate of 75% in each scenario. The tax rate was 12% of gross receipts.

Commissioner Parker asked if the space already used by the lumberyard and other occupied sites were included in the 300 acres analyzed in the report.

Director Swiecki said it was assumed the lumberyard would be relocated.

Mr. Kelly said the number of acres was rounded based on certain assumptions.

Vice Chairperson Reinhardt invited public comment from the audience on the evening's presentation. Commissioner Munir moved and Commissioner Anderson seconded to open public comment and the motion was approved 4-0.

Anja Miller, Brisbane resident and CREBL member, said the renewable alternative was not included in the fiscal analysis. The community proposed project (CPP) was not really proposed as such. The community supported land uses stated but not acreage. The CPP is much larger than the community wanted. The community has presented the renewable energy alternative. She asked the Commission to look at the community's interest and not the developer's interest. The public needs the renewable energy alternative, which hasn't been fully developed. It needs a specific plan. She said its construction had been found to be economically feasible. She said besides major solar, which has a market now especially with Peninsula Clean Energy, the alternative included hotel, retail, and office and could accommodate campus-type development. That's all that would be acceptable within the public interest component of the renewable energy alternative. She said the cleanup level required by the State is related to the land uses, so the cleanup level for a solar farm would be less, though that needed to be studied. She asked the Commission to look into that further, get a specific plan that can be compared to the developer's scenarios and then conduct a fiscal analysis. The Federal and State government and Peninsula Clean Energy could be sources of funding. There should be public participation at some level. A long-term sustainability analysis is still needed. She said the Commission was starting well and she hoped the Commission would continue to represent the public. She asked for the renewable energy alternative to be considered in more detail.

Joel Diaz thanked whoever was responsible for preparing the fiscal reports. He said they shed a lot of light on how much revenue could be generated for the City. He said the data was bleak and the presentation tonight confirmed that. Typically a sales pitch to a city or investors is the positive return on investment. They heard tonight that the developer is starting off $1.1 billion in the hole and there is no way to overcome that except if market conditions change over time to incentivize the development. We were told about possible tools to offset costs, but in the end someone has to pay for those costs. A special use tax on construction materials would be passed on to the developer. The $300 million startup cost makes the project more expensive. The problem is the developer is already deep in the hole on this project because of the cost of remediation and infrastructure. The key to development is to eliminate those costs. Looking at the east and west of the tracks, the east side is the worst and very expensive to develop. The west side close to Bayshore already has infrastructure and the land is relatively clean. From the developer's perspective that's where development begins. The fiscal reports confirm that development of the east side, the toxic dump, is cost prohibitive. He suggests a solar farm on the east side as suggested in the renewable energy plan because it does not necessitate remediation and infrastructure. The Geneva overpass would not be necessary. The solar farm would just generate revenue. The land that needs to be developed is the land to the west. If that land is going to be housing, the fiscal report shows it will be a $2.1 million deficit to the City, which doesn't make sense. According to the recent survey, the community doesn't want the level of housing proposed by the developer. If something is going to be built, it should be a win-win development for the City and developer. It appears hotels generate the most money through TOT.

He continued to say that the fundamental problem with these reports is that they make a lot of assumptions. For example, the fiscal impact report assumes the best possible scenario. 2,000 hotel rooms in that location is impractical. It might take 50 to 100 years before those rooms would be absorbed. A recent Swift report talks about how many rooms can be supported in a certain area. Hotels are built across the Peninsula, and we can't rely on 2,000 rooms being put in one area. The Swift report says in this economic boom there are not many hotels being built. It's nowhere near thousands of rooms. All the revenue generated in the fiscal impact report comes from hotels. Once hotels are removed, the City is left with nothing. He likes hotels and if they are going to build a hotel it should be along Bayshore on the west side. It wouldn't take care of the $1.1 billion infrastructure cost.

He continued that the report found the cost of city services to be around $10 million for police, fire, and public works. By eliminating homes, service costs would be eliminated. By eliminating development of the east side, costs would be reduced as well as the risk the City would bear. It would be smart to eliminate costs where possible. The plan has no provision for long-term infrastructure maintenance and repair, which adds to the burden. The cost is a very deep hole that is only getting deeper. The notion that in time the DSP will become financially more feasible as market conditions change isn't true. The cost of development moves in parity with the land value. Even though the land goes up in value, so do the costs to remediate. There will always be a burden tied this former San Francisco dump site because of the onerous infrastructure and remediation requirements.

He said the feasibility analysis set out to determine what would influence the developer to make the project economically feasible and how the City could ensure the project has positive fiscal impacts. The developer will measure feasibility in terms of return on investment. Right now, it's a big loser. The $1.1 billion in horizontal cost does not include the cost of the land itself. He quoted the last paragraph on page eight of the Economic Feasibility Considerations memo, and said reducing the $1.1 billion cost to $600 million would be a tremendous hurdle to overcome. Adding $300 million in special use tax, and maintenance of roads and infrastructure adds hundreds of millions more. Additional city services would incur additional city staff pensions which are unfunded liabilities. For the city to commit to that risk and liability, they would have to have justification and the reports do not provide that. Typically most cities do these kind of developments because they're being promised a lot of money and he was not seeing it here. He concluded that a solar farm should be constructed on the east side of the site.

