Brisbane Baylands EIR

ALTERNATIVE PLANS



City Council & Advisory Boards Visions

May 2007

Brisbane Baylands EIR
ALTERNATIVE PLANS

City Council & Advisory Boards Visions

May 2007

Prepared by

DYETT & BHATIA
Urban and Regional Planners

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Scope and Purpose of the Baylands Alternative Plans	1
1.2	Public involvement	1
1.3	Report Organization	2
2	CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION	3
2.1	Vision	3
2.2	Specific Topics	5
3	OPEN SPACE & ECOLOGY COMMITTEE	10
3.1	Major Themes	10
4	PARKS, BEACHES, & RECREATION COMMISSION	12
4.1	Major Themes	12
5	COMMENTS BY TOPIC	14
5.1	Open Space and Conservation	14
5.2	Sustainability	18
5.3	Land Use and Character	20
5.4	Building Heights, Density, and Design	24
5.5	Circulation and Transportation	26
6	IMPLICATIONS FOR THE BAYLANDS ALTERNATIVE PLANS	28

1 Introduction

The Brisbane Baylands Planning Area consists of approximately 660 acres of mostly vacant land located entirely within the City of Brisbane. The Baylands area is bordered on the west by Bayshore Boulevard, on the north by Beatty Avenue and the City and County of San Francisco, on the east by the US 101 causeway, and on the south by the south end of the Brisbane Lagoon. Portions of the site were historically used as a municipal refuse dump and a Southern Pacific Railyard, resulting in the need for substantial environmental remediation that continues today. Within these general boundaries is an operational lumber company, located adjacent to several industrial parcels just north of the project area; as well as the Kinder Morgan Energy Tank Farm in the west-central portion of the Phase I planning area.

Consistent with the requirements of the Brisbane General Plan, the primary landowner of the Baylands, Universal Paragon Corporation (UPC) has submitted the Brisbane Baylands Phase 1 Specific Plan to the City of Brisbane for its consideration and approval. An important part of the City's decision-making process is the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed project, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Among the criteria required by the City for completion of this EIR is detailed and serious consideration of possible alternatives to UPC's proposed plan.

1.1 SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE BAYLANDS ALTERNATIVE PLANS

From a CEQA perspective, alternatives should be designed to minimize the negative impacts of the proposed project. They should also help accomplish the City's objectives for the Baylands as articulated in the General Plan, including maintaining a low-rise profile, maximizing open space and public accessibility, respecting the environmental sensitivities of the setting and its proximity to the Bay, promoting a diverse mix of uses, preserving views, and promoting multi-modal accessibility. Furthermore, the Alternative Plans are an important opportunity for the community to be involved in a systematic way in shaping the future of the Baylands.

1.2 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Public participation is an integral aspect of preparation of the EIR, and especially critical to development of alternatives. The outreach program is designed to foster trust in the planning process and provide opportunities for vigorous discussion of and effective input regarding the Specific Plan and its environmental consequences, visions for Brisbane development, planning principles and growth and development scenarios. Opportunities for public input are designed to allow the City's planning team to learn directly from decision-makers, residents, business owners, and other community members about their needs and expectations, as well as to allow the public to provide feedback as alternatives are developed.

PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS

The public input process is designed to enable two-way communication—both the giving and receiving of information and ideas between the public, elected and appointed officials, City staff members, and the City's EIR team. The multi-pronged outreach process includes:

- *Newsletters.* Newsletters will be used to provide updates on the planning process, and workshop and public hearing schedules.
- *Stakeholder Interviews.* Stakeholder meetings were conducted at an early stage in the planning process in order to obtain a foundation of community perspectives, which were compiled and analyzed by the consulting team. Stakeholders included residents, property owners, business owners, interest groups, neighborhood leaders, service providers, and other community members.
- *Community Workshops.* Community-wide workshops will be held at several points in the planning process to provide information to, and receive feedback from the public. A visioning workshop was held on May 12, 2007. A second workshop in June will help future shape alternatives. Additionally, a Community Open House on Alternatives will be held to present the refined alternatives being considered for the EIR. After the presentation, community members will be invited to ask questions and offer comments at stations that will have rich visuals and other information on all alternatives.

- *Neighborhood/Key Group Briefings.* At several stages in the process the consulting team will provide briefings to and collect feedback from interest groups and organizations (such as the PTA, Chamber of Commerce, Mothers of Brisbane, etc.) in locations where these groups regularly meet.
- *City Council/Planning Commission Meetings.* This report covers a *joint workshop of the two bodies* held in April 2007 to brainstorm visions and issues. Decision-makers will be briefed at several subsequent stages in the process to keep them informed and to solicit comments and ideas. This report and future planning documents will also be presented to the decision-makers when they are drafted.
- *City Commissions.* In addition to the joint City Council/Planning Commission Workshop, this report also includes input from meetings held with the Open Space & Ecology Committee and Park, Beaches, & Recreation Commission. Members of these groups will continue to be briefed as the EIR process progresses.
- *Public Access to all Documents and Results.* The results of all public meetings, workshops, and presentations will be summarized and made available to the public, and will be posted at the City of Brisbane website.

1.3 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report summarizes several separate visioning sessions with various City boards and commissions, including a joint workshop of the City Council and Planning Commission, and visioning sessions with the Open Space and Ecology Committee and the Parks, Beaches, and Recreation Commission. Each visioning session is summarized separately in the following chapters, where key issues and ideas are captured in discussion of major themes.

2 City Council and Planning Commission

A joint City Council and Planning Commission Visioning Workshop for the Brisbane Baylands site was held on April 9, 2007. This chapter provides a summary of the major issues and visions for the site following the general format of the workshop discussion. The discussion was separated into two parts: City Council and Planning Commission members first expressed their overall vision for the site, followed by a more specific discussion of issues regarding land use, design character, transportation, open space, and sustainability.

