DRAFT
BRISBANE PLANNING COMMISSION
Summary Minutes of May 18, 2016
Special Meeting

A. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 7:31 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

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

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

Anja Miller read from her written comment letter [available here on the City's website].

F. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Acting Chairperson Reinhardt acknowledged written communications from the Project Information Center, MTC, Dana Dillworth, Anja Miller, and a letter from the Community Development Director regarding a sign review approval at 5000 Marina Boulevard.

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.

Director Swiecki introduced Lloyd Zola of Metis Environmental Group, consultant to the City, who gave the PowerPoint presentation [available here on the meeting webpage].

Commissioner Parker referred to Slide 13 of the presentation and said she thought the Commission had recommended some commercial and office development in Area 6 in addition to research and development (R&D).

Commissioner Anderson agreed and said he recalled they were open to a tech campus in that area, as well as trade commercial and a hotel.

Commissioner Parker agreed and said they also considered similar uses for Area 5.

Mr. Zola said the presentation slides referenced the primary land uses the Commission had discussed to date, but the other secondary uses would also be considered, per their discussion.

Commissioner Anderson asked how large the bay-front park shown on Slide 32 could be.

Mr. Zola said as shown on the slide, it was about 30 acres.

Commissioner Parker asked how large Area 2 would be with the park.

Mr. Zola said he would follow up on the size of Area 2.

Commissioner Anderson asked for confirmation that Area 7 was not owned by the applicant.

Mr. Zola confirmed the applicant did not own Area 7. He said Area 7 was added to staff's conceptual illustrations to address the Baylands area holistically, not necessarily to contemplate change in that area. He said Area 2 would stay the same size, as well as Area 3 and Area 4.

Commissioner Anderson asked for updated information on the individual area sizes.

Mr. Zola said he would follow up on that.

Commissioner Munir asked for an explanation of the color scheme on the map on Slide 15.

Mr. Zola said purple represented industrial uses and parking, light blue represented energy generation, green represented open space, red represented commercial, and yellow represented transit-oriented development (TOD).

Commissioner Munir said Slide 16 did not include renewable energy generation.

Mr. Zola said wind energy could be integrated into buildings. This has been done at Arizona State University, where they created turbines that look like public art, and can be mounted anywhere on the site. The CREBL alternative calls for a large solar field, but wind and solar energy could also be incorporated into site development.

Commissioner Munir said they could approve an individual floor area ratio (FAR) for each building block or project.

Mr. Zola said to allow for a range of intensity within the area, the Commission could establish an overall FAR for a subarea, with the caveat that a portion of that site or site-specific development could have a slightly higher FAR.

Commissioner Munir said it would be difficult for planners to figure that out as one area may take the entire floor area allowance.

Mr. Zola said it depends on how the City decides to approve site-specific development. He said other specific plans he has seen establish a square footage maximum within a defined area, and the developer may want to use the entire square footage in a smaller footprint. It is incumbent on the City to craft conditions of approval to address scenarios where the overall amount of development is concentrated in a smaller space; e.g., requiring the balance of space to be useable open space. Large-scale projects often experience that kind of concentrated development. The City has control over site-specific approvals.

Commission Anderson asked what the FAR was for a typical tech campus, such as Apple.

Mr. Zola said the Google campus is about 3 million square feet on 80 acres, just under a 1.0 FAR. He said the issue is not so much the intensity of the campus but their square footage. Microsoft has about 8 million square feet, and Apple is about 4 million square feet. The desired intensities depend on what the company wants their campus to look and feel like. Campuses are typically at least 1 million square feet.

Commissioner Parker asked where the fire station would be located.

Mr. Zola said the North County Fire Authority would ultimately determine its specific location. It would be logical to have it in the Baylands, but the Authority would be considering the needs for their entire service area. One of the Specific Plan requirements could be to design the area so it meets the response standards of the Authority, depending on the land use program.

Commissioner Munir said the train would need a separated crossing to allow for emergency vehicle access across the site.

Commissioner Parker referred to Slide 33, showing a tech campus in Area 2 that would incorporate renewable energy features. She noted the renewable energy would be primarily serving the tech campus and asked if there would be enough solar energy for the City's use.

