

BRISBANE PLANNING COMMISSION  
Summary Minutes of June 9, 2016  
Regular Meeting

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Do called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Anderson, Do, Munir, and Parker.

Absent: Commissioner Reinhardt.

Staff Present: Community Director Swiecki and Associate Planner Julia Capasso.

C. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. APPROVAL OF DRAFT ACTION MINUTES

- i. April 28, 2016 regular meeting

Commissioner Parker moved and Commissioner Anderson seconded to adopt the consent calendar. The motion was approved 4-0.

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

None.

F. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Do acknowledged written communications from Clara Johnson regarding item G.1, a handout from the Fair Political Practices Commission regarding conflict of interest guidelines, and a letter from the Open Space and Ecology Committee regarding item G.1.

G. 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. Ongoing Planning Commission deliberations.

Director Swiecki introduced Lloyd Zola, of Metis Environmental Group, who gave the staff presentation. [The presentation is available here on the City's website:

[http://www.brisbaneca.org/sites/default/files/060916\\_Deliberations\\_Presentation.pdf](http://www.brisbaneca.org/sites/default/files/060916_Deliberations_Presentation.pdf).]

Commissioner Anderson referenced Slide 7 and asked for clarification on the square footage of the existing Recology facilities. Mr. Zola confirmed that existing development in the subarea, including existing Recology facilities, totaled approximately 400,000 square feet.

Commissioner Munir asked where the 585,000 square foot figure referenced on Slide 7 came from. Mr. Zola said that figure includes the existing building area in Area 2, including existing Recology facilities, and would allow for 185,000 square feet of additional development. It is assumed that Recology submit a specific plan application to the City to request additional development intensity in that area to expand their facilities. It did not seem practical to allocate additional square feet to accommodate Recology's theoretical expansion absent an application from Recology.

Commissioner Munir referred to Slide 8 and said the land area of Area 2 could potentially change based on the final location of Geneva Avenue.

Mr. Zola agreed.

Commissioner Munir said that a solar farm would be a flexible use for Area 2 considering the unknown location of Geneva Avenue and the HSRA maintenance yard. He said putting development next to the fictitious Geneva Avenue alignment would compress that development.

Mr. Zola said 10 to 15 years in the future, a solar farm provides more land use flexibility in terms of what HSRA might do. If the community wants to see some development along the Geneva Avenue extension, particularly if that becomes a tipping point for dealing with the location of the Caltrain station, they would have that option in the future.

Commissioner Parker asked Mr. Zola to clarify his last statement.

Mr. Zola said the City would have more flexibility by designating the area for a solar farm because it would not preclude a decision later to accept some level of development on that site.

Commissioner Munir asked Mr. Zola to clarify which option he was suggesting.

Mr. Zola said he was not recommending one option over another.

Commissioner Parker asked if designating the subarea for only solar energy generation would provide more or less flexibility.

Mr. Zola said it would provide more flexibility. Depending on the configuration of the rail yard, and what the community may decide in terms of adding development intensity in relation to the location of the Caltrain station, designating the area as a solar farm would allow the City to change their minds in the future and accept some level of development. It would be harder to designate the area for some level of development now, and then eliminate that in the future.

Commissioner Munir said they could include the bay view park as well as a solar farm.

Mr. Zola said that was an option, or they could eliminate the park, and Sierra Point Parkway would remain in its current alignment and swing west as it approaches the Caltrain station.

Commissioner Munir said they have to determine how much energy they want to produce before determining how large the solar farm should be.

Mr. Zola said the capacity and final design of a solar farm would be a decision of the operator and builder, based on the market and operating and maintenance costs.

Commissioner Munir said the County had launched a Community Choice Energy program and this area could be important for that effort.

Mr. Zola said if a park is located along Highway 101, and a larger renewable energy farm is needed, Sierra Point Parkway could be pushed east toward the Highway. It would depend on what the community envisions for that space. He cautioned them against trying to calculate the exact square footage of the solar farm or park.

Commissioner Munir suggested that no square footage numbers be assigned to the solar farm and park. There were many factors at play, including the Geneva Avenue extension, that would impact the specific acreages.

Mr. Zola said they could recommend a park adjacent to the freeway and Sierra Point Parkway pushed to the west, while recognizing that there was roadway and solar farm design could change that alignment and potentially exclude the park.