2.1 VISION

In general, Council and Commission member visions focused on the overall character and role of the Baylands with an underlying focus on both environmental and socio-economic sustainability. They saw the creation of a place that would complement and include Brisbane and its residents—"something that everyone in Brisbane can view or see and appreciate that it's there." Central to this new place would be its physical and visual connections between Baylands and Central Brisbane, connecting residents and employees via transportation, open space, and development. Several descriptive comments included:

- "[A place where] people know where they are, where they are going, and what is offered in the area."
- "…bringing together residents of Brisbane and neighboring communities with school-affiliated community centers, interactive educational opportunities on mountain habitat, bay and aquatic region, climate change, and an emphasis on alternative energy."
- "…facilitating connections to transit (BART, Caltrain, etc.) should be of highest priority."

In the context of this overall vision for Baylands, several major themes emerged including sustainability, character, connectivity, and the site's role within the City and region. Key ideas from each theme are described below.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

- Energy-neutral, zero-carbon emission development that maximizes advances in green technology;
- Remediation of existing environmental contamination;
- Preservation of the southern 30 to 50 percent of the site for open space, wetlands, and habitat restoration; and
- Passive and active recreation, including more open space with reclaimed waterways and marshlands that are also accessible and connected to the rest of the development and the Bay Trail.

OPEN SPACE

- Open space distributed throughout the development, not just in one area; and
- A mix of active and passive uses within the open space, including natural areas and wetlands, a golf course, sports fields, and pedestrian and bike trails.

CHARACTER

- A mix of uses, including smaller-scale shops and restaurants rather than big-box retail, as well as light industry, biotech, office, and health care;
- In general, low-rise development, ideally only north of Visitación Creek, with no development or buildings around the lagoon; and
- Pedestrian-oriented and "user-friendly" development environment.

CIRCULATION

- Creation of a circulation network that safely accommodates pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular modes; and
- A multi-modal transportation hub that would minimize the need for driving, placing more of an emphasis upon walkability and bicycle access and connectivity.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY

- Self-sufficient commercial development, featuring companies that focus on green-energy and sustainable business practices;
- Businesses that hire locals first and pay wages that enable workers to afford to live in Brisbane; and
- Diversified development and revenue structure for the City.

ROLE

- Enhancement of the quality of life for Brisbane residents—establishing a lasting legacy that will identify Brisbane as a leading entity and destination for sustainability and cultural activities;
- A place for social interaction and bringing the community together—through educational, cultural, or athletic means; and
- Provision of services that would benefit the community, such as a community center, educational opportunities focused on the environment and sustainability; as well as entertainment venues, music, theater, and art shows.

2.2 SPECIFIC TOPICS

Specific recommendations by City Councilors and Planning Commissioners were captured in the discussion of major site issues. The following breakdown of issues and ideas reflects the format of the workshop discussion, where the topics of land use, design character, transportation, open space, and sustainability were each addressed separately.

LAND USE, MIX, AND PHASING

Land Use & Mix

Recommendations for uses covered a wide spectrum of possibilities, from open space to industrial warehouses, and were generally geographically oriented. Almost unanimously, Council and Planning Commission members wanted to see the south end of the Phase I site area preserved for some type of open space or recreational uses. The remainder of the site, to the north, was viewed as the optimal location for more intense development that would include a mix of uses. Council and Commission members saw this mix of uses as the nexus for a dynamic new place for the Brisbane community, which would include shopping, educational facilities, and cultural uses.

Essential to this dynamic mix would be a strong commercial center, with mid-sized anchors and smaller-scale stores as opposed to typical big-box development and its associated sea of parking: rather, Council and Commission members wanted to see architecture and circulation focus upon the "human element." Open plazas, sidewalk cafés, and a neighborhood scale—akin to old-world examples such as Barcelona, or successful California developments like Santana Row, Seaport Village, and Santa Barbara—were cited as key organizing structures to commercial development. Complementing commercial uses would be a diverse range of cultural, entertainment, hotel and convention center, and educational uses that would further support the strong core of activity envisioned for the Baylands site.

The other primary segment of uses suggested for the site focused on job and energy production, with bio-tech, healthcare, and green industries as key uses. The overriding theme for these uses was that of sustainability—both in economic and environmental terms. Businesses would provide high-level, professional, and continuous jobs; while green industries and uses would tap into energy production through solar, wind, or bio-gas. Design of buildings was also deemed important, with emphasis upon the need for high energy efficiency and zero-carbon emission development.

While this wide range of non-residential uses was easily imagined for the Baylands site, residential uses were not. Given existing General Plan policy for the site, and the hazardous waste implications, the majority of Council and Commission members agreed that housing should not be present on the site—and that any living quarters should be temporary if at all, such as in a time-share or hotel scenario. However, a few members felt that housing could be beneficial to the mix of uses, noting that it would "maintain an economically viable sub-community on the Baylands." New housing on the site would be located on the north end of Baylands near new housing in San Francisco and the future multi-modal transit hub.

Finally, existing uses on the site, particularly, the Tank Farm and Icehouse Hill were also addressed by Council and Commission members. Several members felt that the Tank Farm and its visual and physical impacts be well-screened from future open space and new development, while others wanted to "make it disappear." On the other hand, Icehouse Hill was viewed as a visual asset for the area, with suggestions directed towards maintaining the hill as open space.

Phasing

The primary concern expressed by Council and Commission members in respect to the phasing of the project was ensuring open space and transportation benefits were realized in the build-out of the plan. Several members suggested that the open space and transportation elements of the entire site be delineated and assured as part of the first phase of development. This implementation strategy would ensure that these benefits and essential elements of the plan would not be lost in any future phases.

