



# CITY of BRISBANE

## Open Space and Ecology Committee Meeting Agenda

---

Wednesday, October 22, 2025 at 6:30 PM • City Hall 50 Park Place, Brisbane, CA 94005

---

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

Masks are no longer required but are highly recommended in accordance with California Department of Health Guidelines. To maintain public health and safety, please do not attend in person if you are experiencing symptoms associated with COVID-19 or respiratory illness.

#### Remote Participation

Members of the public may observe/participate in the Committee Meeting by logging into the Zoom Webinar listed below. 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](http://www.brisbaneca.org) at least 24 hours prior to a Special Meeting, and at least 72 hours prior to a Regular Meeting. Archived videos can be replayed on the City's website, [brisbaneca.org/meetings](http://brisbaneca.org/meetings).

#### Remote Public Comments

Remote meeting participants may address the Committee members via the Zoom Webinar or Call In Number. Meeting participants are encouraged to submit public comments in writing in advance of the meeting to [mebrown@brisbaneca.org](mailto:mebrown@brisbaneca.org). Emails will not be monitored during the meeting.

**Join Zoom Webinar:** [www.brisbaneca.org/osec-zoom](http://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 Mollie Brown at [mebrown@brisbaneca.org](mailto:mebrown@brisbaneca.org) or (415) 218-1348. 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**

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

- B. Minutes from 09-24-25 Meeting

**OLD BUSINESS**

- C. 6:30 PM Draft Open Space Element - Comments due 10/20

- D. 7:00 PM Baylands Specific Plan - Comment Review

**NEW BUSINESS**

- E. 7:30 PM PCA (Priority Conservation Area) Grant Application Discussion

- F. 8:00 PM 2026 OSEC Workplan Discussion

**STAFF UPDATES**

**SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

**CALENDAR ITEMS**

**CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBER MATTERS**

**NEXT MEETING:** Wednesday, December 17th, 2025

**ADJOURNMENT**

**File Attachments for Item:**

B. Minutes from 09-24-25 Meeting



# CITY of BRISBANE

## Open Space and Ecology Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 24, 2025 at 6:30 P.M. • Hybrid Meeting 50 Park Place, Brisbane, CA

### CALL TO ORDER – 6:30 PM

#### ROLL CALL

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

Committee members present: Armstrong, Atapattu, Becker, Salmon, Rogers, Walker.

Staff members present: Assistant City Manager, Fernandez; Senior Planner, Johnson; Sustainability Fellow, De La Cruz

#### ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Rogers moved to adopt the agenda and Becker seconded; the motion was adopted unanimously.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS – none

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS** – Becker would like to develop a formal process to evaluate and add plants to the Invasive Species Regulation. Staff to agendize the topic and whether this process should be handled by the full committee, a reinstated invasive species subcommittee, or the tree subcommittee. Armstrong would like to include scientific names of the species to avoid ambiguity.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES** – Minutes of August 27, 2025 – Armstrong would like to amend the minutes to add reference to the discussion on the Crocker Trail frog habitat and whether the issue was addressed with the property owner, as it remained unresolved at the time. Becker motioned to approve the minutes and Armstrong seconded. Rogers abstained due to her absence. The motion was adopted unanimously.

#### OLD BUSINESS

- B. Open Space Element - Ken Johnson, Senior Planner

- Johnson presented the Draft Element that included previous comments on the May draft made by the Committee
- Department to complete mapping and table of citywide vacant lands to comply with SB 1425 and include in the final draft to meet state requirements. The Bill goes into effect January 1
- Staff to review comments made by the Committee with aim to release a complete Draft in October, with a tentative plan to schedule a Planning Commission Hearing for November, followed by a City Council hearing in December

- Johnson stated that the aim of the Department is to have the Element adopted by the end of the year
- Committee members to review the draft Element individually and provide comments to Staff before the October 23 Planning Commission workshop. The Public Hearing will take place in November
- Individual comments can be submitted until the Draft goes to Council the first meeting in December
- De La Cruz to distribute a template for Committee

## NEW BUSINESS

### C. Baylands Development, Inc. (BDI) Presentation

- BDI presented elements of their Draft Specific Plan, available for review on the City's website, to the Committee
- BDI team to ensure written and verbal feedback from Committee is documented and reviewed during Specific Plan updates.

### D. Baylands Specific Plan - Review Comment Schedule

- Committee to review current redline of Baylands Draft Specific Plan, De La Cruz to resend
- De La Cruz to send out timeline and schedule of due dates
- Final comments due to staff December 9
- Individual comments can be submitted until December 31
- De La Cruz to follow-up with Committee on availability of the Draft at the library

### E. Quarry Trail work - Tony Verreos

- Tony Various Fire Trail and Beautification project efforts using natural materials to manage runoff and erosion was presented to the Committee
- Committee informally endorsed his ongoing work unanimously (no motion required)
- De La Cruz to follow up on receiving and distributing the drainage diagram from Verros
- Committee to agendize item at a future meeting if drainage issue escalates

## STAFF UPDATES –

- Fernandez mentioned the success of recent Coastal Cleanup day - 95 volunteers, 591 pounds of trash and recyclables removed.
- Staff mentioned upcoming Day in the Park – Committee to increase sign-ups for participation. Staff to address comments about the new timing of the event with Parks and Recreation Department

- Fernandez to confirm member term dates and changes, staff will aid in recruitment to ensure vacancies are filled
- Staff to research extension of the trash grabber program

#### **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS AND REORGANIZATION**

- Events (Becker, Salmon) – Day in the Park, as discussed
- Education and Outreach (Armstrong, **Rogers**, Walker) – Butterfly host plant display is up at the library with plant coupons donated by San Bruno Mountain Watch
- Climate Action Planning (Atapattu, Walker) – no updates
- Open Space Plan update (Becker, Rogers, **Salmon**) – no updates
- \*Crocker Trail Frog Habitat (**Armstrong, Rogers**, Salmon) – Staff to help coordinate next meeting with Committee and Paul Bouscal to plan another restoration day. Staff to follow up on concern about previous habitat destruction.
- Tree Subcommittee Meeting (Rogers, **Salmon**) – meeting scheduled September 29
- Baylands Specific Plan subcommittees – no updates
- Sierra Point Park Planning (Salmon) – no updates
- Liaisons – no updates
- PCA Grant (**Becker**, Salmon) – meeting scheduled September 29

**CALENDAR ITEMS** – Volunteer event confirmed for Dec 13 at Ice House Hill – time TBD. October 18, 10 AM – Noon is the Committee and Commission recruitment, Volunteer Pathways, at Community Meeting Room at City Hall. Dumpster weekend confirmed for Nov 15–17 (yard waste only).

**CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBER MATTERS** – Committee to include more robust collaboration with schools (beyond science fair judging) in 2026 Work Plan discussions. Discussion to create a new subcommittee for defensible space / wildfire resilience, with focus on sustainable landscape alternatives to concrete (e.g., permeable surfaces) and public education. Reinstatement of invasive species subcommittee, as mentioned.

**NEXT MEETING:** October 22, 2025

**ADJOURN – 8:27**

**File Attachments for Item:**

D. 7:00 PM Baylands Specific Plan - Comment Review

[Note that comments have been attributed to individuals in this draft for sake of review and discussion at the public OSEC meeting. They, and any other notes in red text, will be removed in the final submission document.]

**Open Space and Ecology Committee – All Comments as of 1 p.m. 10/16/2025**

**Chapter/Section: Chapter 00 - Vision & Executive Summary**

**Becker**

**General Comments:**

- Why does Figure 1 (and numerous figures afterwards in this and other chapters) in the April 2025 BSP “(w/redline)” say “Revise to reflect the updated Specific Plan Boundary?” This text implies that this figure is not up to date and that the boundaries are changing. I assume all these updates will be made available to the public prior to the City approving the Specific Plan. Further, for the few of us that will read this document numerous times, I recommend that the draft date be included on the first page of every chapter or in the header/footer of each page.

**Specific Comments:**

**Walker**

**General Comments:**

- Strong articulation of design and sustainability principles. Would benefit from more explicit prioritization of climate resilience, GHG accountability, and environmental justice as foundational goals.
- The summary should more clearly outline mechanisms for accountability and public oversight — especially around phasing, environmental performance, and public benefits delivery.

**Specific Comments:**

**Section 0.4.4 – Sustainability in All Forms**

This section presents an aspirational vision but lacks clarity around how sustainability goals will be measured, enforced, or reported. Recommend explicitly requiring public-facing GHG metrics, embodied carbon benchmarks, and clear LEED/zero-carbon building standards.

**Section 0.4.7 – De-Emphasizing Vehicles and Parking**

Appreciate the emphasis on pedestrian and transit-oriented design. However, parking strategies (especially in low-density zones like Icehouse Hill) may undermine TDM goals. Suggest parking

minimums be replaced with maximums, especially near transit nodes, and include TDM performance triggers for future buildout phases.

### Section 0.5 – Community Design Structure

The narrative and maps should clarify which districts or uses are slated for early vs. late-stage development. Phasing implications are critical to understanding when and where GHG emissions, traffic, and infrastructure burdens will manifest. Recommend inclusion of a development timeline visualization in the Executive Summary.

## Salmon

### General Comments:

- In the General Plan Amendment No. GP-1-18 for The Baylands, Northeast Bayshore and Beatty Subareas voted on with the passing of Measure JJ, there are several provisions that do not seem to be fully addressed by the Baylands Specific Plan.
- Under Chapter 5: Land Use Section 3. “Development within the Baylands Subarea shall be subject to the City’s approval of a single specific plan for the entirety of the Baylands Subarea and a development agreement that is consistent with General Plan policies, incorporate all applicable EIR mitigation measures, and is consistent with the following standards...” which goes on in detail.
- The original EIR was a Program EIR and many remediations were somewhat non-specific because the “specifics” were to be addressed in detail in the Specific Plan EIR. Also, numerous data gaps in the original EIR were to be addressed, as well.
- We spent many months reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Review for the Baylands Specific Plan and the final EIR has not yet been approved. Approving this Baylands Specific Plan before the Specific Plan EIR has been approved seems to be putting the cart before the horse. This Specific Plan does not address issues, omissions and data gaps raised in the Specific Plan DEIR and that is extremely concerning.
- Also under Chapter 5 Section 3 of the GP Amendment No. GP-1-18, I would just like to remind us all about certain provisions: C. All Residential development shall be designed and remediated to accommodate ground level residential uses and ground level residential-supportive uses such as daycare, parks, schools, playgrounds, and medical facilities. H. Key habitat areas, including Icehouse Hill and Brisbane Lagoon and adjacent habitat as identified in the 2001 City Open Space Master Plan shall be preserved, enhanced and protected. And K. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit to export soil or move soil from the existing landfill area for incorporation in a remediation or grading plan, the soil shall be tested in a manner approved by the City.