Mr. Zola said it would depend on the site-specific development. For example, the parking lots could be covered in solar.

Commissioner Parker asked how the solar energy would actually be transmitted off-site.

Mr. Zola said the buildings would use the solar energy generated on-site first. Any excess energy not used by the building would be sold to PG&E, and PG&E would supply electricity back.

Commissioner Parker said CREBL's proposal was dedicated to generating enough solar energy on the Baylands to power the entire town.

Mr. Zola said that was a policy decision for the Commission to make.

Commissioner Munir agreed with Commissioner Parker and said the goal was to generate energy not only for Brisbane but potentially for other cities in the County. He added that potentially the TOD area could be a solar farm.

Mr. Zola said the Commission should consider whether locating solar fields adjacent to the Caltrain station was consistent with the direction of the Sustainability Framework to maximize transit orientation of development. The scenario shown on Slide 34 would represent about 3 million square feet of development, with solar fields on top of parking structures on the west side of the site. Energy generation would be offset by energy consumption on-site. There would likely be a net energy generation, but not as much as a solar field would generate without on-site development.

Commissioner Parker referred to Slide 40, showing conceptual development types for the Roundhouse area, and asked if Mr. Zola could provide examples of "container parks".

Commissioner Munir said he saw some similar structures off Highway 80 near Fairfield.

Mr. Zola said this had been done across the country, including Las Vegas and Austin, TX. The idea was to create activity and a sense of place, similar to the San Francisco Ferry Building or Quincy Market in Boston.

Commissioner Parker asked about the size of Area 9.

Mr. Zola said Area 9 was about 10 acres, which could fit the lumberyard and Caltrain parking.

Mr. Zola then launched a presentation [available here on the City's website] using the software program "Sketch Up" to demonstrate potential physical layouts for the types and intensities of development discussed in the PowerPoint presentation.

Commissioner Parker said the SF Trains group wanted to reestablish some rail track for use, and asked if that was incorporated into the Sketch Up model.

Mr. Zola said the Sketch Up model incorporated a working rail track into the Roundhouse Area running under the boxcars. The boxcars could be mobile or static, depending on the land use

program. Even if funding couldn't be obtained to regain a functional rail spur, the model demonstrated how the City could recreate the feeling of a working rail line.

Commissioner Parker asked where the water treatment plant would be located.

Mr. Zola said there were a few options based on discussions with the Public Works Director, including west of Tunnel Avenue and north of Visitacion Creek. From an operational standpoint, Public Works would like to to minimize the amount of pipeline connecting to Bayshore. Ultimately, the location of the recycled water facility would be an engineering decision. By the time it is designed, it would not look like a big industrial building.

Commissioner Munir asked about the water tanks.

Mr. Zola said there is not adequate storage capacity within Brisbane for water storage for the Baylands. As the EIR states, before any development could occur on the Baylands, DPW would have to site a location for a 1 million gallon storage tank at sufficient height above the ground. After the site is located, the City would initiate a separate environmental review process. The tank would likely not be on-site. The EIR identifies Ice House Hill as the only area on the site with sufficient elevation, and there is no proposal to put a tank on Ice House Hill. The water tank would not be for the exclusive use of any specific area of the City; it would be integrated into the citywide system. The tank would not be for the exclusive use of the Baylands.

Commissioner Munir asked if the fiscal analysis took the water tank and treatment plant cost into account.

Mr. Zola said the capital costs for building the tank, water lines, and water-recycling facilities would be borne by the applicant, not the City.

Commissioner Munir asked what the cost would be.

Mr. Zola said it was included in the overall $1 billion development costs estimate from the applicant. A separate stormwater and sewage treatment system would also be needed.

Commissioner Munir asked how the cost could be calculated if they don't know what site would be chosen.

Mr. Zola said there were methods to estimate that cost based on land values in the City. The applicant would provide the water tank and recycled water facility at no cost to the City, including the new pipelines under Bayshore Boulevard.

Commissioner Parker said the recreation area could have solar on the parking lots, which could help provide excess energy for the City.

Mr. Zola said solar could be integrated into parking areas, or the active recreation area could be reduced to accommodate energy generation.

Commissioner Parker said she only saw four areas that could accommodate solar.

