



CITY of BRISBANE

Open Space and Ecology Committee Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, May 24, 2023 at 6:30 P.M. • Hybrid Meeting 50 Park Place, Brisbane, CA

The public may observe/participate in Committee meetings using remote public comment options or attending in person. Committee members shall attend in person unless remote participation is permitted by law. The Committee may take action on any item listed in the agenda.

TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE

IN PERSON

Location: 50 Park Place, Brisbane, CA 94005, Community Meeting Room

Masking is not required but according to the California Department of Public Health guidelines, people at higher risk for severe illness should consider masking. To help maintain public health and safety, we respectfully request that people not attend in-person if they are experiencing symptoms associated with COVID-19 or are otherwise ill and likely contagious (e.g., respiratory illnesses).

REMOTE PARTICIPATION

Members of the public may observe/participate in the Committee Meeting by logging into the Zoom Webinar listed below. Committee Meetings can also be viewed live and/or on-demand via the City's YouTube Channel, www.youtube.com/brisbaneca, or on Comcast Channel 27. Archived videos can be replayed on the City's website, <http://brisbaneca.org/meetings>. Please be advised that if there are technological difficulties, the meeting will nevertheless continue. The agenda materials may be viewed online at www.brisbaneca.org at least 24 hours prior to a Special Meeting, and at least 72 hours prior to a Regular Meeting.

Remote Public Comments:

Remote meeting participants may address the Committee. We also encourage you to submit public comments in writing in advance of the meeting. Aside from commenting while in the Zoom Webinar, the following email will be also monitored during the meeting and public comments received will be noted for the record during Oral Communications or during an agenda item.

Email: aetherton@brisbaneca.org

Join Zoom Meeting: www.brisbaneca.org/osec-zoom

Meeting ID: 976 4295 0160

Call In Number: 669.900.9128

Note: Callers dial *9 to "raise hand" and dial *6 to mute/unmute.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Adrienne Etherton at aetherton@brisbaneca.org or (415) 508-2118. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

- A. Consider any request of a committee member to attend the meeting remotely under the “Emergency Circumstances” of AB 2449

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- B. Minutes of April 26, 2023

OLD BUSINESS

- C. Quarry Development update

NEW BUSINESS

- D. Brisbane Acres Vegetation Management Plan Review
- E. OSEC comments on Baylands EIR Notice of Preparation

STAFF UPDATES

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

CALENDAR ITEMS

CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBER MATTERS

NEXT MEETING: June 28, 2023

ADJOURNMENT

B.

File Attachments for Item:

B. Minutes of April 26, 2023



CITY of BRISBANE

Open Space and Ecology Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, April 26, 2023 at 6:30 P.M. • Hybrid Meeting 50 Park Place, Brisbane, CA

CALL TO ORDER – 6:35 PM

ROLL CALL

- A. Consider any request of a committee member to attend the meeting remotely under the “Emergency Circumstances” of AB 2449 – none.

Committee members present: Becker, Calmes, Ebel, Fieldman, Nunan, Rogers, Salmon

Staff members present: Deputy Director of Public Works, Kinser; Sustainability Manager, Etherton; Special Assistant – Sustainability, Regan; Legal Counsel, Roush

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Salmon moved to adopt the agenda and Nunan seconded; the motion was adopted unanimously

ANNOUNCEMENTS – Legal Counsel presented on the importance of committee members using city emails. All city business needs to be easily retrieved if needed, doing this retrieval from personal email accounts is cumbersome. From time to time, cities receive public document requests that involve a particular item of city business. In an extreme situation, committee members could be called upon by a court for them to determine which personal emails involve city business and which do not. So long as city-related business is conducted through a separate system (i.e., separate email accounts on the same smartphone), this separation should be sufficient. City matters that are not within the committee’s subject matter jurisdiction can be discussed using personal email. If a committee member receives an email to their personal account regarding city business, best practice would be to forward the message to the city email account and reply from that account.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – none.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- B. Minutes of March 22, 2023 – Salmon moved to approve the minutes and Ebel seconded; the motion was adopted with Nunan and Calmes abstaining.