### Specific Comments:

- 0.2 Background: As acreage of the site in the current 2025 Specific Plan has been changed from 641.8 acres in the 2023 version to 680.1 acres, that the mandatory minimum 25% minimum open space/open are will be adjusted accordingly and maps will all be updated.
- 0.3 Planning Process: This section mentions the 2019 Home for All and the City of Brisbane sponsored series of community workshops and how these workshops “yielded valuable community input and direction, which is now the foundation of this Specific Plan.” How many Brisbane citizens actually attended these workshops? Was there any vetting of participants, such as having studied any of the inherent problems of the development site? I attended those workshops and I felt it was a “free-for-all stick your colored dots where ever you want...” That does not seem like a good basis for the foundation of a Specific Plan of this magnitude and complexity especially, considering the extremely toxic nature of the site.
- In reviewing this Specific Plan, it mentions the possibility of a school in the vicinity of Main Street perhaps within blocks B6, B9, or B10 or C2. Look at the map. This is close to the Roundhouse – a site that already will require massive remediation. In reviewing the Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, I would not consider this a safe area. Many sources of contamination were *overlooked or omitted* in the DEIR – specifically Lazzari Fuel Company (Operational from 1963 until destroyed by fire in 2024), Stauffer Chemical, the hide and glue plant (called the Boneyard and generated horrible smells up until the 1960’s), other long-term tenants on Industrial Way, plus Midway Village, located across Bayshore Boulevard along Main Street in Daly City, CA and do not forget a century of lead deposition along major transportation corridors, like adjacent Bayshore Boulevard, from decades of exhaust from leaded gasoline. Also, there is increasing evidence of the dangers of diesel exhaust. Children and young adults are most susceptible to lead and environmental poisoning. How can we approve a Specific Plan when these deep environmental concerns still need to be addressed?
- 0.5.1 Existing Conditions is exactly that, and does not take into account the “changed conditions” that will exist once remediation is complete. For example, the current site on the western side of the railroad tracks is relatively flat with the exception of Ice House Hill. Once a layer of 30 feet of “clean fill” is put in place in areas with the Roundhouse will be reconstructed, it will no longer be flat. This will change pedestrian mobility and bicycle ease of access, it will change storm runoff, viewsheds and many other aspects. I really do not think that this dramatically changing topography was adequately addressed in the Specific Plan.
- 0.5.5 West Side Mixed Use: South of Geneva “Along the tracks, high-rise towers site atop parking structures to afford views of the Bay and San Bruno Mountain.” What happened this? “All Residential development shall be designed and remediated to accommodate ground level residential uses and ground level residential-supportive uses.”

## Chapter/Section: Chapter 1 - Introduction

### Becker

#### General Comments:

#### Specific Comments:

- P36 – The text in the following subbullet appears here and again on page 46. It’s not clear what this means. The upper range of dwelling units is defined by Measure JJ. Why does the State density bonus for affordable units have anything to do with it? Does the statement imply that 2200 is not the maximum number of units allowed, because more can be added if the Developer chooses to put in more affordable housing?
  - *A range of 1800-2200 dwelling units (the upper range of which shall not exceed all units permitted under the State density bonus or other law providing for affordable housing)...*
- P37-38 references a Development Agreement that must be passed by the City. We have not been able to find that online. Can the status for that document be updated? Since this document includes the enforcement provisions, we think OSEC should be given the opportunity to review the document.
- P37 – The table needs to be updated to reflect the status of the RAPs for OU-SM, OU-2 and the Landfill Closure Plan. It still refers to the plans for approval of the drafts to be granted in 2021/2022.
- P40 (letter H) - The planned enhancement of Icehouse Hill will endanger the existing habitat. That area should remain undisturbed, except for invasives removal and any necessary remediation (i.e. the shooting range). The plan to turn it into a park with trails is unnecessary and will be additional expense to the Developer. Use Visitacion Creek and Lagoon Park to satisfy the need to develop more nature escapes but protect the Icehouse Hill habitat by keeping humans away. The General Plan requirements will be met by protecting Icehouse Hill as undisturbed habitat.
- P40 (letter K) - The Compliance summary listed does not satisfy the General Plan Provisions, specifically that “the soil shall be tested in a manner approved by the city.” There is a local story about a shipment of dirt from Hunter’s Point that had limited records and potential radioactivity. Any soil transported to the residential area needs to be tested in order to calm the concerns of current and future residents. Whether the rumor is true or not, the only way to be sure is to test the soil. Radiation detection equipment exists for mounting on haul trucks, which would minimize the resident’s concerns without impacting the timing of the development project.
- P52-53 – Building heights of 270 ft for Multifamily High, 260 ft for Transit Oriented Development, and 240 ft for Hospitality (all with additional uncounted heights for solar and trellises) are TOO HIGH for fill in the bay. First, its seismically scary (even if the building survives an earthquake, there will be stampedes in the stairwells like during 911). Second, the pile driving noise will be a severe nuisance for decades, given the number of tall buildings planned. Taller buildings require deeper piles.

**Walker**

**General Comments:**

**Specific Comments:**

**Salmon**

**General Comments:**

**Specific Comments:**

- 1.2.1 Historical Background: Mischaracterization of the site is an issue. “After the landfill operation stopped in 1967, a cover of soil was been placed over the landfill material, meeting the closure requirements at the time. Except for more recent activities related to soil recycling, industrial, fleet parking, retail and filling operations, the area remains largely unchanged since the landfill closure in the late 1960s.”

Well, this is certainly not correct. Southern Pacific's operations in Brisbane ceased in phases, with the Bayshore Yard closing for freight in the 1980s and the track removal completed around 2005. Stauffer Chemical's operations in Brisbane, CA ceased in 1982, when the polyvinyl chloride (PVC) manufacturing plant they operated was deactivated. Lazzari Fuel company began operations in 1963 and continued until it was destroyed by fire in 2024. The Kinder Morgan Tank Farm, a full pipeline system serving the Bay Area, including Brisbane and the Bayshore Yard, was completed in 1969 by Southern Pacific, at which point a separate subsidiary company, Southern Pacific Pipe Lines, Inc., was operating the system. Interim businesses that operated on the Baylands included Champion Speedway, a ½ mile oval track built in 1963 by Jim McClellan who later added a 1/8 mile drag strip on the speedways straightaway. This NHRA-sanctioned facility was the mainstay of the Bay Area auto racing scene until its closure in 1979.

- 1.2.2 Site Existing Conditions: Mischaracterization of existing conditions continues to be an issue.