BUILDING HEIGHTS AND DESIGN

Building Heights

In respect to building heights, there was an overwhelming consensus to limit building heights and structures in the south end of the site (generally south of Visitación Creek). Structures in this area would be minimal and primarily serve recreational uses–for instance, a two-story club house serving a golf course or the lagoon area might be acceptable. To the north, opinions on possible heights varied, primarily due to differences in aesthetic taste. While initial comments during the visioning process at the beginning of the meeting focused on lower heights, opinions did diversify as the discussion became more specific. Some Council and Commission members stated that they would in fact be open to taller, well-designed buildings that might range from six (6) to 12 stories; others felt that lower, three- to four-story buildings would better foster a dynamic environment that will not be overshadowed by taller buildings. However, several common concerns were expressed by everyone, including the need to step buildings down closer to the Visitación Creek canal, preserve key views from Brisbane to the Bay and San Francisco, and implement high quality, well-designed buildings at any height.

Design

The design of buildings was an essential factor in consideration of taller, more visible structures on the site—two distinct goals surfaced during the discussion:

1. Minimize the visual and physical impact of development on the site through weaving architecture into the landscape—such as living roofs or the concept of "parkitecture" where buildings are integrated into the landscape.

2. Design buildings to be both architecturally and technologically advanced, especially in terms of sustainability and energy efficiency. Whatever the range of building heights—"design, design, design" is the key: "It's not how tall, it's how it looks." Thus, design should focus on architectural integrity in both materials and well-articulated design.

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

The most pressing concern for Council and Commission members was that of connectivity and accessibility to and from the Baylands site. Everyone agreed that Central Brisbane would need to be well-connected to the new development and transit opportunities at the new transit hub. Although a few members mentioned the possibility of moving the Caltrain Station closer to Central Brisbane, most felt that moving the station would be highly unlikely. Instead, several options for bus and rail connections from the center of the city to the transit hub were suggested, including a street rail car, tram, and alternative energy bus system—all of which would have dedicated lanes.

The viability of the transit hub was also discussed, with many feeling that the logistical plans for the hub would undermine opportunities for connections between modes and accessibility to the Baylands. With minimal Caltrain service (the baby bullet bypasses the station currently) and the abrupt ending of the 3rd Street Light Rail line at Sunnydale Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard, the hub would have limited opportunity for multi-modal transportation.

Circulation and street design issues were also an important element of the overall site transportation network. At the larger scale, Council and Commission members had some concern for access to and increased traffic along the freeway and freeway intersections. Careful study of potential impacts and a request to "stick to the General Plan" was advised for future planning on the Baylands site. From a more site-specific viewpoint, the design of streets was an important factor of development, from the character of the Geneva Avenue overpass to the incorporation of bike and pedestrian paths along streets and throughout new development. In addition, Lagoon Way was cited as an attractive, meandering entrance into the Baylands site and Central Brisbane as well.

OPEN SPACE AND CONSERVATION

Amount and Location

Overall, Council and Commission members envisioned an open space network that would be integrated throughout the development. They defined the amount of open space to include the Lagoon and at least an additional 25 percent of land to the north as open space/open area, as prescribed in the General Plan. However, several felt that the 25 percent minimum was inadequate and should be increased to 40 or even 50 percent. While this inclusion of ample open space in Baylands was not in question, the breakdown between public open space and privately-owned open areas was a significant issue for many. This issue would need to be resolved and clarified by the Planning Commission as the planning process continues, with a contractual provision for how and where open space is measured and located to be included in the final plan.

In addition, several Council and Commission members warned that implementation of open space will be a key issue, and that allotment and preservation for the entire site should be addressed and provided within the first phase of development.

CHARACTER AND USE

The character of open space in the Baylands, especially south of Visitación Creek, was primarily seen as a space for wildlife habitat and natural restoration. These sensitive areas would be set aside for birds, other wildlife, and tidal wetland area. The emphasis would be upon the natural environment and on passive recreation rather than manicured green space.

Accessibility to open space throughout the Baylands site was also an important element for many—several visions included a continuous, meandering network of foot and bike paths through the wetlands and creek area that would connect to Sierra Point and surrounding natural environments like San Bruno Mountain. One Council member suggested that connections to this network of open space would be no more than a ten-minute walk from any area in the development.

SUSTAINABILITY

The primary focus of sustainability was upon creating new development that would protect both people and the environment—which would include conservation of the environment, economy, and social equity. Council and Commission members supported passive and active approaches to sustainability through the design and mix of new development. Design-wise, heating and cooling should be minimized through appropriate building siting and exterior designs that would utilize shading and solar protection, living roofs, and energy-efficient, high quality materials like triple-glazed windows. Members also felt that development should actively design and provide for energy production and resource conservation through solar and wind energy generation; as well as utilize nearby resources like the recycling center to create a continuum of use for production and expenditure of energy.

In addition to design, Council and Commission members wanted to ensure that new development would create living wage jobs for Brisbane. Alongside new job creation would be the need for identifying sufficient affordable housing for each new job created. Several people mentioned that the demand for housing could be met in the immediate region of Daly City and San Francisco, where new housing development is planned for Candlestick Point and likely for future redevelopment of Cow Palace.

Finally, the concept of sustainability also included the creation of a balanced, vital, and diversified economy, where no one industry in particular would occupy a majority of the City's economy; and where businesses are self-sustainable. Entertainment, the arts, and retail were also suggested as part of a strong sustainable economy.

3 Open Space & Ecology Committee

A special committee meeting of the Brisbane Open Space & Ecology Committee was held on April 25 at the City of Brisbane City Hall. The format for the discussion was an open forum for committee members to contribute their overall vision for the Baylands site. In general, comments were focused on the character and nature of open space in the site; as well as how open space and ecology might be incorporated into future development. Major themes along these lines included open space location and character, development character, and ecology in design—each of which are discussed below.

