BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES

SPECIAL MEETING TO DISCUSS THE BAYLANDS
TUESDAY, MAY 23, 2017
BRISBANE CITY HALL, 50 PARK PLACE, BRISBANE

6:30 P.M. CALL TO ORDER – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Liu called the meeting to order at 6:37 p.m. and led the flag salute.

ROLL CALL

Councilmembers present:	Conway, Davis, Lentz, O'Connell, and Mayor Liu
Councilmembers absent:	None
Staff present:	City Manager Holstine, City Clerk Padilla, Administrative Services Director Schillinger, Community Development Director Swiecki, Consulting Counsel Allison Krumbein

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

CM O'Connell made a motion, seconded by CM Conway, to adopt the agenda. The motion was approved 5-0.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

A. Brisbane Baylands Planning Applications (Baylands Concept Plans, Brisbane Baylands Specific Plan Case SP-01-06, General Plan Amendment Cases GP-01-06/GP-01-10) and related Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH##2006022136). Specific topic includes Applicant Presentation; Universal Paragon Corporation, applicant; Owners: various; APN: various.

Mayor Liu announced the applicant, Universal Paragon Corporation (UPC), would be presenting.

Jonathan Scharfman of UPC began the presentation. [Note: the applicant's presentation is available on the City's website.] He reviewed the collective experience of the consultant team and milestones in the applicant's planning process since 2006. He discussed Brisbane's history of housing development during World War II and the Bay Area's role in innovation. He said

UPC's proposal would clean up the Baylands site and build the most sustainable project in America. He said while many in Brisbane do not like UPC's housing proposal, reputable experts and policymakers on climate change agree that building housing near jobs and transit is the most sustainable method. He said it was also necessary to support the community benefits desired by Brisbane. He highlighted aspects of the application's sustainability components.

Jim Stickley, Wallace Roberts & Todd (WRT), stated his firm was the land planner on the project for over 12 years. He summarized WRT's history of working with communities for both public agencies and private developers and the timeline of projects in WRT's 50 year history, including projects throughout the Bay Area. He noted WRT's ecological approach started by their founder who authored "Design with Nature." He stated creating a sense of place distinguishes WRT's work. He reviewed how the Baylands Specific Plan responds to the ecological and built context surrounding the site and how those contexts influenced the land use distribution and intensity. He displayed several photosimulations from different portions of the site to illustrate what buildout of the Specific Plan could look like, including open space in the southern portion of the site, 2-4 story campus in the center of the site, and higher density mixed-use (housing, office, and commercial) at the north end of the site.

Pete Munoz, ecological engineer with BioHabitats, said his firm's work on the project was to identify natural system design elements and restore ecological function by restoring habitat. He said his firm were national experts in their field and were early adopters of green building best practices. He said BioHabitats' approach was science-driven and shared examples of the firm's design work across the country. He said the Specific Plan creates stacked benefits to accomplish a variety of sustainability goals. He said BioHabitats was very familiar with disturbed and landfill sites. He said his firm had worked at one of the largest landfills in the world. He discussed the vision for Visitacion Creek to create open space and broaden the floodplain to increase biological function. He reviewed the ecology of "transition zones" and a proposal for enhancing the transition zone at the north shore of the lagoon in line with regional best practices.

Bill Faisst, Brown and Caldwell, said his firm had identified potential water sources for the project. He shared the firm's experience in the region and shared examples of water projects across the country, including recycled water projects. He said the goal was for the Baylands to be a model for water efficiency, including the use of recycled water. He reviewed best practices for using existing potable water and required water supply planning through Senate Bill 610. He said a variety of alternatives were analyzed, and recycling wastewater and transferring water rights were found to be the most appropriate alternatives. He said the proposed potable water would be sourced from transferred unused water irrigation rights to SF PUC and would meet the demand from the Baylands site and additional water for other community needs.