NEW BUSINESS

- C. Consider formation of subcommittee(s) for review of Baylands Specific Plan and future EIR – Etherton confirmed the City Attorney agreed to having multiple subcommittees. The recommendation is to have up to 3 subcommittees, with each person serving on no more than 1, with the intent of avoiding serial meetings. Committee members discussed how to assign the chapters of the Baylands Specific Plan. It should be acceptable for all committee members to read and discuss chapter 04 within the separate subcommittees before discussing it as a whole group at the next publicly noticed OSEC meeting. Staff participation is not necessary at these ad hoc subcommittee meetings.

All will read Chapters: 00, 01, 02, 04, 09. Three subcommittees: Rogers, Becker: 03, 08; Calmes, Salmon, Fieldman: 05, 07; Nunan, Ebel: 06.

The 30-day Notice of Preparation (NOP) public comment period began today. The next OSEC meeting is the day before comments are due (May 25). There is also a public meeting scheduled for May 9. Subcommittees should submit their comments & questions to staff by May 17 for compilation and posting with the May OSEC meeting agenda, at which OSEC can finalize their public comment for submission.

Etherton shared a flowchart showing the [Brisbane Baylands Review Process](#), published on the city website.

- D. Consider formation of subcommittee(s) for future review of Quarry Development and EIR – Kinser reported that the Council agreed to OSEC review. There is no application available to review at this stage, so this is a discussion about future review process. Salmon stated this is a development in the HCP which could have significant impact, and asked if there was a specific plan available to review; staff will investigate. Decided to keep this on the agenda for next meeting.

STAFF UPDATES

Etherton:

- Building Efficiency Program Amendment passed City Council on April 6th and 20th. Upon inquiry, Etherton detailed the changes made.
- Charge Level 2 EV chargers:
 - A faulty setting for the Charge EV chargers was discovered and corrected, which should fix the slow charging experience that some users had previously reported.
 - Charging costs 30 cents/kWh, paid via app. City will receive majority of revenue (Charge receives fees); this rate was set in order to pay for electricity. Etherton will be keeping a close eye on usage and pricing, may need to increase price (especially during summer peak hours).
 - Regarding the EV chargers at Mission Blue, and the implications for parking: signs will be added indicating that these spaces should be used for active EV charging. Enforcement will likely be complaint based. We recognize that parking constraints could be a problem during events in the near term.
 - The construction at Tunnel & Bayshore is complete apart from a PG&E service upgrade. Completing reporting for the grants at the other sites.
- Fast chargers:
 - ChargePoint DC fast charger at Brisbane Village must be replaced; there is a sign posted that this parking space is available for any car. Currently, grant funding is not available for maintenance, replacement, or removal of existing EV charging stations.
 - Fast charger permit for city hall has been submitted.
- Solar interconnection application was submitted to PG&E for the Mission Blue Center project just in time before the net metering rule change.

Regan:

- Building Efficiency Program:
 - The annual reporting deadline is coming up on May 15. At this point, 21 out of 100 buildings have submitted: of these 21, 13 buildings are compliant, 3 are exempt, and 5 have pending revisions.
 - Starting this year, under the Beyond Requirements, commercial buildings must meet energy and water standards or conduct an audit and adopt improvement measures.
 - Vendor Touchstone IQ has greatly improved the compliance review process and is also helping with the preparations for the Beyond phase.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS * = ad hoc

- Events (Rogers, Salmon, Nunan) – successful Earth Day habitat restoration last Saturday with 27 volunteers including several from the city. Thank you to Adrienne and Jeff for your support and participation. July 22 is tentatively suggested for next event.
- Education and Outreach (Fieldman, Rogers) – Fieldman to write a Star article about dark skies (500 words and an image) for the June edition, needed by May 15. Rogers asked if there was space to put up educational posters in City Hall, and commission Bob to create them? Etherton will look into.
- Baylands Subcommittee (Rogers) – no update
- *Building Decarbonization (Becker, Ebel, Fieldman) – questions about implication of legal challenge to Berkeley's ordinance; to be discussed at next meeting
- *Open Space Plan Update (Calmes, Rogers, Salmon) – Kinser to follow up with information/packet
- *Crocker Trail Frog Habitat (Rogers, Nunan, Calmes) – several service requests received regarding drainage issue, and trail resurfacing. Kinser coordinated several experts to consult. Future work after frog season
- *Invasive Species Ordinance (Becker, Fieldman, Nunan) – no updates
- *Dark Skies Ordinance (Becker, Ebel, Salmon) – book recommendation from Ebel: "The End of Night: Searching for Darkness in the Age of Artificial Light". Working with Bob on mapping of environmentally sensitive habitat area. Some other pending items include streetlights and obtaining feedback from a consultant.
- *Tree Issues (Calmes, Ebel, Salmon) – concern about tree removal/cutbacks, ivy-covered city trees, and one tree in particular should be removed because it is buckling the sidewalk & street (purview of a service request). Could be an opportunity to advertise the right trees to replace downed trees.
- *Sierra Point Park Planning (Ebel) –
- *Lipman Science Fair Judging (Ebel, Rogers) – inactive