Paragraph 2: “Since the landfill’s closure in 1967, the area has been used as a repository for fill materials from construction sites in the region and for recycling of sand, dirt, gravel, and other construction materials. Over time, these activities, which are authorized under a permit from the City of Brisbane, have resulted in variable topography, with elevations that are on average 40 to 50 feet above the surrounding grades.” This is not exactly correct. The soils stockpile operations exceeded the height limitation on the permits by over 25 feet and had to move and remove quite a bit of dirt.

Paragraph 4: “The ongoing movement of fill material into and recycled materials out from The Baylands has generally prevented the establishment of any significant vegetation.” This is

unfortunately not true. Almost the entire site from Bayshore to the Bay, including the piles of dirt, is now infested with *Cortaderia jubata*, also known as jubata grass and pink pampas grass, a highly invasive, non-native grass that is difficult to eradicate and is listed on Cal-IPC (California Invasive Plant Council) invasives list as well as Brisbane's list. This is a significant issue as the seeds are spread far and wide by the wind and the soil is now contaminated not only plants but with seeds and will continue to spread.

## Chapter/Section: Chapter 2 - Land Use Program & Definitions

### Becker

#### General Comments:

#### Specific Comments:

- Table 2.2 – The table footnote (on pgs 54-56) says that similar uses to what is in the table are also authorized. This is a loophole. We recommend that any unlisted uses instead be considered conditional.
- Table 2.2, Page 54 – Day Care should not be permitted as a Ground Floor Use on the heavily polluted land that was the railyard maintenance site until/unless there are many years of monitoring (in both wet and dry years) that proves the VOCs and other pollutants are not a concern. Children are more sensitive than adults and should be protected until it's proven that those areas are safe. Therefore, we recommend this be Conditional.
- Table 2.2, Page 55 – We're curious why Hardware Stores are not allowed in the Amenities Area, given that Convenience Stores, Food & Beverage Stores, and Retail Sales are allowed.
- Table 2.2, Page 56 – What is Accessory Use and how is it different than the other items below it. This seems like a loophole. Additionally, what Accessory Uses would be allowed in the Open Space Area?
- Table 2.2, Page 56 – Commercial EV Charging Stations are great but shouldn't be in open space area because they are paved parking spaces. Or if they are allowed because they're replacing non-EV-Charging parking spaces, they shouldn't count towards the Open Area requirement.
- Table 2.2, Page 56 – Why are Communications facilities allowed in the Sustainability Infrastructure Area?
- Table 2.2, Page 56 – The transmission towers should be conditional in the Sustainability Infrastructure Area, not Permitted. Their height impacts their surroundings, the EMI impacts their surroundings, and they have impacts on migrating birds. Their placement must be scrutinized prior to permitting.
- Table 2.2, Page 56 – Why is the Sewer Lift Station allowed in the Open Space Area?
- Page 56-E – The DEIR stated that Golden State Lumber will no longer receive lumber shipments by rail. This will greatly impact their cost of goods and therefore threaten their business. Further, shipping lumber by truck is heavy and inefficient and will increase the GHG emissions. Is the DEIR correct? We encourage you to consider how to maintain their ability to receive shipments by rail.

- Page 57-H – The “Conflicts with Other Laws” paragraph only exists in the Kinder Morgan Tank Farm subsection. Is it out of place? It seems like it should apply to the whole chapter.

## Walker

### General Comments:

- Detailed land use definitions and site program. Commend the effort to blend residential, commercial, and sustainability-focused zones.
- Greater clarity needed on adaptive reuse requirements, equity in housing distribution, and open space governance.
- Recommend land use definitions and allocations be updated to explicitly identify and limit fossil-fuel-reliant uses, embedding flexibility for emerging clean technologies, and codifying the city’s 66% by 2030 and 2040 net-zero climate targets into the plan’s development criteria as these timelines overlap significantly
- Various rules around non-conforming structures are mentioned at multiple points. Recommend that these concepts are revisited in a way that explicitly decouples requirements around offending structures so as not to hinder the ability to build or integrate renewable infrastructure like solar and battery storage, or add or service EV charging infrastructure, etc. in an ongoing way. Hypothetical examples: it should never be the case that installing needed EV chargers is blocked by or made unreasonably expensive by secondary requirements like curb dimensions or similar feature that functionally has nothing to do with EV charging.

### Specific Comments:

#### Section 2.2.2 – Preservation of Natural Resources

Strong intent to protect habitat areas like Icehouse Hill and Brisbane Lagoon. Recommend including performance targets and habitat health metrics, updated regularly, and public transparency on stewardship and funding responsibilities (City vs. developer vs. HOA/management company etc).

#### Section 2.2.3 – Infrastructure & Services

Critical to define ownership, operations, and maintenance responsibilities — particularly for energy storage systems, stormwater systems, and habitat corridors. Recommend a backup plan in the event of private entity failure (e.g. bankrupt developer vs. HOA/management company etc).

#### Section 2.3 – Land Use Program Table & Maps

Helpful overview of use distribution. Suggest including expected population and GHG emissions impact estimates by district to inform analysis of cumulative environmental burdens and transit needs.

#### Section 2.5 – Allowable Uses Table

Table may permit low-impact or non-performance-based TDM strategies (e.g., passive amenities) that dilute overall climate performance. Recommend a weighted impact scoring system or prioritization of high-leverage TDM interventions.