Mr. Zola said the presentation showed different concepts for the Commission's consideration.

Commissioner Parker said she wanted the renewable energy generation to power the City.

Mr. Zola said renewable energy generation could be accommodated in Area 3 through a combination of open space and active recreation.

Commissioner Parker said she didn't want to reduce the open space area.

Mr. Zola said that was a policy decision for the Commission. He said Area 2 could also accommodate a solar field with wind generation, or building mounted solar and wind that would generate less net energy. Recology could possibly have significant renewable energy generation incorporated into their expansion.

Commissioner Parker said she thought that renewable energy generation at Recology would be used for the on-site development, including vehicles.

Mr. Zola said some of the energy would be used by on-site development, but it could generate a significant amount of excess energy for the grid.

Commissioner Parker suggested putting solar on top of the water tank.

Mr. Zola reiterated the extent of solar was the Commission's choice.

Commissioner Munir said in the future, the roads would have solar cells.

Mr. Zola said Australia is investigating designing freeway signboards to incorporate wind turbines.

Commissioner Munir said energy could also be generated by the tides.

Mr. Zola said the Commission could consider building-mounted renewable energy generation, or net energy generation for the entire community. The buildings shown in the Sketch Up model represented about 5 million square feet of development, not including Recology. Going a few stories up would get them to the Community Proposed Plan (CPP), at about 2 million additional square feet.

Acting Chairperson Reinhardt asked Mr. Zola to use the Sketch Up model to show a view of Areas 6 and 1 from Candlestick Point.

Mr. Zola said the buildings in those areas are set back from the shore. Buildings on the west side of the rail line are three stories, and buildings to the east of the rail line are four stories. As a comparison, a potential six-story building would be up about halfway up the ridge from that vantage point. They wanted to ensure the buildings were low as seen from Candlestick Point. A tech campus in that area would also push the buildings west, away from the shore, and would have less impact out on the Bay.

Acting Chairperson Reinhardt announced a five-minute break.

The Commission reconvened.

Commissioner Munir asked why the high speed rail (HSR) maintenance yard was not shown in the Sketch Up model.

Director Swiecki said as the Commission has discussed numerous times in the past there were no set plans for a HSR maintenance yard in the Baylands. If the Commission wanted to designate where such a yard might belong, it was their prerogative, but staff could not guess that hypothetical yard's location or configuration, nor would it be accurate or useful to model a hypothetical facility.

Commissioner Munir said Caltrain started rail electrification already. From what he has heard, the preferred HSR yard site is in Brisbane.

Commissioner Parker said she imagined in the HSR yard with a solar farm over it in Area 2.

Commissioner Munir said he was thinking Area 4 or 5, because they are close to the tracks. He thought their planning process should envision that.

Commissioner Parker said she didn't want to think about the HSR yard. Areas 4 and 5 could be cleaned up more easily than the other areas for other developments.

Mr. Zola reiterated the Commission's previous direction regarding the potential HSR yard would be to acknowledge that the Baylands is the under consideration and allow the HSR Authority to do its own environmental work and define its location. Staff suggests designating the land uses the Commission thinks are appropriate in the absence of a HSR yard. The size and location of the HSR yard would be the HSR Authority's decision.

Commissioner Munir said the HSR yard would impact the intensity of development.

Mr. Zola said at the General Plan level, if the HSR Authority decided to acquire land in the Baylands it would remove that land from development. The question the community would face is what happens to the land use intensity that was purchased; does the developer get to transfer that elsewhere, or does the intensity disappear?

Commissioner Munir said they could ask the City Attorney what would happen in that case. It would be difficult to assign intensity for an area that could be designated a HSR yard.

Mr. Zola suggested that continued Commission speculation on the location and size of an HSR yard would not be particularly useful.

Commissioner Anderson referred to Slide 51, which showed potential land use options and intensities for each subarea. He asked if Recology could expand in Area 1 without taking additional land.

Mr. Zola said the "lower intensity" column in the table on Slide 51 showed Recology staying within its existing footprint, with light industrial uses between Recology and Geneva. If Recology expanded, as shown in the "mid-range intensity" and "higher intensity" columns, it would expand south to Geneva. Both of those columns showed a total of 1,050,000 square feet for the entirety of Area 1. If Recology didn't expand, the balance of that square footage would be available for the other properties in Area 1.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the existing Recology facility is 1,050,000 square feet.