Jonathan Scharfman, representing project sponsor UPC, addressed the Commission regarding the $1.1 billion cost number. In April 2009 there were preliminary estimates of construction and project wide costs for infrastructure, land improvements, and site-side improvements that included community benefits like the park construction, and a recycled water plant. The 2009 numbers were much higher than $1.1 billion at $1.3 billion for the DSP and $1.4 billion for the CPP. There were assumptions made to reduce those figures to $1.1 billion. They aggressively assumed the overburden of soil, which has benefited the City's general fund for the past 20 years up to $1 million a year in net revenue, would be removed from the development cost pro-forma. The revised figures instead assume a soil management program through the phased development program to lower the burden on the development cost side and move it to the operations side. The revised costs were given to the City in 2013.

Commissioner Anderson asked for clarification.

Mr. Scharfman said a significant portion of the development costs for the CPP, DSP, or any of the variants assumes a tremendous amount of cost associated with moving the soil overburden that has been taken in for temporary soil storage and surcharge on the east side of the site. This soil overburden will eventually need to be moved from the east side to either the west side or off site. As the City Engineer has report it's a requirement for the landfill closure that the overburden be taken down to a certain level. That has been taken into account as a development cost in the 2009 numbers. In the 2013 numbers that carried through to the $1.1 billion discussed this evening, that was the major area where the cost reductions occurred.

Commissioner Parker asked where that cost went?

Mr. Scharfman said the city was looking at a phased development starting on the west side adjacent to existing infrastructure on Bayshore and a longer-term phasing plan for the east side. The EIR requires over 2.5 million cubic yards of soil to come into the west side to raise those grades to meet the requirements of the infrastructure plan, proper drainage, and the grades of the Geneva extension and the like. That's $2.6 million yards of material that the original assumption was they would be moved from the east to the west. Between 2009 and 2013 there was a more proactive assumption made that they would reduce the overburden on the east side and move it off-site to places like Candlestick Point or Hunters Point, and take in new material on the west side, the soil operations business would address that cost. He wanted the Commission to understand those numbers include several hundred millions of dollars to build parks, not just streets and utilities. As the consultants mentioned earlier, the community facilities district tool is very effective to offset utilities and street costs. Of that $1.1 billion, if a couple hundred million are removed for community benefits associated with building parks, there is a certain amount that can be funded in the $600-800 million range that can help be funded by CFD. Those are costs fronted by developer and then offset through a bonding mechanism that adds an additional tax. He lives in a master planned community and pays those taxes himself and they are clearly disclosed by State requirements. He wanted to make sure those items are clearly understood and agreed on two points with Mr. Diaz. The hotel revenues that were on the fiscal impact side the projection of revenues the highest projection of revenues in the general fund are clearly tied to the 18 or 1900 hotel rooms in the CPP. As a reference, Mission Bay which is at buildout about 16 million SF of development and 5,000 housing units and institutional campus for UCSF, they are a few years from buildout and only beginning after 20 years to build their first and only hotel at 250 rooms. It is a pragmatic reality that the fiscal impacts is for them to not be negative. But he asks the Commission to seriously reconsider the notion that development itself doesn't' have positive benefit on the city because that $1.1 billion is to bring tremendous benefit to clean up a toxic legacy from the last century and provide access to underutilized transportation infrastructure and reclaim some lands for habitat.

Commissioner Anderson asked Mr. Scharfman if he had a breakdown of east versus west development costs.

Mr. Scharfman said the figures provided to staff included a combination of the street networks for the DSP and CPP, linear feet of streets and all utilities running under, and grading associated with that. The second part in each scenario were comprehensive project costs broken down according to area. He encouraged the Commission to look into those.

Commissioner Munir moved and Commissioner Parker seconded to close the public comment and the motion was approved 4-0.

I. ITEMS INITIATED BY STAFF

Director Swiecki said staff needed the Commission to provide summer schedules. He said the July 28 meeting may need to be rescheduled due to a conflict with the City Council. He said the next meeting in April would include Baylands hearings and he would like the Commission to talk about the schedule moving forward at that time.

J. ITEMS INITIATED BY THE COMMISSION

Commissioner Parker asked for more information on the Parkside study session at the Council.

Director Swiecki said the consultant was working on a series of concepts to get feedback from the City Council, after which a preferred scenario would be incorporated into the draft plan and would be subject to review by the public, Commission, and Council in the formal hearings process.

Commissioner Parker asked if the City was current with the State or not.

Director Swiecki said the deadline had come and gone, but the process is moving forward with due diligence and he was confident they would report positively to the State in the next annual report.

Commissioner Parker asked if the State required design considerations.

Director Swiecki said no.

K. ADJOURNMENT to the Regular Meeting of April 28, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.

Commissioner Parker moved and Commissioner Anderson seconded to adjourn to the regular meeting of April 28, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. The motion passed 4-0 and the meeting adjourned at 10 p.m.

Attest:

____

John A. Swiecki, Community Development Director

NOTE: A full video record of this meeting can be found on DVD at City Hall and the City's website at www.brisbaneca.org.