

OPEN SPACE AND ECOLOGY COMMITTEE

ACTION MINUTES

Wednesday, September 18, 2013 6:30 PM
Community Meeting Room
Brisbane City Hall
50 Park Place, Brisbane, CA 94005

Call to order

- Vice chair Hayuk called to order at 6:35 PM

Committee members present:

- Court, Ebel, Fieldman, and Gutekanst

Committee members absent:

- Salmon and Sweeney

Staff members present:

- Community Development Director Swiecki
- Management Analyst Muñoz

1. Adoption of the agenda.

- Adopted

2. Oral communications for items not on the agenda.

- N/A

3. Review of DIER Chapter/s 4P and discussion with Lloyd Zola:

- Clarification that discussion with Zola and Ch. 4P are separate.
- Swiecki discussed conference call with Chair Salmon and Zola; Zola can discuss comment types and EIR process but is not able to go over specific questions.
- Zola: All comments must be responded to in writing. Avoid comments that will solicit a Yes or No response. Project questions should be separate from EIR comments. Questions are answered literally as they are asked, be precise in formulating comments targeting what you want the response to be. If you do not agree with methodology, it needs to be stated what are the missing components. Submitted comments and responses to comments will be in the FEIR.
- Gutekanst asked about iterations of comments on EIR and project approval. Zola discussed certifying an EIR without a project approved, the EIR can be re-circulated. If the project will be denied, the EIR does not need to be certified.
- Fieldman asks about Program DIER and proposed plans; the developer sponsored plan is more detailed than the community proposed. Program EIR sets a set of rules for development for level of impact and required mitigation.

- Gutekanst asked for clarification about Program vs. Project EIR. Zola clarifies that project refers to a proposed plan or action. Under CEQA the Program EIR is written for a set of projects/actions. The program EIR analyzes a set of projects.
- Ebel asks about impacts that are not covered in the EIR. Zola describes that CEQA looks at impacts and whether it requires mitigation or not. Substantial impacts that have not been addressed can cause an EIR to be re-circulated.
- Ebel asks about Zola's professional background. Zola is a senior VP at ESA, practice leader for land developmental group. Zola does final review on documents and circulates comments.
- Ebel mentioned she had difficulty understanding a particular chapter of the DEIR, those types of questions can be addressed to Swiecki.
- Fieldman asked how to address comments about methodology; due to the fact the response may be that this is standard procedure. Zola recommends writing comments questioning methodology to have them on the record. The example discussed was GHG per capita measured and thresholds.
- Hayuk asked about questioning the Urbemis model, personal research will be done to back up your point on questioning a method or model used. Avoid asking about how the model works and about inputs into the model. Focus on why the answer seems to be incorrect and add reasons why. Questions can also be asked if the model accounts for specific outcomes.
- Zola discussed litigation of the DEIR; there is no testimony, only a judge to make a ruling with all documentation made available.
- Gutekanst discussed organization of comments.

4P Energy Resources

- Energy use based on land use type per Swiecki.
- Remediation during the project is discussed.
- Lifecycle analysis was discussed.

4. Miscellaneous

- Fieldman will not be at the next meeting.
- Ebel will not be at the next meeting.
- Day in the Park materials was reviewed.
- Hayuk discussed the model named Urbemis used to measure fuel use and GHG emissions.
- Comments on comments will help alter our final submission of comments and limit what will be reviewed in the last few meetings.
- Barbara presented a carbon footprint spreadsheet she constructed.

5. Approval of the minutes

- Minutes have been approved.

6. Adjournment

- The meeting adjourned at 8:50 PM