David Yanni, Chief Development Officer of GI Energy, shared the firm's expertise in energy

master planning and developing sustainable energy resources to meet the energy demand of a project. He reviewed GIE's experience working on the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard redevelopment "eco-district" as well as renewable energy generation and storage projects across the country. He discussed the concept of a "micro grid" which would provide refuge during energy blackouts. GIE's approach to the Baylands site was to electrify as much as possible and move away from natural gas or fossil fuels. He said mixed-use developments were opportune for maximizing energy use and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. He said energy storage was key to ensure efficiency of use. He reviewed a "geoexchange" system, which significantly reduces water usage that would otherwise be devoted to mechanical cooling. He said resiliency was another key design component of the Bayland's energy system. Finally, he said innovative systems have a higher upfront cost, can be financed at relatively low costs over time.

CM Conway asked Mr. Munoz to clarify his comments regarding work on the north end of the lagoon.

Mr. Munoz said currently there is a very steep slope from the lagoon to the upland habitat. A typical way to develop transition habitat is to make that slope shallower by cutting into upland areas and filling aquatic areas. Since this is a landfill site, it is problematic to dig into the upland area. His firm reviewed the potential for filling the edge of the lagoon with BCDC, which is in line with other restoration projects they are overseeing.

CM Conway said that area had the least amount of fill and likely garbage would be encountered quickly.

Mr. Munoz said they did not plan on digging into upland areas and would focus on fill.

CM Conway asked if the Lagoon Road configuration would remain as is.

Mr. Munoz confirmed.

CM Davis asked Mr. Munoz about the importance of transition habitat.

Mr. Munoz said most urban waterways have eliminated the ecotone, or space between ecological systems. He said creating shallow areas that get inundated with tidal fluctuation was important.

CM Lentz asked Mr. Munoz to explain how the channel would be protected from the garbage below in the context of sea level rise.

Mr. Munoz said they had looked at sea level rise impacts on the lagoon side, which would bear more of the impact. He said it would be less of a concern at Visitacion Creek because of its

DRAFT

elevation.

CM Lentz asked how deep the fill would be from the creekbed to the lining.

Mr. Munoz said they would need to understand the underground layers, and widen the ecological flow of water across the site. He said it would vary depending on flood bottom versus the floodplain, and a balance would need to be struck within the 100-year floodplain.

CM Lentz asked for additional details about BioHabitat's work at the Fresh Kills Landfill.

Mr. Munoz said the Fresh Kills restoration focused on creating a safe and inviting place for the community and enhancing habitat and biodiversity. He said there were no buildings at that site.

CM Lentz asked why there was no development planned for that site.

Mr. Munoz said the City of New York was not looking for additional development but rather additional open space.

CM Conway asked about the location of the recycled water plant.

Mr. Scharfman said the location for the recycled water plant was on the northeast corner of the creek next to the railroad tracks. It would be south of the area proposed for relocation of Sierra Point Lumber.

CM Conway asked if there was a defined elevation for the recycled water plant.

Mr. Faisst said there was not at this time.

CM Lentz asked why Level E water efficiency was not selected.

Mr. Faisst said certain elements of Level E were duplicative of Level D.

CM Lentz asked if UPC's plan would include non-flowing urinals.

Mr. Scharfman said the Specific Plan did not get to that level of detail. The driving principle was to have a constant demand for the recycled water, which is low-flow urinal flushing. They could incorporate waterless urinals in commercial buildings, but that would impact the volume of recycled water that could be created.

CM Lentz asked for a brief description of using recycled water.

DRAFT

Mr. Faisst said the method was relatively low-tech and ecological friendly. In downtown San Francisco and in Tokyo, graywater is used to flush toilets and for cooling water, which was done by putting small treatment plants in the basements of buildings. However, those systems may increase a building's energy use.

CM Lentz asked if Mr. Faisst was familiar with water recycling facilities that would take black water and use biomass technology to create energy.

Mr. Faisst said those technologies are evolving now and may be available in the future. Their proposal includes technologies that are proven, but the industry is evolving and the project has an extended buildout. He said proven facilities are energy and water efficient.

CM Lentz asked Mr. Munoz why his proposal removed the existing riprap around the lagoon.

Mr. Munoz said the ripraps are currently installed to prevent erosion due to the steep slopes. The transition zone development would make much more gentle slopes, which would dissipate tidal and wave energy and rocks would not be necessary. The steeper the slope, the more difficult it is to create a vegetated zone. The northern edge of the lagoon had the best opportunity for that.

CM Lentz asked if BioHabitats looked at the creek running into the lagoon.