3.1 MAJOR THEMES

OPEN SPACE

One of the primary concerns of the Open Space and Ecology Committee was that of accurately defining and measuring open space in future Baylands development. As committee members noted, currently (April 2007), the General Plan requires a minimum 25 percent open space/open area for the Baylands planning area. This "open space/open area" designation includes two different open space typologies—publicly-owned open space and privately-owned open areas like landscaping or a golf course. To the committee, the somewhat vague description and requirements for open space in the General Plan do not ensure that the majority of future open space will be publicly accessible or set aside for conservation and habitat restoration. Rather, the lack of a defined composition of open space could mean the difference between park space and landscaping alongside a building. While the General Plan makes no recommendation upon what proportion of open space should be publicly accessible or privately-controlled, the Committee stated that it would like to see the majority publicly-dedicated.

In addition to better defining the nature of future open space in the Baylands, the Committee also expressed the desire for requiring a minimum of 40 to 50 percent of the site for open space—outside of existing water courses in the site. Overall, committee members felt that the southern portion of the site should be targeted for the majority of this open space, with the caveat that Vistación Creek should not be the limiting northern boundary. Within this area, open space uses could include active park lands and perhaps a golf course, as well as native, functional wetlands and a wetland river park. Trails would connect park and wetland spaces in Baylands to Sierra Point Marina, Central Brisbane, and the ridge.

The character of future park and open space was also important to the Committee. Several members expressed the desire for maintaining and creating topography in the park areas, allowing for views to the Bay, and for visual and physical variety such as in Golden Gate Park in San Francisco. Preservation of natural topographic features, therefore, was also high on their agenda, such as for Ice House Hill. With its unique history, horse grazing, and

several endangered species, the hill has a cultural and symbolic quality within Brisbane. Because of the sensitivity to the Ice House Hill site, a few committee members were reticent about the proposed bridge between the Lagoon and Bayshore Boulevard, believing that the construction could negatively affect the topography of the hill. Additional issues with vehicular travel in and around the site focused on the noise generated by the freeway. Buffering the noise through a sound wall or vegetation was mentioned as a likely mitigation, although these options were countered with the fact that bay views would be compromised.

LAND USES AND DEVELOPMENT CHARACTER

Land use and development character also had significant bearing on the quality and design of future open space. One of the major concerns of the Committee was that of creating a continuous network of open space through both the southern, more open part of the site, and new development. Thus, the design of buildings came into play as an important issue. On the south end of the site, the Committee described building structures as low (0-3 stories), ancillary structures or facilities like restaurants that would complement park uses. However, in the northern portion of the site, some members did express the acceptability of taller building heights if they allowed for more open space. Others lobbied for lower buildings with more surface area for solar energy production of green roofs.

For the most part, suggested uses of new development centered on a strong core of green technology and sustainability. Uses such as an alternative fuel station, sewage treatment plant, and energy production with bio-fuel, wind, and/or solar power were suggested; as were options for food production and creating opportunities for purchasing local products such as in a farmer's market. Some committee members also wanted to see uses that maintained some of the historic value of sites like the Roundhouse and horse farm on Ice House Hill. Additional suggestions included facilities for the elderly—given proper remediation of the land—a mausoleum, and even a possible water source/storage facility for emergency City use.

Ecology in Design

The Committee recommended that one of the alternatives studied for the site should maximize sustainable and eco-friendly technologies and site design to create a completely integrated system of development and landscape. Possibilities for alternative energy uses like water, wind, and sun generation could be explored both as a use and as a building element to be incorporated into building structures and sites. Likewise, any future design should utilize green, sustainable building technologies like green roofs and parking lots to reduce heat and provide additional permeable area.

However, as a whole, while the Committee wanted to see sustainable, active uses in the Baylands planning area, it did express concern over fertilizer run-off into the Lagoon or Bay from manicured open spaces such as a golf course, as well as the overall toxic content of the site and the need for remediation.

4 Parks, Beaches, & Recreation Commission

A special commission meeting was also held on April 25 for the Brisbane Parks, Beaches, and Recreation Commission. Similar to the City Council/Planning Commission and other committee meetings, the format for the discussion was an open forum for committee members to contribute their overall vision for the Baylands site. The committee discussion focused upon opportunities for recreation and community benefits for existing Brisbane residents, as presented in the following section.

4.1 MAJOR THEMES

CONNECTIVITY

The Commission stressed the importance of incorporating Baylands into the existing recreation network of Brisbane and the surrounding area, with new uses connected to existing trails and recreation areas, as well as to transportation hubs and corridors like the Caltrain station. For instance, the Commission described the recent completion of a new hiking trail through the Crocker Park area, and how they would like to see future connections from the trail to the Bay Trail and Baylands. Further incorporating the Bay Trail throughout new development in Baylands was also cited as an important element of the project.

COMMUNITY RECREATION

Many of the ideas expressed by the Committee were gleaned from a recent Parks, Beaches, and Recreation Community Survey, within which Brisbane residents were expressly asked what they would like to see at the Baylands site. Popular responses included both passive and active uses, with some focused on opportunities within open space areas, and others more venue-based. Some of the major open space activities included a golf course, driving range, and concession stand, as well as a "man-made" lake for boating and other water opportunities. For the latter activities, the Commission felt that the Lagoon was a prime opportunity to offer passive recreational boating and kayaking, and stressed that use of the Lagoon would require new connections to the area, as well as associated parking and concessions. Additional large-scale and outdoor active uses recommended included:

- Sports complex with various full-size sports fields for soccer, baseball, and softball, and a concession stand;
- Tennis courts;
- Children's play area; and
- Walking/running track and trails.