### Salmon

#### General Comments:

#### Specific Comments:

## Chapter/Section: Chapter 3 - Development Standards & Controls

### Becker

#### General Comments:

- This chapter has glaring examples of how the Open Space calculation is biased towards the developer.
  - On pages 90, 102, 113, 122, and 134, it says “A minimum of 50% of the podium setback shall be landscaped; the surface area occupied by built-in planters or other permanent landscape features shall be included in this calculation.” Really? Planters are hardly Open Space, even according to the Measure JJ definition.
  - It appears that the parks and greenways shown in Figures 3.7, 3.9, etc is called open space. While it may be a nice walking path, it’s not ecologically relevant to Brisbane and the San Bruno Mountain habitat. This is the problem with the measure JJ definition of open space. There’s nothing the BSP needs to do about it, but it feels like false advertising to call it open space when it more of a Parks and Recreation–type paved bicycle and walking path.
  - The following italicized text from P74 implies that an open-air theater, cafe, and museum are counted as open space, which is inappropriate: *“The footprint area of the Roundhouse shall be included in the 25% Open Space requirement. This restoration includes an open-air theater with flexible seating and stage, community space, a railroad museum, a café, and other community-oriented uses.”*
- The BSP authors do not seem to be aware of the Brisbane’s Invasives Regulation (which is different than the Landscape Ordinance referenced on P90, 102, 113, 122, 134, 151, and 160) and of the need to focus on planting non-invasive landscaping. While the promise for

conserving water in landscaping is a great first step, more must be done to protect the local habitat.

- It’s not until page 167 that the text in the following subbullet appears, which is interestingly in the description of Hospitality Area. All areas should be held to this standard or go further by focusing on drought-tolerant plants from San Bruno Mountain or at least the Bay Area.
  - *“Where landscaping is provided, at least 75% native California or drought tolerant plant or tree species shall be used (Refer to Section A4.106.3 Landscape Design).”*
- There are several mentions of “ground-mounted up-lights for trees” (p 144, 151, 159, 167, 176 and likely more that we missed). This is not compliant with Brisbane’s Dark Skies Ordinance. Lights need to be directed downwards. We recommend double checking Section 3.8 to confirm compliance with Brisbane’s Dark Skies Ordinance. At least two bullets are not.

**Specific Comments:**

- P72 – Roughly how many 270’ tall buildings are planned? Any how many 260’ tall buildings? It's not clear from this section or anywhere else in the BSP.
- P76 – It’s alarming that half of the allowed parking for the entire project is in the Icehouse Hill district. If this will be a tech-campus or an education-campus, there needs to be transit shuttles. Why are we encouraging people to drive to the area that is not near a main thoroughfare, such as Geneva Ave or 101. According to the DEIR, Bayshore Boulevard will be reduced to one-lane, so additional parking for the campus Mid/Low does not seem to benefit the project. This is concerning because it opens that area up for mass retail, similar to Serramonte and Daly City. Presumably, there will be some parking for the community ball fields, but hopefully there will also be a shuttle stop near there.
- P80 – Having 15 parking spaces max to accommodate the solar farm, battery storage, water storage, WRF, Lagoon Park, Baylands Preserve Park and the Brisbane Lagoon seems insufficient.

**Walker**

**General Comments:**

**Specific Comments:**

**Salmon**

**General Comments:**

**Specific Comments:**

## Chapter/Section: Chapter 4 - Sustainability Framework

### Becker

#### General Comments:

#### Specific Comments:

#### Specific Comments:

- P182 - #6 in table – It’s great to see focus on water conservation, but when talking about landscaping, we need to consider native plants, not just drought tolerant plants.
- P183 – Section 4.3.1 - Does the 7.5 lbs/sqft of waste include the Landfill Closure waste?
- P184 – We’re curious why the Multi-family Mid building type has the lowest allotment of parking per residential unit. It seems like the Multi-family High and Multi-family Low are similar in needs for parking, or that the Multi-family Low many need a little more because it’s farther from Caltrain.
- P184 – We’re curious why Campus Mid and Campus Low need so much more parking than the other commercial. If this is a tech-campus or an education-campus, there will be transit shuttles. Why are we encouraging people to drive to the area that is not near a main thoroughfare, such as Geneva Ave or 101. According to the DEIR, Bayshore Boulevard will be reduced to one-lane, so additional parking for the campus Mid/Low does not seem to benefit the project. Let’s encourage more shuttles!
- P187 #2 – The DEIR implied that the WRF non-potable water would be used in SSF, rather than in Brisbane. Please address this inconsistency between the BSP and the DEIR.
- P 187 #5 – It’s great to see the Development Standard of using locally adaptive native species! We've noticed a big inconsistency throughout the BSP wrt low-water landscaping versus natives (for example P182 #6; Section 4.8.1; P90; 102; 113; 122; 134; 151; and 160). The latter is highly preferred, because the plants are adapted to our climate cycles, are noninvasive and have a symbiotic relationship with the species of concern in our area.
- P188 – Section 4.8.1 - We’re very concerned that native plants are not mentioned at all in this section. There's more to landscaping than being drought tolerant.

### Walker

#### General Comments:

- **Lack of Concrete Commitments**  
While the chapter gestures at climate goals, it fails to clearly articulate enforceable requirements. Phrases like “carbon neutral” are used without defining mechanisms, timelines, or mandates—raising concerns that these goals could be achieved via offsets

or intensity reductions rather than actual phaseout of fossil fuel usage and infrastructure.

- **Misalignment with Brisbane Climate Goals**

The plan references California’s 2045 targets but does not anchor its timelines to Brisbane’s more aggressive 2040 net-zero goal or the 66% emissions reduction by 2030. This is a critical oversight that undercuts the City’s climate leadership and should be addressed explicitly.

- **Strong Commitment to All-Electric Buildings Undermined by Diesel Generator Loophole**

The plan makes a commendable and critical commitment to all-electric infrastructure, explicitly prohibits new natural gas infrastructure in residential and commercial buildings. This is a major step in the right direction and aligns with Brisbane’s climate goals. However, this progress is severely undercut by the lack of a phase out plan for existing natural gas infrastructure and the continued allowance of diesel backup generators in buildings. Given the availability of clean, reliable alternatives—including significant and already planned solar + battery storage—there is no justification for embedding any fossil fuel combustion into a development billed as “sustainable” and “all electric.” Allowing any diesel and natural gas undermines both the spirit and substance of the all-electric commitment and contradicts the emissions reduction goals laid out elsewhere in the plan. This loophole should be closed, and diesel generators should be explicitly prohibited.