Mr. Munoz said they had not examined that as it was not part of the Baylands site under the proposal, but it could be examined.

CM Conway asked Mr. Yanni to describe the lifecycle of a Bloom Box.

Mr. Yanni replied that the Bloom Box contains a stack of ceramic cells, over which hydrogen flows to create electricity. When the ceramic cells degrade, they are reused to fabricate new cells. He suggested the Council tour the Sunnyvale factory. The box itself can last 30-40 years.

CM Lentz asked Mr. Yanni where zero net energy (ZNE) technology was now and where he saw it going in the next 5-10 years.

Mr. Yanni said ZNE buildings are currently limited to 4-6 story buildings. He saw innovation in district-scale ZNE. He said mixed-use sites are primed to be ZNE districts, as commercial facilities have high-density energy usage, that can be balanced by residential uses. The industry is looking at more systematic campus approaches. The most efficient system balances out the loads with a diverse mix of uses.

DRAFT

CM Lentz asked about the future of California's Title 24 regulations.

Mr. Yanni said that Title 24 regulations will require photovoltaic (PV) for residential. By 2030, more reliance will be placed on energy storage. He said the regulatory markets have not defined the wholesale market for energy storage, but markets will catch up by 2030.

CM Lentz asked about treating wastewater and using the solid waste. He said the City's green waste is currently collected and turned into compressed natural gas, which fuels trash vehicles. He asked if the same type of facility could be scaled for the Baylands.

Mr. Yanni said it could. Development at hundreds of acres and millions of square feet is still not generating a significant amount of wastewater and may not be a huge energy source at that scale. He said waste disposal is its own environmental issue. Contra Costa County is currently doing an environmental study for such a system, but has not yet found a solution to dispose of the waste. He said as the technology becomes broader and less specialized, economic gains on lower volumes of waste could be realized, but the market is not there yet.

CM Lentz asked about energy storage.

Mr. Yanni said batteries are the most straight forward method to store energy. There are also opportunities for thermal energy storage. He suggested touring Stanford's energy plant, which features massive thermal energy storage that has reduced their GHG footprint significantly. It was very expensive, but it's the future. It's an example of an integrated campus. Unlike a kilowatt hour, a British Thermal Unit (BTU) can be reused if it's done efficiently.

CM Lentz asked why Stanford did that.

Mr. Yanni said it worked for their long term economic plan, and they are saving money in terms of employee hours. Ford is interested in reducing engineering hours in Michigan; however, there is a tradeoff there as those jobs are important to the local economy.

CM Lentz asked about lifecycle economics with a 30-year plus horizon.

Mr. Yanni said private-public partnerships have not been prominent in the US but have been in Europe. He said GIE's focus was to focus on innovative systems.

Mayor Liu said the community has asked that the Baylands provide free electricity to the town. She asked for examples of projects that have provided a surplus of energy as a community benefit.

DRAFT

Mr. Yanni said surplus energy can go back into the grid, but tying that energy to specific end users is difficult. It begins to infringe on the franchise of those utilities. He said there are ways to do it on paper, through Community Choice Aggregation programs, which is the primary tool he can think of. He thought creating redundancy, resiliency, and reliability to stabilize the entire grid could be a benefit. He suggested discussing this with PG&E.

Mayor Liu announced a five-minute break.

After the meeting reconvened, Nancy Bice of Geosyntec introduced her company and summarized its geotechnical work on the project, including the landfill closure. She reviewed the historic uses of the property as a municipal landfill and railyard. She reviewed the two operable units, OU-1 and OU-2, and their status under the review of the State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), respectively. She summarized the investigations done to date, and stated that a data gap analysis would be done once a project is finalized to design a safe remedy for the site. The monitoring results of the Baylands landfill is consistent with the monitoring done across the Bay Area and nothing unusual has been detected to date. She reviewed the primary contaminants, including chlorinated solvents and metals, mostly lead and arsenic, related to herbicide use. She discussed preparation of a remedial action plan (RAP). She stated remediation would likely include active soil cleanup for metals, long-term monitoring, engineering tools, and land use controls where appropriate and safe. Clean utility corridors would be required to protect workers. She stated following completion of remediation, an Operation and Monitoring agreement and Financial Assurance Agreement would be required to ensure long-term monitoring. She reviewed the known contaminants in OU-1, OU-2, and the former landfill. The landfill would need to be formally closed through the State's Title 27 procedure, which will take sea level rise into account.