Mr. Zola indicated that figure refers to the expanded Recology facility, adding that Recology was presently about 586,700 square feet.

Commissioner Parker said she had a lot to process and wasn't ready to discuss intensity. She hadn't anticipated staff's presentation and needed more time to process the information.

Commissioner Munir agreed and said staff's presentation went beyond what the Planning Commission could do, because it is not the type of development they're looking for. He thought the City Council should be involved in the intensity discussion.

Commissioner Parker said she didn't necessarily agree with Commissioner Munir's statement, but she needed more time to make a decision.

Commissioner Anderson said Keyser Marston mentioned a clean-up cost of $1.1 billion. There was a note in the analysis, however, that the clean-up cost could be reduced to $600 million. He requested an explanation. He understood the landfill had to be closed, but he was curious where the cost savings would come from.

Director Swiecki said the developer had calculated a cost of $1.1 billion for infrastructure, grading, and remediation/landfill closure. Keyser Marston had suggested that cost be reduced in the areas of infrastructure and other components, not the remediation or closure technique. He suggested it was not clearly demonstrated that a 40% cost reduction could be achieved.

Commissioner Anderson said it was mentioned at a previous meeting that the applicant wanted to continue the soil-processing program as long as possible to allow for dirt to be sold and new dirt to be purchased. He asked when the applicant would start selling the dirt, and asked if the soil processing business benefitted the City.

Director Swiecki said the City benefitted from truck haul fees. The owner would benefit financially from the ongoing operations.

Commissioner Anderson asked whether it was the City or the applicant who wanted to extend the soil operations business.

Director Swiecki said the fiscal impact analysis takes into account the potential revenue loss to the City if the soil processing operations cease prior to site development.

Commissioner Anderson said the financial analysis was done at a very high level, and it was difficult to compare the financial impact of a 1 million square foot development to that of a 6 million square feet development or somewhere in between. The financial analysis found that 1 million square feet of development would not be feasible. Though the CREBL plan was found in the past to be financially feasible, they have heard otherwise from Keyser Marston and they never saw an analysis for that alternative. He asked if they could get financial analyses on the alternatives so there is more than just opinion to back up feasibility assumptions.

Director Swiecki said there was a wide array of information in the record regarding financial and economic feasibility considerations. The Commission should weigh that in making its planning recommendation. The City Council will have the option to require refined studies. The Commission is not obligated to test the feasibility of every alternative. In making findings for its recommendation, the Commission can address economic feasibility considerations if it so wishes.

Commissioner Munir said the Commission couldn't make a recommendation without having complete fiscal analyses. He wanted all alternatives to be analyzed for their fiscal feasibility.

Director Swiecki suggested that if financial feasibility is the sole basis or driver of the Commission's land use recommendation that is what the Commission should put forth to the City Council.

Commissioner Munir said the Commission needs all the information they can get, irrespective of the cost, to make a constructive recommendation. The EIR is incomplete.

Commissioner Parker said the Commission should come up with the best design based on what the City and developer want, under the umbrella of the financials, and submit that to the Council.

Director Swiecki said the Commission will be making a recommendation to the Council and has a range of options in front of them. If financial feasibility is the driver behind any given choice,

they should relay that to the Council. If it is the Commission's majority opinion that there is insufficient information to make a recommendation to the Council, then that should be the Commission's recommendation to the Council. The City Council will ultimately determine whether additional study is needed.

Commissioner Munir said the Commission had asked for fiscal analyses since the beginning of the EIR process. It came at the end of the process and has been found incomplete. It is part of their approval of the EIR and the specific project. If they are missing a critical element, how can they make a recommendation?

Director Swiecki said it is up to the Commission to make that decision. If they feel that certain studies are inadequate, and can identify what else needs to be done, that can be addressed in their recommendation. The Commission must consider how the fiscal impact study drives their decision-making. The Commission should articulate why the fiscal impact analysis is inadequate, and why it is so critical to the decision-making process that the Commission is incapable of rendering a land use recommendation based on those perceived deficiencies. They need to put it in the record for the Council to evaluate.