CALENDAR ITEMS – Summer Habitat Day (June 22)

CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBER MATTERS –

- Becker: gift certificate to native plant nursery is a fantastic Mother's Day gift!
- Fieldman: KQED "Road to Zero Carbon" beginning at 9pm this evening

NEXT MEETING: May 24, 2023

ADJOURNMENT – 8:38 PM

File Attachments for Item:

D. Brisbane Acres Vegetation Management Plan Review



755 Baywood Drive, Suite 380
 Petaluma, CA 94954
 (707) 996-6633
www.hanfordarc.com
info@hanfordarc.com
 CA LIC. 461167

BRISBANE ACRES GRASSLANDS ENCROACHMENT REDUCTION 2023

To: City of Brisbane
Address: 50 Park Place
 Brisbane, CA 94005

Hanford contact: Ariane Wilson
Phone: (707) 981-1131
Email: a.wilson@hanfordarc.com

Attention: Karen Kinser
Phone: (415) 508-2133
Email: kkinser@brisbaneca.org

Date: 5/15/23
Quote valid for: 30 days
Anticipated start: TBD

Item	Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit price	Ext. Price
1	Brisbane Acres Vegetation Management	7	DAY	\$3,143.00	\$22,001.00
GRAND TOTAL					\$22,001.00

SCOPE SUMMARY

- Improving and maintaining the open space, grasslands, and meadows that are already present via cutting and herbicide application on targeted vegetation.
- We estimate that the initial pass of the following sites will take 7 days to complete. Any additional consulting with County Parks may result in additional days on site(s) and an estimate for this effort can be negotiated as needed.
- Hanford will obtain and follow the guidelines dictated in a Site Activity Permit from the San Bruno Mountain HCP manager: San Mateo County Parks Department (<https://www.smcgov.org/parks/webforms/scientific-permit-site-activity-review-application>).
- Mapping of work will be performed in CalFlora.
- A representative from Hanford will attend a Brisbane citizen advisory committee meeting at the end of the work to give a presentation (ideally with photos and GPS data) describing the work that was performed and answering questions. The time commitment for this meeting will be less than one hour.

Sites to be Treated:

- East – Harold Road Site:** Cut/treat French broom/fennel on ridge with herbicide. Cruise areas for any new weed species.
- Brisbane Central – Humboldt – Water Tank Sites:** Cruise, map, and treat small populations of invasive species in all city-owned parcels between Harold Road and Margaret/Upper Paul Ave sites (Brisbane Central). Species focus on broom, fennel, cotoneaster, and pine.
- West – Margaret/upper Paul Avenue Sites:** Cut/treat resprouting invasive species (i.e., French broom, Eucalyptus, Acacia and Cotoneaster) with herbicide along Mountain Watch

new trail system. Cruise for missed Eucalyptus sprouts in upper Power Line area and lower slope of Paul Avenue/parking area. Map and assess any new populations of Erharta grass and Acacia resprouts in the Mountain Watch stewardship areas.

- **Brush Control – Various Sites:** Cut/treat native brush species in prioritized grassland areas throughout the acres. Expand on previous sites along the ridgelines in the Water Tank areas and begin new treatments on the ridges above Harold Road.