Todd Adair, BKF Engineers, shared his firm's history in the Bay Area. He discussed the bifurcation of the Baylands site east and west of the railroad tracks. He said the biggest infrastructure concern on the west side is the consolidation of Bay Mud. He said settlement over time is the best way to address that, and detailed the methods of settlement through reconsolidation of the mud and use of engineered materials. He said Redwood City, Foster City, and South San Francisco have used these techniques for Bay Mud settlement successfully. The east side of the site has similar conditions, with the added condition of landfill which would continue to degrade and create additional settlement over time. He said engineered materials and design solutions, including flexible paving and utility connections, and hinged foundations, would make infrastructure and structures flexible to that settlement. Clean fill would be placed around utility infrastructure to ensure that future maintenance would not be compromised. Ongoing maintenance and monitoring would be in place for infrastructure and the landfill cap to ensure that ruptures are quickly identified and repaired, and failures can be detected before they

become an issue. Various funding mechanisms could pay for those repairs over time. He shared BKF's experience with landfill closure and redevelopment in the Bay Area, including Colma, San Jose, Santa Clara, and Brisbane (Sierra Point) where anticipated settlement was calculated and integrated into the project design and the use of third party reviewers for quality control. He emphasized that final reports and RAPs have yet to be prepared and accepted, and the final designs and mitigation measures have not been prepared yet.

Tom Graf, Grafcon, shared his experience working in brownfield redevelopment for over 35 years, including in Mission Bay and AT&T Park in San Francisco and the Oakland railyard. He addressed liquefaction in a landfill and showed several diagrams showing the various layers of material on the Baylands site. He said dense sands do not experience liquefaction intensely. Dense sands experience inches of settlement 60 feet below the surface, which does not manifest above grade. Lateral spreading is not expected to be a significant problem at the landfill site. When piles are driven into the landfill, through 20 or more feet of pliable clay mud, the Bay Mud will seal around the pile. In regard to whether piles would be driven to bedrock, piles would be designed on a site and building specific basis. He reviewed the purpose of short and long-term risk management strategies and the role of State regulatory agencies both prior to and post-development. He discussed the legal responsibility for operations and maintenance post-development.

Jim Musbach, Economic and Planning Systems, shared his experience in real estate economics for over 30 years in redeveloping brownfield sites, including Treasure Island and Hunter's Point in San Francisco. He reviewed the purpose of the feasibility and fiscal analyses as tools to solve complex land use problems to benefit both the developer and community. He discussed the economic requirements to redevelop distressed sites, and the need to balance economic return with community benefit. He shared several public and private financing mechanisms for infrastructure and project development.

Jonathan Scharfman, UPC, discussed Brisbane's value for community engagement and participation. He asked the Council to trust the experts on UPC's team. He addressed the community's passion behind development of the Sustainability Framework and stated UPC had asked One Planet Living to provide an independent analysis of the developer's alternatives, which would be forthcoming in a few weeks. He encouraged the Council to reach out to the leaders of other cities who had dealt with similar complex projects to understand how they made those decisions, such as the City of Mountain View. He also urged the Council to consult with County and State elected officials. He encouraged the Council to talk to local employers about their plans and constraints for future growth. He stated UPC was available to negotiate, and asked Council and staff to review recently approved development agreements for projects in the Bay Area. He said economic feasibility should be a key component of project review. He shared his own personal experiences in sustainable development throughout the US and the world since

1992. He played a vocal clip from a previous talk by Tom Murphy, former Pittsburgh mayor, through the Brisbane Baylands speaker series in 2007.

CM Conway asked Mr. Adair to explain the alternative fill materials referenced in his presentation.

Mr. Adair said cellular concrete and geofoam act like soil, but are lighter than soil.

CM Conway asked where the remediated sites referenced in his presentation were located.

Mr. Adair said the sites were in San Jose and Santa Clara.

CM O'Connell asked Mr. Adair to respond to settlement recently found at the Dakin Building.