Commissioner Munir said the project will be costly to get off the ground, and in order to make a constructive decision they need to have information on the alternatives. The $1.1 billion initial cost is a lot of money for the developer. The Commission has to make a decision, and the studies are missing elements.

Commissioner Parker suggested looking at it differently. They could make a land use recommendation based on the information they looked at that they think Brisbane could live with, acknowledging they were missing certain financial information. They have heard from the community and the developer at many public meetings. They should make a recommendation based on what the community could live with and would enhance the town. She thinks that is the role of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Munir asked how that could be accomplished.

Commissioner Parker said they have reviewed the EIR, and heard all the people who have come to the public meetings. Based on that input and their own discussions, they have something to contribute to the project. She thinks it is their responsibility as the Planning Commission.

Mr. Zola said the Commission had two options in making a recommendation. They could recommend the land uses, locations, and intensities they believe are appropriate for the community at a General Plan level. With that, they could also recommend that the developer demonstrate the feasibility of their recommendation, and demonstrate that each phase of development will generate adequate income to the City to mitigate the fiscal impact of development. That method would free the Commission from studying every different level of development that might occur; they would make a policy decision to require the project to pay for itself. Alternatively, the Commission could recommend that they cannot make a

recommendation since they are missing certain studies. Then the Council would decide whether to conduct those studies and remand them back to the Commission, or move forward without those studies, in which case the Commission would pass on their opportunity to make a land use recommendation.

Commissioner Anderson asked if a density is established for a defined area, and the owner decides they want to subdivide and sell a portion of that area, does the owner decide how to divide that density?

Mr. Zola said that is not a General Plan-level issue but more of a Specific Plan policy. The Specific Plan should identify how development intensity gets allocated within an area. There are many different ways to accomplish that. The Commission's job is to recommend that it be part of the Specific Plan.

Commissioner Munir asked if the Commission had reviewed a Specific Plan. He said the plan presented by staff tonight was completely different from what was studied in the EIR.

Mr. Zola said the applicant submitted a Specific Plan to the City, which was in front of the Commission. However, the Commission had said repeatedly that they did not want the land uses proposed in the applicant's Specific Plan. They also said they wanted to work from the concept plan (General Plan) level first, to discuss land uses, development intensities, and establish the basic structure of a Specific Plan. Then they would look at the Specific Plan submitted by the applicant and determine whether that Specific Plan was consistent with their land use vision. If it is, they could recommend its approval. If it isn't, they would recommend to Council that the applicant's Specific Plan be revised to be consistent with their land use vision. They have also talked about issues that go beyond the scope of the applicant's Specific Plan.

Commissioner Anderson said it was a difficult format for the Commission to really examine the information, because in some cases there are gaps in information or maybe it's not possible to get more information. But in other areas there is information they could potentially review. When they are on the dais it's hard to break open their notes and review line item by line item. He suggested appointing a subcommittee to look at the information in depth.

Commission Munir said the traffic study would be totally different for the plan presented by staff at the meeting.

Director Swiecki said the drawings shown to the Commission at the meeting were a visual tool to illustrate land uses based on the Commission's previous discussions at various densities. They were not illustrating land uses that weren't studied in the EIR.

Commissioner Munir said the traffic analysis for staff's drawings would be completely different than what was studied in the EIR since it did not include residential development.

Director Swiecki noted the CPP alternative studied in the EIR did not propose residential development.

Commissioner Munir said staff's drawings proposed a different configuration of land uses and the traffic analysis would be very different from the EIR.

Mr. Zola said traffic generation would likely be lower than the CPP. At the beginning of this process, the Commission had asked how they could meld the four alternatives studied in the EIR as a type of hybrid. As discussed at the April 28 meeting, all the alternatives have the same building blocks. The Commission discussed a hybrid of the renewable energy alternative and the DSP in Area 4. The concept in front of them tonight was a hybrid of the renewable energy alternative and the CPP- Recology variant. The idea was for the Commission to focus on that preferred hybrid, and identify their questions regarding traffic generation, air quality impacts, and others. If the Commission recommends a hybrid land use scenario, staff would come back with a series of findings based on the Commission's recommendation comparing it to the EIR analyses.