Commissioner Munir said 1-3 million square feet of building area would not be considered a transit-oriented (TOD) development.

Mr. Zola said 3 million square feet could accommodate some TOD. The city of San Francisco had written submitted comments on the Draft EIR regarding the location of the Caltrain station and how many people could walk to the station from their home, or the "first mile," as opposed to how many people could walk to the station to work. The Geneva Avenue extension and a bus rapid transit route could tie in other San Francisco neighborhoods such as Candlestick Point. There would be parking provided south of the station.

Commissioner Munir said they don't know the Caltrain station parking requirements.

Mr. Zola agreed.

Commissioner Munir said many transit stations do not have enough parking. He stated people still drive to BART stations, and as a result there are parking issues. The parking requirement for the Bayshore station should be studied.

Mr. Zola said the existing parking area was not heavily used. Additional land south of the station toward Tunnel Avenue could also be developed for parking. He suggested the Commission is not

in a position to design the Caltrain station for Caltrain. Ultimately the decision on how much parking to provide would be a policy decision, not an engineering question.

Commissioner Munir said the whole Baylands development is tied to the station, so there has to be some interaction between the two. Without that, how will Caltrain design it?

Mr. Zola said the starting point for a conversation on station design is for the City to determine the general layout and land use program it would like. If the City wants the station moved south, they would communicate that to Caltrain, and Caltrain would let them know what was needed to make that happen.

Commissioner Munir thought that San Francisco would have a bigger voice than Brisbane.

Mr. Zola suggested there could be competing interests within San Francisco itself. Pushing the station north onto Schlage Lock increases the number of San Francisco residents who can walk to the station but decreases the number of people who can get there by transit, unless connecting transit is run through local neighborhoods to Schlage Lock. He noted that in the comments on the Draft EIR, some San Francisco City departments recommended reducing the density and endorsed the renewable energy alternative, while others advocated for increasing density to make the development as transit-oriented as possible.

Commissioner Munir asked if the Caltrain joint powers board (JPB) made the decisions regarding station location. He said heavyweights like San Francisco dominate the JPB decisions.

Chairperson Do asked for comments from the other Commissioners.

Commissioner Anderson said he would prefer to have some discussion among the Commission before opening it up for public comment. The Commission agreed.

Commissioner Anderson said in 1994 Brisbane selected 1-4 million square feet as an appropriate amount of development for the Baylands. The General Plan defined the density of the Baylands as what could be sustained by traffic conditions. Since then, the traffic conditions driving those numbers have changed substantially. These changes do not increase the capacity of the site. Also, the land condition, including toxicity and susceptibility to liquefaction, is an even stronger reason to limit density. Brisbane can always change its mind, but the applicant has no guarantee or expectation for density higher than the General Plan levels. He thinks the Commission should be looking at a total density of between 1-4 million square feet on the site. They should recommend a distribution of densities somewhere in those ranges across the whole site, not just in Area 6. Given that the Commission would like to recommend a net energy positive site, it makes sense to place the most density in Area 6, and leave other areas at lower density. Area 2 should be reserved for solar. Solar could extend into Area 3 if other uses are desired closer to the transit center. Compatibility with Recology is also an issue. HSR may be “inserted under” solar if the City is forced to take it. They would not necessarily need to reduce density because of HSR. If a 12 million square foot project were approved, HSR would probably impact that if it came in after the fact. Building per the General Plan would give the City time to see how the land holds up. It would likely take at least 20 years to build, and another 20 years of observation

may then justify higher density. Perhaps in that time BART may be extended, or Highway 101 may become multi-tiered.

Commissioner Parker asked if Commissioner Anderson was suggesting stating in their recommendation that they are open to additional development in the future.

Commissioner Anderson said no, he didn't want that included in their recommendation. He said the area has been experiencing demand for housing, and there are many arguments in favor of infill development. However, they are also experiencing exponential growth, and in the short term, they have little hope of keeping things affordable in the long-term. Under those circumstances, Brisbane should concentrate on building in places appropriate for building and leaving places that are more difficult to build at lower density.

Commissioner Munir said the Commission started off reviewing the EIR. A specific plan was submitted, but it turns out it was not a Specific Plan. The question from the beginning has been whether to certify the EIR or not. Since then, the Commission has deviated completely from the current EIR. The development intensity criteria discussion should be part of a separate EIR. That's not what the Commission was called upon to do when they reviewed the EIR in the beginning.