Several indoor and community-serving facilities for entertainment, health, and community gathering were also mentioned. For venues such as a community center/gymnasium with work-out facilities, the Commission members expressed that they would like to see these open to both residents and employees of Brisbane. Other venues suggested included a theater/performance center and indoor ice hockey and ice skating rink.

While the Committee recommended a number of active uses for the site, members did stress that the open space in the Baylands would not have to be fully active—that parts of the area could just incorporate trails and passive uses. In addition, several members mentioned that while the 25 percent minimum open space requirement in the General Plan might be sufficient, they would like to see as much open space as possible. Finally, the Commission voiced a few major concerns for having open space in Baylands—the first being the amount of water consumption required for manicured landscapes for golf and sports fields; and the second being the wind levels in the Baylands. Activities like golf and other sports may suffer; windbreaks with trees, and through the siting of buildings throughout the development could play a role in mitigating some of the wind issue.

5 Comments by Topic

Specific comments and issues identified by all of the Council, Commissions, and Committee members are cataloged below by topic. The statements contained in this section are representative of the opinions of participants in the workshops and meeting discussion forums. Some statements may contain factually inaccurate information, but were nevertheless included in order to provide as complete a summary of input as possible.

5.1 OPEN SPACE AND CONSERVATION

LOCATION AND AMOUNT

- More open space throughout entire project.
- No development in the southern half of the area—just have reclaimed waterways and marshlands.
- Open space incorporated into development—accessible by all.
- Do not want to have Phase I with minimum open space and then not have enough in Phase II or anything at all if Phase II does not happen.
- All of the land south of lagoon Way and Icehouse Hill should not be counted toward the minimum 25% of developer-provided land—should be in the landfill and rail yard area.
- Integrated throughout the development to benefit quality of life for San Francisco residents.
- Open space vs open area: planning commission to better clarify in regard to the requirement for 25% open space.
- Southern area should be open area, more open area in northern area.
- Integrate open space/open area—40% min. throughout development.
- Native species within the natural area.
- 50% minimum; meandering throughout, but connected to the mountain, pathways through wetland river park, crossing street with green corridors.
- Most through southern area with footpaths, bike paths within Lagoon to Sierra Point.
- 50%--how will it be measured and implemented? Build it, and then go from there.
- Don't want to live in a city that looks like a jail. The 25% should not be included in the open space—waterways, lakes; native wetlands.
- Naturalistic open space no more than 10 minutes walk from any area in the development.

- Dirt moving operation—keep dirt piles as hills/geographic/topographic features.
- Contoured, not 600 acres of flat ground.
- Southern portion targeted as much as possible—doesn't think that the southern portion south of the creek should not be the limited factor—could see it north as well.
- Could see park land and golf course.
- Park with varying levels of height so that you can have views of the Bay, as well as views similar to that of Golden gate park from Brisbane.
- Concerned in the relationship of the open space to the water courses—in that the water courses should not be calculated into the open space calculation.
- Landscaping—native, since they adapt to the soil—the majority of the content of the soil is clay.
- 25% minimum which is over 150 acres for the overall project.
- Open space vs open areas in planned development.
    - The 1994 General Plan calls for 25% open space/open area in the Baylands. The distinction is between publicly owned open space and privately owned open areas like landscaping or a golf course.
    - The problem with the General Plan and open space plans, do not specify what percent should be public and what should be private.
    - The committee has recommended that the majority of it be open space. In the open space plan, they mean publicly-owned open space.—for the new gp, which is in the process of being considered.
- Minimum 25% open space/open area, with the majority publicly dedicated.
- Would like to see 40-50% open space.
- There are areas the committee (Open Space & Ecology) would like to see as publicly designated areas that the city does not want to own—public easement/conservation easement.
- Open space does not mean parking lot medians.
- Wants to see most of the 25% for conservation and the lower portion for human recreation.
- 25% is sufficient—although some would like to see as much as possible. Open space doesn't have to be fully active—could just incorporate trails.

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE USES

- Open space: golf course, wetland river park with interconnecting paths connecting to the Bay Trail.
- Recreation—the Sierra Point marina is totally cut off and they should have trails that connect the Baylands to the Marina to the center of town and the ridge.
- Sports complex, walking trails, playing fields were the biggest—especially soccer fields—a lot of kids who play soccer.
    - No specific locations—would need to consider wind factor for sports fields.
    - Issues of parking with the sports complex; concessions/facilities.
- Golf course—concerns registered at some point about using chemicals or herbicides that would result in runoff or of concern to users.
- Looking into possible usages of the Lagoon itself—minor boating, passive uses, kayaking—
    - Would need a connection to the area, concessions, parking.
- Hiking trails: now opened up a new hiking trail through the Crocker Park area—the idea of the master plan area has future connections to the Bay trail and Baylands.
- Bay Trail would need to be incorporated into the project.
- Would love to be able to connect the Crocker Park trail to the Caltrains station.
- Gymnasium/community center (there is a proposal for developing one on the northeast ridge).
    - Would like to see one on Baylands as well; to include a workout facility.
    - All of the facilities are open to the general public, including people who work in Brisbane.
    - Water play structure.
    - Indoor ice hockey/ice skating rink.
- Golf course, putting green—can be a contentious subject because of water use and wind issues—but would like to see one.
- Major concern for any activity in that area is wind—windbreaks with trees, siting of buildings.