Commissioner Munir said they could also recommend that the EIR on the developer's proposal be revised.

Mr. Zola suggested that could be an outcome if the Commission wishes to recommend approval of the applicant's specific plan in some form.

Acting Chairperson Reinhardt said he thought there was a lot of confusion after reviewing the details at the beginning of the deliberations process. As the Commission visualizes the land use potential, they have become more concerned with the possible impacts of their decision. The tool presented by staff tonight helped visualize how the intensity might be impacted by their areas of concerns, such as traffic or soil toxicity. He said he would like a smaller footprint for Recology and higher intensity in Area 2. The other details are getting in the way, such as feasibility and the cost of development.

Commissioner Anderson suggested that those issues be addressed by a subcommittee.

Acting Chairperson Reinhardt supported that idea but cautioned that he wanted to the subcommittee to work in a timely fashion.

Director Swiecki said the next Baylands meeting was June 9. He asked for more information about what the Commission wants the subcommittee to do. .

Acting Chairperson Reinhardt said the subcommittee should provide staff with their questions prior to meeting so they can move forward at the next full Commission meeting. He thought the subcommittee should focus on organizing the outstanding questions or concerns of the Commission and transmitting that to staff.

Commissioner Munir said he wasn't sure what decisions they were being asked to make. He did not want to be on the subcommittee. He said they have been doing things differently than what they had been asked to do initially. The EIR was different than what they had discussed tonight. He was reluctant to give any opinion on the intensity. As for the other issues, he thought they had already aired them out and he was ready to make a recommendation on everything except for the intensity. He didn't know what FAR was better for Recology, for example. There were so many factors involved. It should be decided later, after the concept plan is prepared and additional studies are prepared. He was uncomfortable making a decision tonight.

Director Swiecki said the Commission is working toward creating a concept plan. You have already identified preferred land uses and the next step is to determine intensity. Referring to the suggestion that further studies be undertaken before the intensity is established, he noted that any meaningful environmental, fiscal or economic study needs to be based a square footage buildout scenario. which requires that development intensity be established or assumed. An EIR could not study a bubble diagram of land use absent intensity in a meaningful way. He added that the General Plan establishes density and intensity standards for the entire City, and the city is legally obligated to provide this overarching control in its General Plan. The General Plan is then implemented through a Specific Plan that shows how the overall policy translates into a more precise land use program.

He continued that based on the testimony to date, the developer's Specific Plan does not seem to fully suit the community's needs, so the Commission is now setting ground rules for a specific plan which will comply with the community's vision. Providing direction on intensity is a necessary next step in this process. Moving forward without intensity will ultimately not lead to a successful outcome.

Commissioner Munir said they could use the intensities established in the General Plan.

Mr. Zola said the 1994 General Plan identifies maximum allowable floor area ratios for specific portions of the Baylands. They are high- 2.4, 4.8. If the site was built out to the maximum FARs, the development would be two to three times the size of the DSP. However, policies throughout the General Plan regarding traffic congestion and open space would limit the buildout. The General Plan never states what the maximum buildout is in terms of square feet of floor area. The General Plan EIR makes an assumption as to the yield, based on traffic levels that would maintain Level of Service D at key intersections. That figure was about 1 million square feet of traffic-intensive commercial/retail or 4 million square feet of low-intensity industrial. The General Plan EIR does not establish regulations and is not enforceable; the only policy in the General Plan is the established FARs. Establishing intensity maximums in the General Plan would ensure development is not more intense than the community intended.

Commissioner Munir said the intensities provided on the Land Use Options Handout [available here on the City's website] are "Lower", "Mid-range," and "Higher." He asked how the intensities shown in those columns were determined.

Mr. Zola reviewed the handout. For Area 1, at "lower intensity," no additional square footage was recommended compared to what exists there today. At both the mid-range and higher intensities, some additional square footage was recommended. In Area 2, the lower intensity option would be a solar farm with no building area. The mid-range intensity could be a tech campus with 2-4 story buildings. The high range could be 4-6 story buildings.

Commissioner Munir said the Commission had discussed dedicating half of Area 2 to solar generation.