PROVISIONS

- 8-hour shift on-site.
- 4-person crew (1 crew leader, 3 crew).
- Portable restroom (1).
- 1 crew truck, 1 foreman truck (4WD-capable).
- Travel on and between sites and work areas (i.e., mobilization).
- Hand tools (dibbles, hoes, rakes, McCleods, Pulaskis, etc.).
- Herbicide equipment for treatment.
- Fuel for on-site tools and vehicles.
- Safety materials (spill kits, etc.) and personal protective equipment (PPE) for crew.
- Fire risk mitigation (fire extinguishers with gasoline-powered tools, equipment and vehicles, water reservoir available, round point shovels, etc.).
- Plastic bags, canvas totes/sacks, and other standard containers (action packers, plastic bins, etc.) with which to transport tools and equipment, etc.
- Decontamination of all equipment and tools (including work boots, gloves, etc.) with a 10% bleach solution or with 70% isopropyl alcohol before using onsite and when moving between different project sites.

CONDITIONS

- Prevailing wage rates assumed.
- Hanford requires a three (3) weeks notice to start work/schedule resources.
- Hanford works 7:00 am – 3:30 pm, Monday - Friday. This proposal excludes weekend and holiday work, unless specifically requested; in those instances, costs would be re-negotiated.
- Hanford reserves the right to re-schedule or postpone work at any time due to existing environmental conditions that created unsafe work environment for crews (Covid-19, air quality index, wildfires, etc.).
- We assume full access to the site in order to perform our work (gates unlocked, property access, etc.)
- Proposal specifically excludes design, surveys, monitoring reports or water pollution control elements (unless specifically negotiated).



AUTHORIZATION

By signing below, the proposed party has accepted this proposal by its duly authorized office, as of the day and year set forth below:

Signature

Date

Name and Title

E.

File Attachments for Item:

E. OSEC comments on Baylands EIR Notice of Preparation

City of Brisbane Open Space and Ecology Committee (OSEC) Comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP for the Baylands Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR))

Sea Level Rise

Measures for dealing with anticipated sea level rise (SLR) include the proposed Visitacion Creek wetland and the elevation of buildings and other structures and features. Almost all such measures are based on what are termed "Medium-High risk SLR" for the years 2050 and 2100. It seems that the specific estimates for Medium-High risk SLR come from the State of California Sea-Level Rise Guidance, 2018 Update, which is referenced on page 424 of the Specific Plan. This Guidance is, as of 2023, over four years old and does not incorporate the most recent findings of sea-level rise science, which indicates that sea levels are likely to rise further and faster than was predicted a few years ago.

Scientists have often understated the extent of possible global warming and the severity of its consequences in official reports such as the IPCC Assessments (<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/11/08/opinion/sunday/science-climate-change.html>) because the assessments are subject to consensus requirements and political review. Recent studies suggest that IPCC projections probably understate the danger. (<https://www.npr.org/2022/08/30/1120025637/zombie-ice-will-raise-sea-levels-more-than-twice-as-much-as-previously-forec>); (<https://www.sciencefriday.com/segments/antarctic-ice-shelves/>).

Thus, the whole spectrum of Sea-Level Rise risks seemingly should be shifted upward, so the Medium-High Risks incorporating the most recent science would be higher, perhaps considerably higher, than the 1.9 feet and 6.9 feet for 2050 and 2100, respectively. One of the above-referenced articles mentions possibly 15 feet of SLR by 2100!

- Shouldn't the measures proposed to address SLR (building "freeboard", space allocated to Visitacion Creek wetland) be re-evaluated and adjusted to account for the likelihood that SLR will be worse than previously expected?
- How will SLR, especially the larger-than-originally-expected SLR, affect the integrity of the cap over the landfill? The higher the sea level, the greater the weight and lateral pressure of seawater and the more likely is seawater intrusion and mixing with groundwater. Could it lift or breach the cap? I don't see any evidence that this possibility has been thoroughly studied in the case of the Baylands. See this *Los Angeles Times* article: <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-08-17/sea-level-rise-flooding-inland-california>.
- If Hwy 101 needs to be raised to compensate for sea level rise, how does that affect the proposed grading and water movement in the Baylands?

Electrical facilities, renewable energy generation, and battery storage

- Per research, storage of batteries can cause toxic and combustible gases "off gassing." How will this be addressed? How will the disposal of batteries be handled?
- Have any otherWhat challenges have other new developments undergone approvals and/or installation of awith large solar farm with and battery storage faced, and how have they been resolved? Any red flags?