Commissioner Anderson said the EIR must be certified for some type of use.

Commissioner Parker said they could have a hybrid scenario.

Commissioner Munir said staff had presented a totally different plan than what was discussed in the EIR.

Director Swiecki said the EIR discusses a mix of land uses distributed across the site in various ways at intensities at or greater than what the Commission is currently discussing. The assertion that what is being proposed or discussed in the deliberations is outside the scope of the EIR is inaccurate.

Commissioner Munir said the EIR discusses five alternatives, and the Commission had to determine whether the EIR was sufficiently detailed in its analysis of impacts.

Director Swiecki said when the Commission determines the land use program it wishes to recommend to the City Council, the question is whether the EIR adequately addresses that land use program. If the Commission is not interested in recommending approval of 12 million square feet of development, the Commission does not need to consider whether the EIR adequately analyzes impacts of 12 million square feet of development.

Consulting legal counsel Alison Krumbein confirmed the first step for the Commission is to determine its land use recommendation. At the point, the question is whether the EIR adequately analyzes that recommendation. Staff has continued to recommend that the Commission come up with a land use program first.

Commissioner Munir said that is not how he has reviewed EIRs in his career. He understood that the EIR must be considered on its own merits. The land use concept discussed by Mr. Zola was a new land use plan not studied in the EIR.

Mr. Zola said the question is does the EIR adequately address the recommendation the Commission is willing to make? In any General Plan or Specific Plan he has been involved in, at the end of the process the City Council recommends changes to the project if they choose to approve it. In his experience, 80% of the time the project approved is different than the project description in the EIR. An EIR is an informational document to support a land use decision. If the ultimate decision is to recommend denial of the applications, the EIR does not need to be certified. If the Commission considers recommending approval of an EIR alternative, they would then consider whether the EIR adequately addresses that alternative. If the Commission does not like any particular scenario, but would like to recommend some changes to any one of the scenarios, they would consider the same question: does the EIR adequately address that scenario? In some cases, the answer may be yes. In other cases, the answer may be no, and the EIR may have to be revised and recirculated. The EIR follows the land use, not the other way around.

Commissioner Munir said in order to certify the EIR, they have to look at all alternatives they are considering. The HSR rail yard was missing from the EIR, leaving the EIR incomplete.

Mr. Zola said the Commission can make whatever recommendation it wishes to make.

Commissioner Munir said there was a lot of concern about not having adequate information about hazardous materials, and the uncertainty of water supply, that are missing from the EIR and need to be analyzed and addressed. The Commission is being asked to approve a particular land use, and he has difficulty doing that unless those issues are analyzed.

Mr. Zola said if the Commission can recommend to the City Council that the EIR be revised before making any land use recommendation.

Commissioner Munir said the Commission could recommend another alternative, like the renewable energy alternative, that wouldn't require any different analyses.

Chairperson Do said it seems like a case of the chicken before the egg. There will never be a perfect EIR. The Commission can recommend certification of the EIR with modifications to match their land use vision. The Commission has been working toward that outcome, and they have to move forward.

Commissioner Munir said he is fine with deciding the land use of a particular parcel, then preparing an EIR on that land use. They could not certify the current EIR because it was totally different. Also, they have to decide whether to go with the land uses discussed at tonight's hearing, or the land uses presented in the EIR.

Commissioner Parker said the Commission is putting together a plan that it feels would be appropriate for Brisbane's needs. Then they can look at the EIR and see if the EIR has the

potential to be certified based on the hybrid plan. If they do that, they can see which parts of the EIR need additional study and then they can send a recommendation to the Council.

Commissioner Munir said there are multiple issues that need further investigation.

Commissioner Parker said she would like to come up with a plan that the Commission feels would adequately represent what the Baylands should be for Brisbane, and then determine what else needs to be studied.

Commissioner Munir said that was not the assignment they were given. They were told to review the EIR and consider changes to the General Plan.

Chairperson Do said she agreed with Commissioner Parker that the Commission should agree on a vision first before acting on the EIR. The Commission would be much more productive moving forward under that strategy.