CONSERVATION AND PROTECTION

- Vistación Creek—think of it as a viable habitat creation, accessible for wildlife.
- reflect more of what might have been there naturally, restore areas that can be, reclaim to have natural setting brought back—native restoration, not manicured green/imposed green open space.
- lagoon for passive recreation—set aside for birds, tidal wetland, exposed mud at some point in day.
- Incorporate the wetlands—idea of the wetlands river park.
- Wetlands river park—to go from the PG&E area, down Bayshore, and then along Vistación Creek.
- Ice house Hill—an area that should be preserved for open space—Boneyard Hill.
- Johnny jump-up and viola habitat developed by the horse grazing; place for the silverspot butterfly as well—which is endangered.
- Opposes the proposed bridge between lagoon and Bayshore—would have a bad affect on the slope of Ice House Hill—the connection and flow of traffic doesn't make any sense.
- Likes the idea that there is a tiny bit of ruralness to Brisbane—might be able to improve the facilities on Icehouse /Horse Hill (which has historical value because there is nothing in the county of that caliber-not really any buildings or structures of value).
- Likes what was done behind Costco in South city off of S. Airport—wetlands with trails (decomposed granite) and habitat preservation—most of it is left very natural. Good use of open space around a commercial use.
    - Walking on trails and having nice bridges is a nice user-friendly way to have a wetland park.
    - Doesn't take much in terms of maintenance.
- Needs to be a study of plants and animals that are out there. (seen turkey vultures, and savannah sparrow) a lot of natural resources out there.
- Wetland river park should be more than just a meandering ditch—should be a functional wetland with hundreds of acres.

5.2 SUSTAINABILITY

- Sustainable community—economically; zero-energy community; zero-carbon emission.
- Environmentally sustainable.
- Local/world—supporting one another; consideration of global warming.
- Sustainable, lasting legacy.
- Energy use—equal and opposite component of energy generation through solar, water, wind to offset demand of energy use.
- Driving force for great developments throughout world—protects people, environment, how the area is used.
- Very critical element—make or break the project (along with open space)—should have very strong measures in the two areas.
- Community values sustainability, sustainable economic community.
- Millbrae/San Bruno—collect restaurant grease/oil and use it for waste management recycling plant.

- The community has the resources, take advantage and be a role model.
- 3 components: conserve and preserve environment; vital economy; social equity (housing and healthcare).
- Social equity: types of jobs should pay living wage for Brisbane (as a measure); housing should be addressed for those working in Baylands—for every job, a housing unit should be identified (sustainable development includes local housing opportunity for jobs).
- Economic: balanced for vital economy—avoid focusing on one segment—hedge our bets. no more than 20% of econ. activity should be attributed to one segment; ensure that businesses that contribute to the city redevelopment agency funds that are adequate to protect/sustain businesses.
- Renewable energy generation.
- Economic sustainability through entertainment, retail, arts.
- Fair share, but no housing in site: Candlestick Point will have 6,000 units with no jobs; Daly City will have mixed-use, mostly housing development at Cow Palace area; San Francisco building many homes—sustainability can be considered regionally, with Brisbane remaining small.
- Example for future textbooks to refer to project in terms of sustainability—responsibility and duty for future generations, to set an example.

- Passive energy, construction materials and techniques.
- Economic diversity.
- Housing issue: "houses galore" in the immediate area—derive jobs that are accessible by public transportation.
- Totally sustainable-defined alternative. Would take into account everything that would make the project sustainable—everything that has to do with waste, recycling, water, construction process, building operations, wind, solar energy.
    - Would involve where streets go, site planning, wind flow, foliage, sun.
    - Everything needs to be integrated since all of these things are interdependent.
    - Innovative, comprehensive alternative—a few council members have expressed an interest in it (Barnes and Conway); idea suggested by Bill Prince (Planning Director).
    - Water, wind, toxics, etc. need to be studied.
    - Would define the land use potential in various places.
    - Sustainable San Mateo—nonprofit with a lot of different ideas—sustainability indicators.

5.3 LAND USE AND CHARACTER

LAND USES

- Smaller commercial retail projects without big box retail.
- Low-rise office.
- Educational center, multicultural campus setting.
- Ground level shopping with restaurants and services to benefit the community.
- Commercial development is self-sufficient.
- Green-energy, alternative companies.
- Services to businesses where they can flourish; locals hired first.
- Shopping, light industry, biotech, office, open space.
- Arts and entertainment mecca.
- Music, theater, art shows, entertainment venues—large to very small.
- Roundhouse—year-round theater, art studios; 5-star hotel; convention center.
- Retail promenade with time-share condos above.
- Service, green manufacturing on the Bayshore Boulevard side.
- Provide a shopping area.
- Physical facility with track, soccer field, gymnasium.
- Flexible about wind energy production on-site; consider whether it can be done east of 101 in the Bay.
- No car dealership/outside car lots.
- Rise in use of nuclear energy to limit greenhouse gases—France is taking the lead and selling energy to other countries—is solar/wind enough?
- Great site for wind.
- Commercial center.
- Ability to remediate the existing toxins—best use would be no use at all if not able to remediate.
- Mixed uses, dynamic place for the community—shopping, education, cultural.
- Phasing: with an appropriate plan, a build-out could occur without proactive period of development.
- Effects of the Tank Farm need to be effectively screened.

- Green power plant—solar, wind and bio-gas.
- Biological sewage treatment plant—compatible with energy plant; using leftover gray water.
- Entice green building, alternative energy companies/buildings to the site—perhaps a campus involved with green-building research.
- Concentration to the north (housing) open space/bike paths to the south.
- Commercial—open plaza, European, inviting central Brisbane; bringing everyone together as a community.
- Commercial with mid-sized anchors.
- Icehouse Hill: maintained as open space, allowing the horses to remain.
- Sports complex.
- Understand economics of car lots.
- Hotel, convention center, arts/entertainment.
- Low-rent, light industrial area—warehouses.
- Bio-tech.
- Recreation (active—ball fields, mountain bike park at south end).
- Health care—doc in the box/clinic or hospital.
- Tank Farm: make it disappear.
- Would like a study done if sound walls are being contemplated, doesn't believe that they would lessen the traffic—what are the intentions in terms of buffering—perhaps would not be worth the investment.
- Mausoleum where local residents could be buried in their town.
- Would not like to see a state university since they are not governed by local municipality rules and so would have no control over them.
- Alternative fuel station—bio fuels to encourage local companies to have a place to fill up their vehicles—such as diesel and natural gas.
- Growing algae in floating bins in the bay to create biofuel.
- Sewage treatment plant—would be able to reclaim the water and use it for irrigation.
- There is a well in the Baylands (200 foot aquifer) and spring boxes (50 gallons a minute)—explore these sources. Should do some detailed surveys to see what there is.