#### Specific Comments:

- **4-2 Zero Carbon Buildings:** A Master Property Owners’ Association is mentioned in the context of *Section 4.3 Zero Waste* as having a role in outlining management of waste disposal, etc. Recommend they also play a role in providing clear information and access to solar and storage systems onsite to buyers and/or tenants. Solar and battery systems often benefit from access to monitoring dashboards and the like and may require some minimal maintenance and participation in associated virtual power plants or other load shifting programs that require an associated account and direct control of the assets. Who can monitor, control and profit from these systems via virtual power plant or other grid participation programs, etc. should be clearly established. And information about participation as well as relinquishing control at the end of ownership or a rental agreement, as well as hand-offs to new tenants etc., should be made easy, clear, public, and readily available.
- **4-4 Sustainable Transport:**  
The focus on trip reduction in this section is important and well-placed, but it should be paired with an equally strong and explicit commitment to eliminating fossil fuel use in transportation. Trip reduction alone will not achieve our climate goals if the remaining trips continue to rely on internal combustion engines. Given the long timeline of this development—stretching to 2043 or beyond—this plan must assume and actively support a near-total transition to zero-emission vehicles.

Specifically:

- All new transportation infrastructure (including the proposed shuttle system) should be fully electric or zero-emissions from the outset. “Efficiency” is no longer a sufficient benchmark—only zero-emission transport should ultimately be considered “sustainable.”
- EV charging infrastructure should be proactively scaled to meet the realistic and growing demand by the time the development is completed. Planning for today’s EV share is not sufficient—this system must be future-ready.
- The plan should also explicitly prohibit the use of fossil fuels (gasoline, diesel, propane, etc.) in any new fleet vehicles or supporting infrastructure.

This section is an opportunity to lead—not just in reducing trips (which in an all or even mostly EV world have a much less straightforward relationship to emissions) but in ending fossil fuel reliance altogether. The plan should state that clearly.

**Salmon**

**General Comments:**

**Specific Comments:**

**Chapter/Section: Chapter 5 - Conservation and Open Space**

**Becker**

**General Comments:**

**Specific Comments:**

**Walker**

**General Comments:**

**Specific Comments:**

**Salmon**

**General Comments:**

**Specific Comments:**

## Chapter/Section: Chapter 6 - Circulation

**Becker**

**General Comments:**

**Specific Comments:**

**Walker**

**General Comments:**

**Specific Comments:**

**Salmon**

**General Comments:**

**Specific Comments:**

## Chapter/Section: Chapter 7 - Infrastructure

**Becker**

**General Comments:**

**Specific Comments:**

**Walker**

**General Comments:**

- **Commendation on All-Electric Commitment (w/ Caveat)**  
The plan explicitly states that no new natural gas infrastructure will be installed, which is a major and commendable milestone. However, this progress risks being undermined by ongoing support of existing natural gas infrastructure and continued reliance on diesel generators for backup power, both of which are inherently incompatible with the project’s sustainability framing and long-term resilience. A truly future-proofed plan should prioritize battery storage, microgrids, solar, and other non-emitting forms of backup power exclusively from the outset.
- **Plan for Future Load Growth, Including EV Charging**  
The infrastructure planning must take into account that this development will reach full buildout around 2043, by which time internal combustion engine vehicles will be rapidly declining and likely eliminated from the fleet mix sometime in the first decade or two of operation. All infrastructure—especially related to electrical distribution—must be

scaled accordingly, with future-proofing for near-universal EV charging in residential, commercial, and transit-supportive settings. Waiting until later phases to address these needs will be too late and result in costly retrofits.

- **Wastewater and Reuse Planning Could Be More Ambitious**

While minimal stormwater treatment and water reuse are mentioned, the intent appears to be to simply allow it to run off into Visitacion Creek and the Brisbane Lagoon. There's an opportunity to go further: greywater reuse, aggressive stormwater harvesting, and decentralized water recycling systems could be better incorporated. These measures would align well with the region's long-term drought planning and the Bay Area's leadership on water resilience.

- **Specific Electricity & Microgrid Opportunities Must Be Better Defined**

While the plan includes admirable high-level goals around electrification and grid resilience, the lack of specificity in this section undercuts its potential impact. Many of the most promising opportunities—such as on-site solar, battery storage, microgrids, and VPP participation—are acknowledged only in vague terms or deferred to future study or unspecified third-party operators. This leaves open the real possibility that none of these initiatives will ever actually be implemented, especially if not required. We recognize that some flexibility is necessary at this stage, but this document is called the Specific Plan for a reason. If we want to see these ambitious ideas realized, the plan must include stronger direction and clearer expectations, including concrete steps to ensure that distributed energy resources and grid-interactive infrastructure are integrated into the core development process, not left as optional or secondary add-ons.

This is not just a technical concern—it goes to the heart of the development's identity. The plan's core environmental claims of being "all-electric" and "net zero" are entirely contingent on how it generates and uses renewable energy on-site. If too much flexibility is retained, and no firm commitments are made, it becomes far too easy for these claims to be quietly abandoned if market conditions change. We must ensure that what's currently aspirational becomes binding.

### Specific Comments:

- **7.2.1**

The explicit acknowledgment of sea-level rise underscores the need to ensure that adaptation and resilience planning are **real and funded**. There is mention of for example the potential of a '100 year flood' level as a kind of baseline – we need to go above and beyond that. With the climate warming faster than expected, 100 year floods have become the norm, and not the exception – in July 2025 we had at least three of these events in a one week period across the country. Viewing these events through the lens of this old framing is practically laughable – these events don't happen every 100 years anymore – this is just our new reality. Let's call the climate risks what they are and do our best to build to meet or exceed our new reality. When – not if – '100 year flood' levels are exceeded in the Baylands, will any cleanup and rebuild be fully funded?