- Confirm that no new fossil fuel infrastructure will be constructed evaluate the potential to remove and replace with electric and existing on-site fossil fuel infrastructure (i.e. natural gas lines) requiring relocation or modification.

Transportation

- Approval of the Geneva overpass and extension requires other agency approvals. ~~Is there a plan B? If not, the, how will~~ congestion on Bayshore and Tunnel ~~will be forever gridlocked~~ be addressed if these approvals are not received?; If the overpass is not viable, the development allocation should be adjusted to avoid gridlock.
- ~~Density and Development Controls~~ Again, if the Geneva overpass is not viable, then ~~development allocation must be adjusted to avoid gridlock~~
- Given the limited parking, is there a way to enforce that garages are used for cars?
- ~~The NOP says to expect 19,000 workers! Some may live in the Baylands or Brisbane, but many will commute from other areas. The Bayland's TOD fails to recognize that the Bayshore Caltrain station is only available on Local routes (meaning there is no express service) and that Caltrain (and BART) have limited coverage across the Bay Area. The impact of this is that commuters are pushed to cars instead of public transportation.~~

Commented [EA1]: Incorporated with above bullet

Commented [EA2]: This is not a question and transportation impacts are already going to be studied. Is there is a specific analysis being requested here?

Transportation/Cumulative Impacts

- Please consider the potential future development of Candlestick Point and the High Speed Rail Light Maintenance Facility. These two large projects are in planning phases and will have cumulative impacts on Transportation ~~(gridlock at 101!!!)~~, the lagoon overpass, and the environmental ~~effects-impacts~~ of this project.

Cumulative Impacts/Growth Inducing Impacts

- There will be considerable impact to 'old' Brisbane if the building height limits for the Baylands are considered precedent for future development in the city. Is there a way to ensure that the height limits only apply to the Baylands?
- How will the Quarry Development impact the Baylands Development - in particular, traffic: ~~Currently the Geneva overpass is highly critical to the Bayland project, but if the overpass is not feasible, Bayshore Blvd will be inundated... more thought and studies required for traffic congestion~~

Proposed Land Use

- ~~Please re-evaluate the definition of "Open Space" needs to be redefined--see table 2.2 Allowable Uses--Other--Open Space--and what is allocated -lots of infrastructure towards the Open Space goal. counted as Open Space, f~~For example, the parking lot for EV charging, solar panel arrays ~~and, the sewer lift station. Further areas in the BSP also imply that,~~ paved bike paths, the Roundhouse community space and landscaping adjacent to buildings all count as Open Space.

- The NOP references the California Air Resources Board (CARB) 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan; an updated Scoping Plan was adopted in 2022 that should be used as the basis for evaluation.

Fire Station relocation

- Please address concerns on emissions and safety of the 1000 gallon above ground fuel tank as this is adjacent to other businesses. Evaluate the ability to convert to non-fossil fuels and on-site clean energy storage.

Water Supply

- The ~~Infrastructure chapter NOP~~ states that the MOU with the Contra Costa Water District provides for 2500 acre-feet per year, plus or minus 20 percent. But the anticipated demand for potable water on the Baylands is less than half of that, or 1122 acre-feet/year. ~~My question is, why~~ is over twice as much water as anticipated demand being contracted for? Is there some other potential source of demand that we haven't heard about but that is "back of mind"? An explanation is requested.
- Per SF Water representative at the NOP meeting on 5.8.23, the water supply agreement is tenuous. Please address this, including the implications and any alternatives.

Water, sewer, and drainage facilities

- Please describe the technology and power source to be used for the recycled water facility and system. Evaluate the potential capacity to expand the recycled water system to areas outside the Baylands (i.e. Crocker Industrial Park).

Approvals

- Required Approvals - consider adding more prerequisites for the Approval of Specific Plan - i.e., move several subsequent approvals of the BSP to the prerequisite category - i.e. Water, Geneva Overpass, etc...