  - The southeast San Francisco plant is vulnerable to terrorist attack and earthquake.
  - Would like to ensure health safety and autonomy for the community.
  - 7-day water supply for the City, but PUC says that the City could be out of water for 60 days in an emergency situation.
  - Baylands needs to build it's own water storage—could be easier to build more if one is being built—City engineers say that the City doesn't need it.
  - Not that the Baylands to foot the bill for the rest of the City, but could provide opportunity for more storage. Any community that has wells, they would be in a better situation—even if the well is just a storage (doesn't believe that the Baylands wells would be contaminated—it's 200 feet deep.

- Need to include food production, which has been taken out of General Plan:
- Fish hatchery, not farming; mushrooming.
- Buying locally-produced items such as in a farmer's market.
- Industrial zone right in the middle should be deleted—needs to be clarified in terms of getting rid of industrial zoning.

HOUSING

- San Francisco has housing in the area—still have a concern about housing on the site; especially doesn't want to see single-family/sprawl.
- condos near San Francisco site for continuity—make housing a possibility.
- Seaport Village in San Diego—housing is small-scale, stores are small (although not sure of the economic feasibility of this smaller scale).
- Housing: If toxins are removed, would like to see housing to the north, near multi-modal transportation hub.
- Residential above, mixed-use.
- Housing: absolutely no permanent housing—the alternative of time-share condos; not continuous 24/7 living—could address the human element as well as hotel and convention center.
- Long-term housing in question; although there is a need for a consistent human element to create a sustainable area—how to get around it or incorporate housing is the question.
- Needs to be a clean, safe environment—if housing is in the mix would maintain an economically viable sub-community on the Baylands.
- Housing is a concern in respect to toxicity; as well as schools.
- Baylands development helping to provide for housing.
- Facilities—elder care facilities—could have some type of housing facilities.

CHARACTER

- User-friendly; people know where they are, where they are going and what is offered in the area.
- Clean, safe, and sustainable business center that will enhance the quality of life of residents of Brisbane.
- Continue maintaining the small-town atmosphere; at the same time providing services at global/cultural level for the arts.
- Something that everyone in Brisbane can view/see and appreciate/be glad it's there.
- Businesses: green, focused on energy efficiency, with an artistic/cultural focus.
- Human element is the key and will provide for the overall experience in Baylands; should be looked at—recreate scenes from Barcelona; old-world architecture and commercial centers—and do not repeat old mistakes.
- Farmer's market, like Mountain View, Santa Barbara—type of architectural themes and circulation patterns—bring in ideas from other places like this.
- Balance with green building and sustainability.
- Role-model for the entire area/Northern California—create a first-class vision for the area.
- Businesses that create high-level, professional, and continuous jobs.
- Sidewalk cafes, neighborhood quality.
- Kids have nature-deprivation—be around "farm" animals—horses and geese—part of the Brisbane culture she'd like to see preserve.

REMEDIATION/CONTAMINATION

- Contaminants mitigated to the extent that a walk in Baylands is no more hazardous than walking through Central Brisbane.
- Remediation of existing environmental contamination—maintain air and water quality.
- Concerned with golf courses or lawn parking lots—make sure that fertilizer runoff wouldn't create a problem in the lagoon or bay.
- Incorporating permanent features that will detoxify soil and water.
- Environmentally responsible development begins with clean water and clean soil.
- Assumption that contamination would be resolved before the dev would occur.

5.4 BUILDING HEIGHTS, DENSITY, AND DESIGN

HEIGHTS

- No buildings around lagoon, increasing development density to the north.
- Most of the open space in the south, no development around the lagoon.
- Development should be densest in north, with southern 30-50 percent devoted to open space, wetlands, restoration (see ducks, geese, herons).
- Zero in the south.
- No problem with taller buildings in northern part, trade-off for open space.
- Northern area—most use; southern less. looking at taller than six stories in the north.
- Not how tall, how it looks—architectural integrity, how it looks from above—no Trump tower. Don't' compromise in materials; design with articulation.
- 3-4 stories; not shadowed by development, lower buildings are better—more dynamic and livable environment; living roofs for sustainability, especially for visibility from upper Brisbane areas—example for rest of world.

- South of channel—2-story club house on golf course—okay.
- Look at Sierra Point—4-5 stories, 6/7, 12-story towering—do we want that bulk and mass? Design, design, design—design the buildings well.
- 3 stories around drainage canal—stepping up to 1 to 2 12 story buildings around transportation hub. Don't block all views—going north on 101, if tallest building is visible, also not obscuring views to the Bay.
- Further north, higher would look at going.
- Building heights—have zero to two to three levels; understands the need for facilities or restaurants—small structures within the park area that complemented the uses would be Okay.
- Building Height—what kind of buildings are the most sustainable in terms of energy—more energy to build high; can have more solar panels or green roofs if buildings have more surface area.
- Would rather see taller buildings with smaller footprints and larger open space areas—more concentrated building area and more cohesive open space (12 story Sierra Point buildings do not bother her); parking structures rather than spread-out parking.