Mr. Adair said 1.5-2 feet of settlement was found, which is at the rate they anticipated as part of their monitoring program. The buildings at Sierra Point are surveyed annually by BKF.

CM Lentz asked about settlement at a parking structure at Sierra Point.

Mr. Holstine referred to the Hitachi building.

Mr. Adair said the Hitachi building had experienced 3-4 feet of settlement, and was built in the late 1980's, in a different regulatory environment.

CM Lentz asked about the Home Depot in Colma built on a former dump.

Mr. Adair said the former Colma dump was a municipal dump and had to be closed prior to development.

CM Lentz asked if Sierra Point was a regulated dump.

Mr. Adair said there were records of what was dumped in Sierra Point.

CM Lentz asked if there was a difference in the process for Title 27 closure for Sierra Point and Colma. He said the community has concerns that the Brisbane dump was unregulated, compared to the Sierra Point dump, which had records.

Mr. Adair said he was unaware of any differences in the remediation and long-term monitoring of the two sites.

DRAFT

CM Conway said he understood Sierra Point was engineered landfill, and its contents were documented.

Mr. Adair said he was unaware that the Sierra Point landfill was engineered. He said the RAP would address the risks specific to the Baylands site.

CM Lentz asked if he was aware of problems with the landfill cap at Sierra Point.

Mr. Adair said he had not experienced any problems with the cap, and noted the buildings' concrete foundations provided an additional barrier. He described how the piles were driven to minimize depressions and reduce water intrusion.

CM Lentz asked about the monitoring system in place at Sierra Point and other sites referenced in Mr. Adair's presentation.

Mr. Adair said methane was a primary monitoring priority for buildings. Leachate was also an issue, and foundations were designed to avoid rainwater intrusion.

CM Lentz asked if Mr. Adair has seen debris from the Sierra Point landfill penetrate the cap and move to the surface.

Mr. Adair said he had not. The cap is engineered with multiple materials and layers to ensure its stability.

CM Lentz referenced the Santa Clara project and asked if the residential was on landfill.

Mr. Adair said residential was located on landfill at the Santa Clara project. The units are podium style, elevated above grade over parking.

CM Lentz asked if the San Jose project referenced in Mr. Adair's project also had residential.

Mr. Adair said could verify that later.

CM Lentz asked if infrastructure tunnels had been contemplated for this site.

Mr. Adair said they had discussed building a utility corridor above the landfill cap.

CM Conway asked for an explanation of the Title 27 closure process.

Mr. Adair said the County Department of Health would be in charge of oversight of the landfill

cap. He described a typical prescriptive landfill cap. He said compaction would be uniform at 90-95% across the site.

CM O'Connell asked Mr. Adair to confirm the components of the prescriptive cap.

Mr. Adair confirmed a typical cap was designed with two feet of soil, one foot of clay, and one foot of soil. He said a minimum of four to five feet of soil would be filled above that with vegetation. He said they wouldn't necessarily need to dig down into the refuse layer during the site engineering.

Mayor Liu referenced asked what the third-party consultant did for the San Jose project.

Mr. Adair said their role was to review BKF's work and confirm it was done according to the required standards.

Mayor Liu asked if the applicant had considered imposing stricter standards to the remediation.

Ms. Bice, Geosyntec, reviewed the RAP process which would be reviewed by the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA).

CM Lentz asked Ms. Bice if other states had higher standards than California.

Ms. Bice said the bulk of her experience was in California, which has some of the strictest standards and were more conservative than the Federal government's. She said she had not experienced people being exposed to contaminants in the projects she had worked on.

CM Lentz asked if Ms. Bice was familiar with Massachusetts' and Holland's standards.

Ms. Bice said she was not.

CM Lentz asked about the types of shipyard waste that went into the landfill.

Ms. Bice said the EIR's Hazardous Waste Assessment report detailed the waste materials.

CM Lentz asked Ms. Bice to explain how the data gap analysis would be conducted.

Ms. Bice said all available information as to what was done where and what kinds of chemicals were used would be gathered. Then they would examine what data they had for those uses and consider the approved land use plan. At that point, they could complete their data gap analysis.

DRAFT

CM Lentz referred to the public comment and review period for the RAP. He asked what role the City had in approving the RAP.