- **7.4.4**

“Baylands Water Recycling Facility provides recycled water for irrigation, cooling and commercial building uses (toilet flushing, etc.), thus stormwater reuse may be, but is not presently, anticipated” Why not? This seems like a waste. Why not codify minimum retention or reuse targets (e.g., capture first 1” of rainfall onsite), rather than deferring to future design guidelines?

- **7.5.4:**

Replace Backup Generators with Battery Storage

Section 7.5.4 notes that backup generators will be provided to support the energy demands of the water supply system – and backup diesel generators are noted at multiple points in the EIR as well in connection to other facilities throughout the development. Especially given that the Baylands completion target is currently 2043, this approach is misaligned with the project’s stated sustainability goals and out of step with the City’s 2040 and the State’s 2045 net zero targets.

Given the project’s extensive on-site solar generation and the rapidly evolving energy landscape, battery storage is a more appropriate and future-proof solution. Batteries not only provide reliable backup power in an emergency without local emissions or ongoing fuel costs, but also enable new lucrative revenue streams through grid participation, time-of-use optimization, and potential participation in virtual power plant (VPP) programs—all benefits that diesel or gas generators simply cannot offer.

Recommendation: Eliminate combustion-based backup generators from the plan completely and prioritize battery storage systems sized appropriately for critical water infrastructure and other emergency loads.

- **7.9: Natural Gas:**

The commitment to exclude new natural gas infrastructure in the Baylands development is an important and commendable step toward alignment with Brisbane’s climate goals. However, the plan’s proposal to leave existing gas infrastructure untouched raises two major concerns:

1. **No Phase-Out Strategy:** If the City aims to achieve net-zero emissions by 2040, continued service to legacy parcels via natural gas — even if technically “outside” the new development — undermines that objective. A phase-out strategy or transition timeline for existing users should be identified.
2. **Stranded Asset and Safety Risks:** Maintaining aging natural gas pipelines amid a large-scale redevelopment creates potential for stranded or forgotten infrastructure and future safety hazards, especially if disturbed during nearby construction. This risk should be proactively addressed through decommissioning planning, rerouting, or enhanced maintenance protocols.

Recommendation: The Specific Plan should not just throw in the towel, but at least include some mention of a pathway for responsibly decommissioning or transitioning existing gas infrastructure within the Baylands footprint to ensure long-term safety and alignment with City-wide decarbonization goals.

### Salmon

#### General Comments:

#### Specific Comments:

## Chapter/Section: Chapter 8 - Public Facilities Financing

### Becker

#### General Comments:

- This chapter tries to make the case that the Baylands development will not cause a fiscal burden on the City, but it left out critical public services. Who pays for the additional police, fire, libraries? Both in terms of manpower and also for infrastructure that needs to be in place when the residences are built.

#### Specific Comments:

- P 451 – Reference #5 refers to the 2015 FEIR, but should be updates to the new EIR, once approved.
- P 451 – The paragraph prior to section 8.3.1 says that funds to improve Icehouse Hill will require funding from third parties or grants. In a previous section, it said this would be at the Developers expense. Either way, Icehouse Hill shouldn't become a trail network. It should be protected and undisturbed (except for periodic invasives removal and shooting range remediation).
- P456 – Section 8.3.6 discussed Transportation funds for clean air. We see the hotels as an opportunity. In a typical scenario, travelers from SFO could rent a car, take taxi/uber/lyft, or take a shuttle to their hotel. Few will opt for Caltrain because it does not have an airport stop. The problem with hotel shuttles is that they run back and forth, sometimes empty. If multiple hotels at the Baylands could share a shuttle, it might be more efficient for both the hotels and guests, as well as have the added benefit of lower GHG emissions for the project.

### Walker

#### General Comments:

**Specific Comments:****Salmon****General Comments:****Specific Comments:****Chapter/Section: Chapter 9 - Implementation****Becker****General Comments:****Specific Comments:**

- P459 – In the end of the first column of text on this page, it states *“For both East and West, remediation and landfill closure require ongoing monitoring and maintenance, which will allow ground floor occupancy for sensitive uses such as residences.”* What is the required timeline for this monitoring? The DEIR suggests it is 30 years with the ability to be waived to one year, which we find unacceptable. Children will be living in these homes and therefore the monitoring must last through many climate cycles and sea level rise before determining that the remediation was thorough enough that no hazards remain.
- P461 – in the text between the tables for Phase I and Phase II, it states that *“Completion Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for any Commercial Development exceeding 4,000,000 Square Feet...”* Does this include development on the east side of the Baylands?
- P461 in the last row of the Phase II table, it says *“Bay Trail and Visitacion Creek: Must be completed before the approval of any building permit exceeding 1.25 million square feet. Baylands Preserve and Lagoon Park: Must be completed before the approval of any building permit exceeding 2 million square feet.”* Does this include development on the west side of the Baylands?
- P462 – The DEIR mentioned the use of a conveyor belt for moving dirt from the east side to the west side. This is a fantastic idea (if protected from wind), because it greatly reduced GHG emission and traffic congestion. But the conveyor is not mentioned in the BSP. #3 at the end of p462 says that approval of the BSP is effectively approval from the planning commission. How is the conveyor included in this permission?
- P464 - #7 mentions the process for seeking variances. Will these be publicly noticed?
- P464 Section 9.3.3 mentions CC&Rs. Will there be real estate disclosures for residences built on the former rail maintenance yard? This needs to be required.
- P465 – The final paragraph seems out of place. Was it copied from Ch 3?