DENSITY & DESIGN

- Stone, concrete, wood, metal and recycled materials.
- Draw from heavy industrial heritage and modern design.
- Safe development, green building techniques—net zero/net plus through solar/wind energy generation.
- All construction should be as green as technology permits.
- Require every building to be energy-neutral with solar technology.
- Design priority should be upon how buildings look from above: don't want to see mechanical equipment, communications towers, etc. Rather, solar panels.
- Passive—siting of buildings, use and position of windows, arbors, trellises, shadows, minimize heating and cooling.
- Active approaches—living roofs (cut down on heating and cooling demands); triple/double glazing; film on glazing.
- Material selection—build for long term—quality of construction to create enduring buildings; materials that could be recycled, not added to a future landfill.
- Fucuoka (in Japan)—is an example of architecture woven into the landscape—if buildings in Baylands are woven into the landscape, it would lessen the visual impact yet still support the density.
- High energy efficiency.
- High-end design, materials—more important than height.
- Living roofs.
- Types of buildings—incorporation of green roofs and alternative energy uses.
- Green building techniques.
- Parking lots made of lawn—very successful—would reduce heat and would be a permeable surface—bioswale.
- Construction end—fly ash concrete since Portland cement is the largest consumer of energy to burn limestone—can get away with 25 fly ash/75 percent for structural and even less for parking areas. Fly ash could come in via rail and reduce the cost to the environment.
- Wind rows with trees—issue with solar panels on the roofs of the buildings—trees out on the Marina get huge—just to ensure that the solar panels are not overshadowed the majority of the day.
- Advantage to concentrating density—whether by going up or clustering the buildings.
- Concentrating the buildings, creating cohesive open space.

5.5 CIRCULATION AND TRANSPORTATION

- Should be safe for pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicular traffic—circulation is a key element.
- Multi-modal transportation hub, bringing together residents with community centers, interactive educational opportunities on climate change, emphasis on alternative energy.
- Transportation hub, intersecting with Geneva Avenue, Class I bike paths that go through the entire site.
- Geneva Avenue corridor—making the connection to Candlestick Point work (frequent bus system); tying into Caltrain station and to BART.
- Connecting people from Central Brisbane to the system.
- Get people out of the cars-minimize the need for driving;
- Provide a shuttle to and from town.
- Bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly.
- People walking by, not driving.

- East-west access with access to 101, extension of Geneva Avenue.
- Easy, non-highway access between Candlestick and to northern Baylands.
- Facilitating connections to transit (BART, Caltrain, etc.) should be of highest priority.
- Make sure that open space and transportation elements are not lost—all open space exactions should come with Phase I—whether in Phase I area or not.
    - including all east-west transit development as well (in Phase I).
- Limit use of cars.
- Sea of green, not of cars; limiting number of cars within the site.
- Caltrain station not in the right place—should have been further south, closer to the Tank Farm; which could have provided as buffer from Tank Farm.
- South and north freeway access should be carefully studied; go beyond 2020—at least 2030 or further.
- Part of the plan is a connection between the different geographic pockets—central, Sierra Point, Baylands—perhaps a streetrail car could connect them—accessibility is key.
- Investigate permanent public transportation system within Baylands—bus system; perhaps do own system outside of Samtrans, Muni—alternative energy buses; free; supported by transportation tax.

- Pedestrian-only pathways (trails and through urban sections of development).
- Likes the shape of Lagoon Way—not a straight shot, curves open up the view, progression to town.
- Bayshore Caltrain station is bypassed by Baby Bullet—would be minimal service from Caltrain.
- Stick to the General Plan.
- Having all of transit changes in place for Phase I.
- Should be able to have connectivity to transit areas from main areas of the city.
- Public interest not being served—poor scheduling, feeling of not being safe—connectivity and accessibility is extremely important.
- Railroad crossing—has seen good below-grade crossings—should explore.
- Class I bikeways.
- Dedicated bus lanes for Samtrans bus routes.
- Pedestrian short-cuts—Shoreline Park in Foster City is a good example; through the building environment as well.
- Caltrain station location—wrong location, especially for multi-modal transportation—challenge will be getting people to and from along Geneva. Would like to see the station move, although chances are low.
- Move people throughout the site—entertainment venue could set up a system (Disneyland).
- Lagoon Road could move north, but still meander through.
- Complete transportation hub—3rd Street light rail ends in wrong place.
- Train stop at Bayshore and Tunnel—dream of community.
- Dedicated bus lanes.
- Pedestrian paths that wander through development, not necessarily along streets.
- Hard to get from City to Bayshore—higher traffic—development should not create more traffic or be a main route for trucks.
- Geneva overhead pass through middle of development—needs to be designed to be pleasant to the eye.
- Alarmed by lowering the transit corridor—when you dig down, you lower the water level line—be an issue for any potable water out there.

6 Implications for the Baylands Alternative Plans

Similar to the input received from community members and stakeholders, the input provided by the City Council, Planning Commission, Open Space & Ecology Committee, and the Parks, Beaches, and Recreation Commission is a significant contribution to the development of the Baylands Alternative Plans. The planning process will benefit from understanding better the large areas of concern around which many opinions coincided. The process will also benefit from the exposure to unique perspectives or singular issues that were not necessarily shared by many interviewed, but which sometimes help a planner tie other issues together when formulating possible solutions.

The consulting team will closely review and consider the Brisbane stakeholders' input, along with comments made at the first public workshop on May 12, 2007 and use these data as the starting point for envisioning the Baylands Alternative Plans. The results of this visioning process will be returned to the community in the form of Land Use and Urban Design Indicators, and the consulting team and the community will formulate alternatives together in another community-wide workshop later this summer.

DYETT & BHATIA
Urban and Regional Planners