Mr. Zola said the regulatory agencies - DTSC or the RWQCB- would approve the RAP. The City has authority over the land uses upon which the risk assessments and remediation standards in the RAP are based.

CM Lentz asked if the Council could approve a use but require a new assessment or use of a different standard.

Mr. Zola said the City's regulatory authority is over land use. The City could allow residential at a General Plan level based on a RAP being approved by a regulatory agency with which the City was in agreement. The City cannot dictate what is in a RAP. The City could allow residential in a portion of the site pursuant to various requirements established by the General Plan.

CM Lentz asked Mr. Adair if he had considered moving soil contamination from OU-1 or OU-2 and placing it in the landfill under during the Title 27 landfill closure.

Mr. Graf said only clean soil can be brought into the landfill. If there is contaminated soil on OU-1 or OU-2 it could not be moved to the landfill. The soil being brought to the landfill currently is tested to ensure it is not contaminated, before it enters the site and after it leaves, and is adequate for residential use.

CM Lentz said many people want the contaminated soil to be removed in order for it to be safe for residential development.

Mr. Graf said the landfill is closed in terms of accepting waste, but has not gone through formal Title 27 closure.

CM Lentz asked if Mr. Adair had knowledge of contaminated soil being imported to the site.

Mr. Graf said he was not aware of that. He said there was excess soil on the site currently.

CM Lentz asked there was potential to put contaminated soil in the landfill if soil was moved.

Mr. Graf said it would be very unlikely.

Mr. Scharfman said BKF's infrastructure plan included a grading plan based on street elevations necessary for positive stormwater drainage and clearance of the railroad tracks. That analysis included how much additional clean soil is on the east side that would need to be taken down for

final development grades and moved either off-site or to the west side where the grades have to come up to meet those designs. The final street elevations may be adjusted based on clearances. Several million cubic yards of overburden on the east side were identified as needed to move off-site or the west side to compensate for final grades. That does not include "dirty" dirt; it would be tested material. He said since the reports were last done in 2011 or 2013, more material has been imported so whatever the balance of material that needs to be moved to the west side or off-site will be part of those designs.

CM Davis said she had been under the impression that the site could be impacted by liquefaction after an earthquake. She asked Mr. Graf to go into more detail into why liquefaction isn't something to worry about in his opinion, and if that would change in a larger earthquake event.

Mr. Graf said liquefaction is caused by an energy wave from an earthquake. When the wave encounters sand, water pushes loose sand apart, which results in complete liquefaction. When geotechnical engineers measure density, they do blow counts in sand (blows per foot). At a certain point, sand is dense enough that it won't liquefy in an earthquake. There is relatively dense sand at the landfill site- not so dense to prevent any liquefaction, but it would be a minor amount of liquefaction.

CM Davis asked Mr. Graf to compare this site to the Marina neighborhood in San Francisco, which experienced devastation in the 1989 earthquake.

Mr. Graf said some areas in the Marina had complete liquefaction. The soil there was characterized by shallow beach sand without any compaction, below the water table with low density. The shock wave pushed all the particles apart and buildings collapsed. A sand that would not liquefy would be about 20-30 blows per foot.

CM Davis asked if Mr. Graf would still anticipate a few inches of settlement in a major earthquake.

Mr. Graf said with an earthquake at the same intensity of the Loma Prieta earthquake, he would anticipate no settlement. In a larger earthquake, he anticipated 3-4 inches of settlement.

CM Conway asked for the difference between Young Bay Mud and Old Bay Mud deposits.

Ms. Bice said the Old Bay Mud dated before the last ice age. When the ice melted, the Young Bay Muds resulted from rising sea levels. The Old Bay Mud is much denser because it went through a period of being dried out. There are significant differences in the behavior of the two muds. She said a significant problem in the Marina neighborhood was that it was filled with hydraulic fill, where Bay sediment was dredged and pumped to create land, which is probably

DRAFT

the worst fill to build on.

CM Lentz asked why the Schlage Lock site was designated for housing yet prohibited for having a daycare or school.