Commissioner Anderson agreed, but said Commissioner Munir made some important points. Mr. Zola had said at a previous meeting that the Commission could certify the EIR as adequate for a certain level of use. For example, the traffic study may be adequate for 1 million square feet of development, but not for 6 million square feet. He thinks the Commission should make some reasonable assumptions, recommend land uses, and at subsequent meetings go over the EIR and figure out what sections are adequate for the recommended land use and from there it will go to Council.

Commissioner Munir said the EIR itself has a lot of information still missing.

Commissioner Parker agreed.

Commissioner Munir said in order to do anything, they must address the EIR issues first.

Commissioner Parker said they would do that after the land use recommendation is determined.

Commissioner Munir said the traffic issue was unresolved and the issue of transit-oriented development and a transit center was up in the air.

Commissioner Parker said it was more productive for the Commission to decide what would be a good land use, and then review the EIR.

Commissioner Munir said he agreed. He said that's what they should have been from the beginning. It confused him by starting with the public hearings on the EIR. They cannot certify the EIR the way it is.

Chairperson Do suggested the Commission move on with its deliberations on the topic at hand.

Commissioner Munir suggested figuring out the areas of the EIR that need further study based on the testimony of the people and the Commission's concerns. For example, the water supply and air quality sections needed additional analysis.

Commissioner Anderson said those were good points, and they do need to make that list, but each item on that list needs to be in context to a land use recommendation.

Commissioner Munir said they could not certify the EIR the way it is. They would have to recommend further study before certifying the EIR.

Commissioner Anderson said a land use recommendation can't turn into an approval without a certified EIR, so he agreed with what staff was suggesting as to process.

Mr. Zola said the Commission could recommend approval of a land use package, with the caveat that before the Council's approval of that land use program additional study would be completed on water supply, air quality, and other areas of interest. For example, if they wanted an updated traffic study, they need a land use program to be studied. An updated study of the land use scenarios in the EIR would not be helpful if they recommend a different land use program.

Commissioner Munir said that was reasonable. He wanted to review the EIR after deciding on a land use package.

Commissioner Parker suggested the Commission move on to discussing the preferred land use program.

Chairperson Do announced a five-minute break.

The Commission reconvened. Chairperson Do asked the Commission to discuss the three subareas identified in staff's presentation.

Commissioner Parker said she took the idea of keeping the renewable energy as a dedicated land use very seriously.

Chairperson Do said she would like to consider the possibility of a tech campus that could support renewable energy in that area.

Commissioner Munir said the renewable energy area should be dedicated to renewable energy. The land area should be determined based on the specific location of Geneva Avenue and the need for energy generation. He likes the bay view park. There is a dire need to generate renewable energy.

Commissioner Anderson said dedicating the area to solar was necessary.

Commissioner Parker agreed with Commissioner Anderson.



Chairperson Do said she supported the potential for a park, as it would keep the area aesthetically pleasing and encourage energy-positivity.

Commissioner Munir said it would improve the aesthetics of the site from the freeway. He suggested designating the area for renewable energy in general as opposed to a particular type of renewable energy.

Chairperson Do summarized the Commission's consensus for renewable energy generation and a park in Area 2.

Moving on to Area 6, Commission Munir said he had many concerns because there was no transit on-site. It might take years before a multi-modal station is built. Knowing the current fiscal situation, with bond measures coming forward, it will be a number of years and may not even be possible. Even if they get a transit station there, Caltrain's service is very inefficient and is not as fast as BART. He didn't think Caltrain had capacity to accommodate that much growth. They would need to have a lot of trains.

Commissioner Parker asked Commissioner Munir to clarify what growth he was discussing.

Commissioner Munir said he was referring to Candlestick Point and Hunter's Point.

Chairperson Do asked what Commissioner Munir recommend in terms of the maximum allowable development intensity?

Commissioner Munir said it was hard to decide at this point. He would not support densities of 4-6 million square feet.

Chairperson Do asked if he had a range in mind.

Commissioner Anderson said 1 million square feet of development in Area 6 was higher than what CREBL had recommended for the entire site.

Chairperson Do said that might be a good benchmark to use.

Commissioner Anderson said their decision should be based on what they want the density of the entire site to be, and Area 6 should take the bulk of that remaining intensity.