Mr. Zola said the Commission could recommend that a portion of Area 2 be developed as a tech campus but that the majority of the area be a solar farm. He said Area 3 is assumed in all intensity ranges as "active recreation," or renewable energy of some kind with no building area. For Area 4, Industrial Way, each intensity range assumed the same amount of square footage there today. For Area 5, the Roundhouse area, the assumption was one-story buildings and the same intensity in each range. For Area 6, the transit-oriented area, 2-3 story buildings or 6 million square feet in lower and mid-range, and up to 4 stories at the higher intensity range. The Sketch Up model illustrated the mid-range intensities. The two areas with differences in development intensity for discussion are Area 2 and Area 6. In Area 2, the question is whether some level of development is appropriate in addition to renewable energy generation, what kind of development would be appropriate, and how intense it should be. In Area 6, along Geneva and the rail line, a configuration with 3-5 stories north of Geneva and 2-3 south of Geneva would be about 6 million square feet. If they felt comfortable with higher buildings, they could go with about 7 million square feet. Otherwise, staff has taken the land use discussion from April 28 and assigned land use intensities based on those discussions.

Commissioner Munir said he was more comfortable discussing intensity after Mr. Zola's explanation.

Mr. Zola said the information provided at the meeting was intended to be a starting point for the Commission's discussion.

Commissioner Parker asked about the subcommittee.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the subcommittee needed to be formed at a public meeting.

Director Swiecki confirmed they should be appointed tonight if that is the Commission's desire.

Commissioner Anderson asked if community members can be in the subcommittee, or if they can be invited to the subcommittee meeting.

Director Swiecki said the subcommittee will consist of no more than two Planning Commissioners. The subcommittee meeting would be open to the public and subject to public noticing 72 hours before the meeting.

The Commission appointed Commissioners Parker and Anderson to the subcommittee.

Commissioner Munir asked if the subcommittee could provide the results of their meeting prior to the upcoming June 9 Commission meeting.

Director Swiecki said it would depend on when the subcommittee meets. The subcommittee could report orally at the June 9 meeting if they were not able to submit materials for the June 9 meeting packet.

Commissioner Parker asked for clarification on the subcommittee's charge.

Commissioner Anderson said the primary purpose would be to review the body of material before them and determine what they do and do not know, and categorize their questions and conclusions.

Acting Chairperson Reinhardt announced the meeting would be extended to 11 p.m. He opened the floor to public commends and asked speakers to keep to no more than five minutes each.

Barbara Ebel said the community and OSEC had discussed that Baylands development should be energy positive, in part because large scale development has a huge energy debt. On average, commercial uses are too energy intensive to be powered solely by rooftop solar. A FAR of 1.0 or 1.5, potentially could, but five and six story buildings are almost guaranteed not to cover their own energy costs on their rooftops, especially if green roofs are used. The tech campus illustration by staff showed a parking lot structure that is three times the size of the office buildings. It would not be energy neutral, let alone energy positive, without areas dedicated to solar energy generation. Solar should definitely be incorporated into parking lots to create a full cycle of uses. They couldn't consider development intensities without considering building height. The community values its viewshed and the windsurfing community depends on lower heights. Regarding soils processing, she likes that it makes money for the developer and the City, but UPC's soil processing does not have a great record with leachate, methane, dust management, or height limitations. Additionally, while the Commission had previously stated they wanted the rail line to continue to serve Sierra Point Lumber, the staff illustrations show the railyard on one side of Caltrain and the lumberyard on another.

Ms. Ebel concluded by saying that at the last meeting they were trying to make decisions in the abstract about land uses. She is a visual person and thought a visual tool would be helpful to the Commission in their decision-making. She distributed hard copies of layered transparencies showing sources of sound pollution, existing man-made features, traffic, housing, reduced building height areas, important habitat areas, air pollution sources, flood zones, waterways, and known hazards.