Mr. Graf said at that site the residual chemicals were in the soil and in soil vapor. The heavy concentrations of volatiles had been excavated. DTSC signed off on remediation for clean-up that would allow either commercial on grade or residential elevated above grade. Residential development is evaluated at a much higher exposure level compared to commercial. The residual concentrations at Schlage Lock allow the construction of residential above podium parking because the vapors attenuate above grade.

CM Lentz asked why a school couldn't be constructed that way.

Mr. Graf said DTSC has special standards for schools, hospitals, and daycares that would not allow podium development.

CM Lentz asked if the residential development in the Baylands would be podium style.

Mr. Graf said it would depend on the groundwater, soil, and soil vapor contaminants on the site. Soil vapors in the groundwater under OU-1 would attenuate over time, and if its concentration was below the concentration of concern for residential, theoretically residential could be built on grade. The same standard applies to metals in soil. He shared his experience on a project in Oakland of multi-family residential above heavy metal contamination.

Mr. Stickley said the office and residential densities proposed in the northern part of the Baylands site would likely require a podium. That corresponds to the area of the old VOC plume. Further south in OU-2, lower density residential is proposed. On-grade development would only be allowed if there were no vapor contaminants and if the contaminants that are there were appropriately remediated.

CM Lentz asked if the Schlage Lock site could be remediated to the DTSC standard that would allow a hospital or daycare.

Mr. Graf said with endless money and time, it could be achieved, but it is not reasonable. The VOCs there are in very low concentrations and slowly move into the groundwater over time, which creates the vapors. Materials caught in clay layers will continue in perpetuity, so it's not feasible to clean to undetectable levels there.

CM Lentz asked why a hospital would be prohibited.

DRAFT

Mr. Graf said hospitals have a set of unique rules. It is a standard deed restriction from DTSC.

CM O'Connell asked for a copy of the slide used to characterize the soil levels.

Mayor Liu confirmed the entire presentation would be available to the Council and the public. She opened the floor to public comment and noted a five-minute time limit.

Greg Anderson said the EIR identified the entire site as subject to high liquefaction risk. Mr. Graf had said there was low to no liquefaction risk. He asked why that was inconsistent.

Paul Bouscal said he hoped the City would conduct unbiased, non-commissioned studies to have a true second opinion on the questions raised. He said the information tonight contradicted some of the EIR.

Barbara Ebel shared her appreciation for the experts. She said the project was the problem, not the experts. UPC's project was not the environmentally superior alternative per the EIR. The consultants cannot make the project the environmentally superior alternative. She appreciated the energy consultant's presentation but thought the scope was too narrow and did not' consider surplus generation for Peninsula Clean Energy. The community didn't expect exclusive use of electricity. She wanted clarification on the square footage of building that could be zero net energy and the types of uses. She asked if the energy per square foot included energy on site or purchased credits. She asked how many other landfill projects the consultant had worked on were un-engineered, unmonitored, and on mud. She was concerned that the consultant did not have information on the realized sediment. She had asked staff many times what has been done with the leachate pumped from the Baylands site and has never gotten an answer. She was concerned with a 30-year bond term. She asked if an owner's association on the Baylands would protect residents if residential was permitted. She said engineered fill has to be compacted at each stage and she didn't understand how any of that dirt could remain on the site.

CM Lentz asked Mr. Graf to address his comments compared to the EIR's findings.

Mr. Graf said he looked at the liquefaction potential under the landfill specifically, based on the cross sections available and the boring results regarding the sand density. Based on the drilling results, eh and the geotechnical engineer came up with the liquefaction analysis that found low potential. Much more work had to be done in OU-1 and OU-2, which hasn't had deep drilling.

MAYOR/COUNCIL MATTERS

A. City Council Schedule

The Council reviewed the draft schedule with the City Manager.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

A. Acknowledge receipt of written communications regarding the Brisbane Baylands Project

Mayor Liu acknowledged written communications received since the last meeting from Daniel and Nikki Ballarin, Yonathan Randolph, Willy Chang, Tony Verreos, Beth Grossman, and Dana Dillworth.

ADJOURNMENT

CM Conway motioned and CM O'Connell seconded to adjourn the meeting. The motion was approved 5-0 and the meeting adjourned at 10:16 p.m.

_____

Ingrid Padilla, City Clerk

DRAFT