Mr. Zola said the CREBL plan proposed 1 million square feet of total development on the site, not including the Recology expansion. The Roundhouse area was the only area proposed for development in CREBL's plan. The Commission has talked about revising CREBL's plan to add industrial along Industrial Way.

Commissioner Anderson asked for a reminder on the Commission's prior recommendation of square footage for Area 5.

Chairperson Do said the Commission had considered 184,690 SF of building area in Area 5.

Mr. Zola said the two revisions the Commission has discussed related to the renewable energy alternative is to add subarea 4, Industrial Way, and some development around the Roundhouse. The question before them now is for the last remaining developable area, what is the allowable development intensity.

Chairperson Do said in terms of determining the maximum allowable development intensity for Area 6, she asked for the Commission's comfort zone.

Commissioner Munir said he didn't know at this point. He had many questions in his mind.

Commissioner Anderson proposed 1-2 million square feet of development with the possibility of more with further study.

Commissioner Parker agreed.

Chairperson Do summarized the Commission's agreement to designate the area for 1-2 million square feet of development, with a possibility of expansion with further study.

Moving on to Area 1, Recology, Chairperson Do said the proposal for 585,000 square feet of building area would include the existing area of Recology. Recology would need to make an application to the City to expand.

Commissioner Anderson said he agreed with that concept.

Commissioner Munir said there are other parcels in Area 1. They need to decide whether Recology will take a certain part of the allowable square footage with their expansion.

Mr. Zola said existing Recology facilities were about 200,000 square feet. The recommended maximum building area of 585,000 square feet would allow for development of other parcels in the area, and then when Recology moves forward with a large-scale expansion they would make an application to the City.

Commissioner Munir asked what the remaining square footage would be without existing Recology.

Mr. Zola said there was 400,000 square feet of existing development in Area 1, including Recology. There would be room for about 158,000 square feet of additional development in the area, and if Recology wanted to expand further, they would make an application to the City. The 1,050,000 square foot figure previously discussed would include Recology's proposed expansion.

Commissioner Anderson said they should consider the total capacity of the site.

Mr. Zola said the Commission could say that Area 6 had the potential for 1-2 million square feet of building area, with the potential for additional square footage with further study. If it

increased to 3 million square feet, with additional study, that would result in approximately 4 million square feet on the entirety of the Baylands.

Commissioner Anderson clarified he was thinking an additional 1-2 million square feet for the entire site, with the bulk of it in Area 6, and an unspecified amount of additional square footage with further study.

Commissioner Munir agreed with Commissioner Anderson that the maximum allowable new development for the entire site should be 1-2 million square feet, with room for additional square footage based on further study.

Chairperson Do asked for consensus from the Commission with Commissioner Anderson's proposal. The Commission agreed with the proposal.

Mr. Zola summarized that the Commission supported a net increase of 1-2 million square feet of building area on the Baylands.

Commissioner Anderson said he wanted to be sure that the total building area on the site would not exceed its capacity. He wasn't sure of the existing building area in Area 2, but he assumed it was fairly negligible.

Commissioner Parker asked if Recology's existing building area was included in that total.

Mr. Zola said he heard the Commission agree to a 1-2 million square foot net increase across the entire site. At the next meeting, he would present the existing building square footage across the entire site.

Commissioner Parker said she wanted to make sure they did not include Recology, as that was separately owned from the rest of the Baylands.

Mr. Zola said if the Commission is discussing net increase, they should apply it to the total amount of development already on the ground.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the uses in Area 2 could be relocated elsewhere.

Mr. Zola said yes. He would research the existing building area in Area 2 and bring it back at the next meeting. He would present the total building square footage including existing development and an additional 1-2 million net increase. The Commission would discuss the EIR in that context as well.

Commissioner Munir said if they could do it all over again, he would have liked to discuss land uses first, because it had nothing to do with the EIR results. It's basically a concept of what land uses were appropriate. Talking about the EIR after that discussion would make more sense. It should have been catered to what the determined land uses were. It would have been a lot easier for the Commission to have decided on land uses and intensities at the beginning of the review process.

Commissioner Anderson said he could not have made land use decisions without the information from the EIR.

Chairperson Do agreed with Commissioner Anderson. She opened the floor to public comments.