Anja Miller said she found it curious that the solar farm concept was so well received and understood for its environmental benefits but is now proposed as a hybrid with a campus, and the reason for the campus to be there is that campuses want a view of the water. She said they have a

beautiful campus that went through a lot of research and work by the Commission at Sierra Point, with a water view, and there was no campus there after 10-15 years. It was all talk to get the Commission not to focus on what they really need. If they want a campus, it could be in Area 6. Also, the HSR Authority will be issuing an EIR in the next year for the HSR maintenance yard. The Geneva Avenue extension is unfunded and up in the air. There are many hurdles in the way before it will be built. The Commission may need to consider a surface Geneva Avenue extension and forget the expensive overpass. By the time Geneva is solved, maybe HSR will be solved. The Commission must view things from the same perspective and not view only certain things as fact. As far as the total development allowed by the General Plan, the 1994 General Plan does have a traffic limitation on total building area. It was an appendix in the EIR, but it is part of the General Plan and it has to do with the level of service at Brisbane intersections. In order to keep that minimum Level of Service D, the buildout of the Baylands would be between 1 and 4 million square feet. In staff's presentation, Area 6 alone is proposed at 2-3 million square feet. She can't believe what kind of traffic would result from that intensity. She asked them to consider the traffic impact of the Schlage Lock and Candlestick developments. The CREBL plan was designed to work within the existing General Plan limitations and be energy positive. The traffic generation for Brisbane residents, their children, and grandchildren must be considered in any intensity determination. She said she has a problem with two-dimensional depictions. At Arizona State University in Phoenix, a planning lab is by the City of Phoenix and others with three-dimensional screens that can display plans, sections, and building heights that can be manipulated in real time. She hoped the Commission would ask the Council to send them to Phoenix to study the alternatives in that lab, or find another place nearby.

Leora Tanjuatco said she had talked about housing with the Commission before. She said her mom was a Brisbane resident and recently told her she was having trouble affording her house in Brisbane. She said deciding land uses is a very big job, but it is critical to include housing, not just for people like her but her children and grandchildren. She has researched real estate cycles in the Bay Area. If they don't build housing and use this land for other uses, the economic cycles boom and bust but housing costs will keep rising. We need to do everything possible to stem that cost. She understood the Commission is interested in the Baylands development being sustainable and energy-generating, but she urged them to look at the feasibility of the solar fields considering the cloudy climate. She asked them to look at the environmental impacts of so many people driving into the Bay Area from other places to get to work. If they built a few thousand units on the site, they could take thousands of cars off the road and encourage use of Caltrain.

David Crabbe said he lived in the Peninsula but was not a Brisbane resident. He saw this project form a regional worldview, including San Francisco and Santa Clara counties. This project calls itself a world-class model of sustainability, but it is designed primarily for private automobiles. The tech campus illustration showed several parking garages. That was the old way of thinking of design from the 1950's, with people driving from home to work and from work to places to eat lunch. He supports the previous speaker's comments regarding housing. Eliminating housing from the proposal would create thousands of jobs and would push housing responsibility to neighboring cities. He doesn't see that as responsible planning at the regional level, as much as he sees the issues the City is facing such as population growth. He thought it made sense to put

housing in the section of the site near San Francisco that they might want to annex, then the City could have the balance of the property to build revenue-generating uses without the housing. He applauds the energy positive approach and open space. The solar farm could be spread throughout the site or a huge space frame across two-thirds of the project. He would like the Commission to draw a circle around the Caltrain station and bus stops and explain how the project would be accessible by walking or transit.

Willy Chang said he just moved to Brisbane a few weeks ago. He said the Commission needed to fine-tune the intensity and find the sweet spot. He supported a big development at the Baylands, but he wanted it to be balanced and to scale. He asked that they consider schools in the project area. He said there was no ratio of building area to parking. He said traffic noise from the highway could be minimized with a sound wall. The most important thing is to apply strict criteria to their decision- it could include views, noise, or others.

H. ITEMS INITIATED BY STAFF

None.

I. ITEMS INITIATED BY THE COMMISSION

Commissioner Munir asked if Sketch Up was compatible with Oculus or other virtual reality software to give the Commission a better idea of the project.

Mr. Zola said he would follow up on that.

J. ADJOURNMENT to the Regular Meeting of May 26, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.

Commissioner Anderson moved and Commissioner Munir seconded to adjourn to the regular meeting of May 26, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. The motion passed 4-0 and the meeting adjourned at 10:44 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.