

**Joint Meeting**  
**BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL & PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Summary of Public Comment**  
**Baylands EIR Scoping**  
**March 2006**

**March 2, 2006:**

**1) John Burr:**

- Does not like the Specific Plan and this is not the plan that will be implemented
- Likes the idea of entertainment uses at the Baylands
- Final project needs to be put to a vote of the people
- Proposed project is inconsistent with the General Plan
- Concerned that UPC does not own all of the land that they have included in the Specific Plan area
- Specific Plan is not specific enough
- There needs to be more Open Space
- Concerned about the impact of toxics on the Lagoon and suggested a wall be constructed to protect people.
- Address impact of the subsurface toxics on future Open Space uses
- Need to have more involvement by other agencies.

**March 21, 2006:**

**2) Linda Salmon**

- Project is ugly and soulless as proposed and needs to be beautiful
- Project needs an architect – someone with vision (look to Barcelona as one such example)
- This Specific Plan looks the same as the “Concept Plan of 2004” – UPC hasn’t listened to the Community
- This was not what was intended for the Baylands when the General Plan was adopted in 1994

**3) Clara Johnson**

- Opposes this Specific Plan. It is not specific enough and should not have been deemed complete. It is not consistent with the General Plan.
- Need to see a good alternative that truly includes sustainability, especially concerning traffic impacts
- Need notification of other agencies, not just to the State Clearinghouse
- The Specific Plan disregards the General Plan’s definition of Open Space
- Need to look at “upstream” impacts this development would have on neighboring communities, both in terms of traffic and water flow. The boundaries of the proposed Phase 1 appears to strategically ignore these potential impacts
- Windrows are not desirable – they would block pedestrian views and are therefore not consistent with the General Plan

- Address impacts of having the railroad tracks below the surrounding development on water flow (potential flooding of the tracks)
- The developer should pay for an advisory committee of architects and landscape architects
- Include renewable energy alternatives for this site
- Reduce the expanse of asphalt proposed by requiring indoor parking and include landscaping measures to reduce asphalt effects
- Characterization of the Lagoon is not consistent with the General Plan and the adjacent park should be wider to make it useful
- Wetlands are not properly delineated
- Grasslands are not identified
- Where are the gardens? Project needs gardens
- Open Space has not been maximized to be consistent with the General Plan
- All of the roads should be shown
- Address police and emergency response needs (staffing and equipment)
- Use gravity sewers versus pump stations and forced mains
- A long term financial analysis should be done
- Appreciates the use of bio-swales, but long term maintenance and monitoring needs to be addressed
- Address impacts and potential risks of having a development of this kind so close to the Fuel Tank Farm
- Address potential impacts of an earthquake on the proposed development
- There are many questions about property ownership and easements that need to be resolved

#### **4) Dana Dilworth**

- The Open Space definition in the Specific Plan is not true (it is not to be mixed up with open areas)
- Identification of land ownership and easements is twisted to the developers advantage
- Wetlands delineation is missing
- Environmental testing has not been done correctly and the expenditures have been misrepresented
- The proposed “permitted uses” is not correct. The General Plan only included “considered uses”. And the square footage to be dedicated to the uses is a moving target in the Specific Plan
- Plan should include only limited exposure uses
- Project needs appropriate agency involvement and approvals
- Maintain habitat corridors, especially between San Bruno Mountain and the Bay, both north and south of Ice House Hill
- At least 100 acres should become reclaimed wetlands
- Address seismic stability and a dormant fault that has been reported in this area
- Use alternative energy

- Include a zero auto use policy
- Use the rail-lines for shipping of goods and not lots of big trucks

**5) Mary Gutekanst**

- When will traffic analysis be completed
- What about Lagoon water standards for the proposed active recreation
- Address impacts of the San Francisco portion of the project in the analysis
- Specific Plan lacks detail
- Include infrastructure in the first phase, especially Wetlands
- Include more specificity on the road network
- Discuss current site grading and the connection to future plans

**6) Michael Warburton (Public Trust Alliance)**

- Make sure project description is adequate for CEQA purposes
- CEQA requires that the whole project be reviewed
- Tidelands even if altered by man are constitutionally protected – we have a “Tidelands Trust” with this property
- There are global warming concerns that could impact this project – including potential seawater inundation and rising groundwater levels within the landfill

**7) Antonio Attard**

- Use this site for generation of renewable energy, especially wind farm and solar
- Restore wildlife habitat
- Use recycled water
- Include more open space and a golf course would be a desirable use for this site
- Form a new committee for this site, the Committee for Alternative Energy at the Baylands (CAEBL)

**8) Lori Liu**

- Alternative plans for the site must be seriously considered
- Include an organic farmers market
- Use this site for renewable energy (especially wind and solar)
- Include a golf course at the south end

**9) Philip Batchelder**

- This site provides an opportunity to become an example to the world for environmental sustainability
- Establish a renewable energy generation zone (especially wind and solar) and tie into other uses
- Use the site for manufacturing biofuels
- Bio-sewage treatment should be on-site
- Use phytoremediation (plants) and mycoremediation (mushrooms)

**10) Paul Bouscal**

- Mine the refuse for buried, valuable materials
- Include high density housing and/or bring back areas to pre-existing Bay
- Look at the risks associated with the fuel lines and the tank farm and how to mitigate this (potential foam fire suppression system)
- Address impacts of a new bridge or tunnel across Bayshore Boulevard on Ice House Hill; Ice House Hill must be preserved
- The proposed water supply appears to be inadequate – it should be doubled or more
- The site should include a new police station, fire station, and new public works office/yard paid for by the developer

**11) John Burr**

- The Specific Plan does not have enough detail
- There are too many questions about who owns the land; provide a map of land ownership and full disclosure of stockholders
- With all the infrastructure costs it looks like the developer wants the government to go into debt over this project
- Maybe \$500,000,000 in liability insurance would be reasonable
- This site was improperly characterized as not being listed as a “Hazardous Waste Listed” site, but it is listed with the State of California as such
- More coordination with other agencies required
- Reduce the size of the “Big Boxes” to 60,000 square feet or less
- Include more Open Space
- Include a public vote in the process

**12) Michael Shumann**

- Develop a good alternative plan for the Baylands that captures the community vision and hopes

**13) Linda Salmon**

- This Specific Plan is uninspired – a vision from a major architect should be developed on a couple of structures of significance and leave the rest as open land
- Consider the use of the power of eminent domain to “take” the Tank Farm and replace it with a water treatment plant or something else
- The possibility of sea water inundation to this site is of concern
- Eliminate the expanse of parking

**Written Correspondence:**

All correspondence submitted as of April 19, 2006 is available at City Hall or on the City’s website at [www.ci.brisbane.ca.us](http://www.ci.brisbane.ca.us); see “Baylands Information” at the City’s homepage.