Noise

- Pile driving during the construction phase of this project will have significant noise effects. Recent experience with pile driving at Sierra Point highlights that the sound will bounce off the mountain behind Brisbane to amplify the noise level. ~~Can the city enforce~~ Please evaluate what mitigations (such as shrouds) can be employed during construction and their expected effectiveness, rather than waiving the existing construction noise ordinance?
- What are the noise pollution repercussions to having 20 story buildings up against the train lines? ~~Will it become a big echo-y canyon that will add to the urban din? Is there any~~ Please modeling that can predict and/or what can be done to mitigate? these impacts along with the effectiveness of various mitigation strategies that could be employed.
- ~~Only one of the Building Designs in Chapter 3 mentions use of CA native and drought tolerant landscaping (specifically, it's the hospitality type - see page 167). For a project geared towards~~

sustainability in our current climate, this seems like an oversight. All initial landscaping should be CA native (preferably locally native) and drought resistant.

Commented [EA3]: This appears to be a comment on the Specific Plan

Biological Resources

- ~~As part of the impact report, please consider evaluate the impact of whether~~ glare from the solar array and whether it will need to be directed away from critical habitat and residential areas.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- The BSP states that 90% of the composite wood used in the Baylands will be formaldehyde free, but doesn't address other wooden building materials. ~~Will there be no~~ Please address the use of pressure treated lumber, ~~or do they expect us to ignore and evaluate the~~ potential leaching of copper, arsenic and chromium?

Aesthetic Resources

- The height of rooftop solar is not included in the building heights proposed in Ch 3 of the BSP, however no mention is given of the allowed height of those installations or any set-backs of the solar installation from the edge of the roof. Please include this in the analysis of the aesthetic impacts of the Baylands project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- Evaluate the embodied emissions in materials and how to minimize them. In particular, consider opportunities to reduce the carbon intensity of materials such as steel and cement.

Energy Resources

- Evaluate the maximum feasible on-site energy generation as well as the expected energy load of the site.
- Evaluate opportunities to utilize non-fossil fueled equipment during both construction and operations.

City of Brisbane Open Space and Ecology Committee (OSEC) Comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP for the Baylands Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR))

Sea Level Rise

Measures for dealing with anticipated sea level rise (SLR) include the proposed Visitacion Creek wetland and the elevation of buildings and other structures and features. Almost all such measures are based on what are termed “Medium-High risk SLR” for the years 2050 and 2100. It seems that the specific estimates for Medium-High risk SLR come from the State of California Sea-Level Rise Guidance, 2018 Update, which is referenced on page 424 of the Specific Plan. This Guidance is, as of 2023, over four years old and does not incorporate the most recent findings of sea-level rise science, which indicates that sea levels are likely to rise further and faster than was predicted a few years ago.

Scientists have often understated the extent of possible global warming and the severity of its consequences in official reports such as the IPCC Assessments

(<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/11/08/opinion/sunday/science-climate-change.html>) because the assessments are subject to consensus requirements and political review. Recent studies suggest that IPCC projections probably understate the danger.

(<https://www.npr.org/2022/08/30/1120025637/zombie-ice-will-raise-sea-levels-more-than-twice-as-much-as-previously-forec>); (<https://www.sciencefriday.com/segments/antarctic-ice-shelves/>).

Thus, the whole spectrum of Sea-Level Rise risks seemingly should be shifted upward, so the Medium-High Risks incorporating the most recent science would be higher, perhaps considerably higher, than the 1.9 feet and 6.9 feet for 2050 and 2100, respectively. One of the above-referenced articles mentions possibly 15 feet of SLR by 2100!

- Shouldn't the measures proposed to address SLR (building “freeboard”, space allocated to Visitacion Creek wetland) be re-evaluated and adjusted to account for the likelihood that SLR will be worse than previously expected?
- How will SLR, especially the larger-than-originally-expected SLR, affect the integrity of the cap over the landfill? The higher the sea level, the greater the weight and lateral pressure of seawater and the more likely is seawater intrusion and mixing with groundwater. Could it lift or breach the cap? I don't see any evidence that this possibility has been thoroughly studied in the case of the Baylands. See this *Los Angeles Times* article: <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-08-17/sea-level-rise-flooding-inland-california>.
- If Hwy 101 needs to be raised to compensate for sea level rise, how does that affect the proposed grading and water movement in the Baylands?