Jonathan Scharfman, representative of UPC, addressed the Commission regarding their discussion of a maximum of 2 million additional square feet on the Baylands, roughly on the 540 acres of the site that are not the lagoon. That would translate to about 4,000 square feet of development per acre. He asked them to consider the economic feasibility of this project that was in the Sustainability Framework, of which economic sustainability was included. At previously hearings, Keyser Marston had concluded that the cost for infrastructure, remediation, and site improvements including parks stand at \$3.67 million per acre with a maximum value for commercial development of \$4 million per acre- less for other uses. He asked for the record that those analyses be complete before any final decision is made. It seemed to him the Commission might be making a recommendation that may not be feasible compared to the cost of development.

He moved on to address the letter written by OSEC to the Commission. He said there were several factual errors and misleading statements he wanted to highlight for the record. He would follow up with a letter next week. On page 1, in the introductory comments, there are loose statements about the developer sponsored plan and variants exposing Brisbane residents to toxics. As he has said before, that is a misleading statement they have heard before. To imply that resident would be exposed to toxics by building housing is misleading. It ignores the State standards set for clean-up of these sites. As he has said before, the State sets the standards and they are followed by any developer that might building housing. On page 1, OSEC references the HSRA's rail yard, but implies it would be a transit hub. He said there will be no transit hub in the Baylands if HSR builds the rail yard. In order for transit stops to be viable, they need to be near housing and jobs. He was confused as to why the Commission has recommended for any inclusion of high speed rail facilities on the site; it's simply not part of UPC's application.

He said on page 2, OSEC claims the developer is sponsoring the community proposed plan or alternative energy plan, or the CREBL plan, and he clarified the developer is not sponsoring those plans. On page 3, OSEC also states a concern about residents living in close proximity to Caltrain, and he finds it to be a misleading statement in conflict with current best practices that encourage housing near transit stations to enhance access and reduce single-occupant automobile use. The EIR for the project has significantly lower greenhouse gas emission results in those analyses for the DSP than the CPP. That logic is following current national and state policy in this area. He respected that people have different opinions on the matter, particularly on how these policies are set and the efficacy of these systems and their improvements, but these are the tools that set the measurement of greenhouse gas emission reductions. High-density development around transit is proven to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

He continued that there are many examples across the country that demonstrate how former rail yards can be developed. He respects the opinions of OSEC and some Planning Commissioners, but there are thousands of people living in Mission Bay just miles away. Former railyards in

Sacramento have also been redeveloped with housing. OSEC also recommends restoring the wetlands on the Baylands to pre-Industrial levels. Since the Baylands were formerly mudflats and the Bay, he is unsure what that recommendation entails as the restoration and creation of wetlands across the entire site would obviate all other proposed uses, including OSEC's alternative energy plan recommendation. Finally, regarding sustainable transportation, there is a recommendation that there should be investment in rehabilitation of the Bayshore station under the alternative energy plan. He reminded the Commission that without density around transit, there would be little increase in ridership and no incentive to expand an already underused transit stop into a transit hub, and there will not be financing available in the priorities set for State investment in these areas. He respects OSEC's opinion on the matter, but asks that the Commission take a pragmatic look at the causal relationship between density and land use and the ability to get transportation investment that will take more single-occupancy vehicles off the road and reduce greenhouse gas emissions as a result.

#### H. ITEMS INITIATED BY STAFF

Director Swiecki gave an update of the study session for the Parkside Precise Plan at the June 2, 2016 City Council meeting. Staff expects a future study session at the Planning Commission in the upcoming months. After discussing scheduling, the Commission agreed to schedule a special meeting on Thursday, July 7<sup>th</sup> as the regular meeting date of July 14<sup>th</sup> was needed for the City Council's only meeting in July.

#### I. ITEMS INITIATED BY THE COMMISSION

Commissioner Munir said he would be absent from the June 23 meeting.

Commissioner Parker asked if the representative from the Center for Creative Land Recycling (CCLR) who spoke to the Baylands subcommittee would return to a full Commission meeting. Director Swiecki replied that CCLR had presented some materials regarding remediated projects over 20 years old to the subcommittee and they could make that available to the Commission in writing.

#### J. ADJOURNMENT to the Regular Meeting of June 23, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.

Commissioner Munir moved and Commissioner Anderson seconded to adjourn to the regular meeting of June 23, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. The motion passed 4-0 and the meeting adjourned at 9:35 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](http://www.brisbaneca.org).