Electrical facilities, renewable energy generation, and battery storage

- Per research, storage of batteries can cause toxic and combustible gases "off gassing." How will this be addressed? How will the disposal of batteries be handled?
- What challenges have other new developments with large solar farm and battery storage faced, and how have they been resolved?

- Confirm that no new fossil fuel infrastructure will be constructed evaluate the potential to remove and replace with electric and existing on-site fossil fuel infrastructure (i.e. natural gas lines) requiring relocation or modification.

Transportation

- Approval of the Geneva overpass and extension requires other agency approvals; how will congestion on Bayshore and Tunnel be addressed if these approvals are not received? If the overpass is not viable, the development allocation should be adjusted to avoid gridlock.
- Given the limited parking, is there a way to enforce that garages are used for cars?

Transportation/Cumulative Impacts

- Please consider the potential future development of Candlestick Point and the High Speed Rail Light Maintenance Facility. These two large projects are in planning phases and will have cumulative impacts on Transportation, the lagoon overpass, and the environmental impacts of this project.

Cumulative Impacts/Growth Inducing Impacts

- There will be considerable impact to 'old' Brisbane if the building height limits for the Baylands are considered precedent for future development in the city. Is there a way to ensure that the height limits only apply to the Baylands?
- How will the Quarry Development impact the Baylands Development - in particular, traffic?

Proposed Land Use

- Please re-evaluate the definition of "Open Space" and what is allocated towards the Open Space goal. For example, the parking lot for EV charging, solar panel arrays, the sewer lift station, paved bike paths, the Roundhouse community space and landscaping adjacent to buildings all count as Open Space.
- The NOP references the California Air Resources Board (CARB) 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan; an updated Scoping Plan was adopted in 2022 that should be used as the basis for evaluation.

Fire Station relocation

- Please address concerns on emissions and safety of the 1000 gallon above ground fuel tank as this is adjacent to other businesses. Evaluate the ability to convert to non-fossil fuels and on-site clean energy storage.

Water Supply

- The NOP states that the MOU with the Contra Costa Water District provides for 2500 acre-feet per year, plus or minus 20 percent. But the anticipated demand for potable water on the Baylands is less than half of that, or 1122 acre-feet/year. Why is over twice as much water as anticipated demand being contracted for? Is there some other potential source of demand that we haven't heard about but that is "back of mind"? An explanation is requested.

- Per SF Water representative at the NOP meeting on 5.8.23, the water supply agreement is tenuous. Please address this, including the implications and any alternatives.

Water, sewer, and drainage facilities

- Please describe the technology and power source to be used for the recycled water facility and system. Evaluate the potential capacity to expand the recycled water system to areas outside the Baylands (i.e. Crocker Industrial Park).

Approvals

- Required Approvals - consider adding more prerequisites for the Approval of Specific Plan - i.e., move several subsequent approvals of the BSP to the prerequisite category - i.e. Water, Geneva Overpass, etc...

Noise

- Pile driving during the construction phase of this project will have significant noise effects. Recent experience with pile driving at Sierra Point highlights that the sound will bounce off the mountain behind Brisbane to amplify the noise level. Please evaluate what mitigations (such as shrouds) can be employed during construction and their expected effectiveness.
- What are the noise pollution repercussions to having 20 story buildings up against the train lines? Please model these impacts along with the effectiveness of various mitigation strategies that could be employed.

Biological Resources

- Please evaluate the impact of glare from the solar array and whether it will need to be directed away from critical habitat and residential areas.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- The BSP states that 90% of the composite wood used in the Baylands will be formaldehyde free, but doesn't address other wooden building materials. Please address the use of pressure treated lumber, and evaluate the potential leaching of copper, arsenic and chromium.

Aesthetic Resources

- The height of rooftop solar is not included in the building heights proposed in Ch 3 of the BSP, however no mention is given of the allowed height of those installations or any set-backs of the solar installation from the edge of the roof. Please include this in the analysis of the aesthetic impacts of the Baylands project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- Evaluate the embodied emissions in materials and how to minimize them. In particular, consider opportunities to reduce the carbon intensity of materials such as steel and cement.

Energy Resources

- Evaluate the maximum feasible on-site energy generation as well as the expected energy load of the site.
- Evaluate opportunities to utilize non-fossil fueled equipment during both construction and operations.