**Walker****General Comments:**

1. **Need for Performance-Linked Triggers:** The phasing language should include clear sustainability and emissions milestones—not just infrastructure completion—as conditions for advancing to subsequent phases. These could include EV adoption thresholds, GHG tracking reports, transit ridership minimums, and renewable energy deployment. This aligns with CEQA mitigation principles and ensures that the city’s 66% emissions reduction by 2030 and net zero by 2040 targets remain central to implementation.
2. **Enforceability and Monitoring Clarity:** The plan references an “Implementation Program” and interagency cooperation but does not clarify who is responsible, how compliance will be monitored, or what mechanisms are in place if the developer fails to meet its obligations. This needs to be strengthened. There should be regular reporting requirements and enforcement tools tied to climate and sustainability performance—not just infrastructure delivery.
3. **No Fossil Fuel Backsliding:** The Implementation Chapter must clearly prohibit any attempt to revisit fossil fuel infrastructure additions (e.g., diesel generators, LNG storage, new gas service connections) at later phases of implementation. This should be explicitly codified and enforced through the development agreement and municipal code where necessary.
4. **Public Transparency:** Implementation oversight should include a mechanism for public transparency and community review, especially on sustainability KPIs (e.g., quarterly or annual GHG performance, VMT data, transit adoption, and electrification rates).

**Specific Comments:**

**Salmon**

**General Comments:**

**Specific Comments:**

**File Attachments for Item:**

E. 7:30 PM PCA (Priority Conservation Area) Grant Application Discussion

Michele Salmon

## PCA Grant Program Summary

- **The Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Grant Program** is an MTC/ABAG initiative (in collaboration with the State Coastal Conservancy) and is administered by the San Francisco Estuary Partnership. It's funded through the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program to **protect, restore, and enhance open space/ag lands, improve outdoor access and urban greening, and build regional climate resilience within designated Priority Conservation Areas.**
- **What are PCAs?** Regionally significant places designated by ABAG (nominated locally) for conservation and recreation benefits: natural habitats, farms/rangelands, recreation areas, urban green spaces, and locations that help fight climate change. PCA designation supports [Plan Bay Area 2050 goals](#).
- PCA [2024 Guidelines](#)
- **Eligible project types (examples):**
  - Protection of natural resources/open space or agricultural lands
  - Habitat restoration/enhancement
  - Trail, pedestrian & bicycle access improvements
  - Urban greening & stormwater improvements
  - Visual enhancements (2024 cycle)
- **How it's evaluated (recent cycles):**
  - Alignment with **PCA goals**
  - Regional significance
  - Multiple benefits
  - Partnerships/Equity & Performance Committee (EPC) benefits
  - Likelihood of success

### PCA Grant Program Priorities (one or more)

1. **Open Space / Habitat Protection:** preserves natural lands, biodiversity, endangered species.
2. **Climate Adaption/Resilience:** wildfire recovery, flooding/stormwater, erosion/landslide prevention.
3. **Access & Connectivity:** trails, safe routes, recreation, equitable access.
4. **Urban Greening/Community Benefit:** nature-based solutions in/near developed areas.
5. **Regional Significance:** aligns with Plan Bay Area 2050 - regional benefits. Multi-county projects are allowed and encouraged. "Projects should serve a *greater than-local* need."
6. Accurate and verified **geographic boundaries.**

## Projects for Consideration

### 1. Quarry Road Project

- Safe route to school focus including easier bicycle access

- Addresses water drainage, flooding, and stormwater issues.
- Planting natives, addressing dying Monterey pine trees.
- Connects to Crocker Trail + area wide shuttle/transit stops nearby.
- Provides walking route connecting Central Brisbane to Crocker Industrial Park and the Northeast Ridge.
- Retention of roadway for emergency access to mountain and school.
- Holds back significant landslide potential; erosion control.
- Trail access - already a popular recreational area – connects with Army Road and leads to Buckeye and Owl Canyon trailheads.
- Protects wildland–urban interface.
- Re-vegetation downslope with more resilient plants to reduce erosion.
- History of landslides and flooding.

**2. Acres Lot 96 above Firth Canyon**

- Above Firth Canyon wash out from 2023 and 1982.
- Likely tied to erosion/flood prevention and land stability.
- Conservation + hazard mitigation potential.
- Helps protect canyon site with one of the oldest Bay trees in San Mateo County.
- Protects Firth Canyon Trail access - already a popular recreational use.
- Protects wildland–urban interface.
- Re-vegetation with more resilient plants to reduce erosion.
- History of landslides and flooding.

**3. Native Seed Bank (Fire Restoration)**

- Fire restoration tactic; supports all 9 Bay Area counties.
- Many seeds are endangered species.
- Regional impact beyond Brisbane and San Bruno Mountain.
- Aligns with climate resilience, biodiversity, and wildfire recovery.

**4. Peking Handicraft Property Acquisition**

- Involves purchase of property (conservation acquisition) and deed restrictions
- Holds back landslide potential; erosion control.
- Trail access to San Bruno Mountain State & County Park from Public Transit.
- Protects wildland–urban interface.
- Provides flyway and habitat for endangered Callippe Silverspot butterfly.
- Re-vegetation with more resilient plants to reduce erosion.

**Example PCA Project Scoring Criterion**

Criterion	Description	Points
PCA Alignment	How well does the project advance PCA priorities (open space, climate resilience, equitable access, urban greening, regional significance)?	0-10

<b>Partnerships OR Equity Priority Community Benefits</b>	The extent to which the proposal describes EITHER the project's partnership activities OR its potential benefits for Equity Priority Communities (EPCs).	0-5
<b>Urgency / Threat</b>	Is there an immediate need (e.g., acquisition window, hazard risk, failing infrastructure, safety issue)?	0-5
<b>Regional &amp; Community Impact/ Multiple Benefits</b>	Does it benefit only Brisbane or also the wider Bay Area? Does it improve access, equity, or recreation for the community?	0-5
<b>Feasibility / Readiness/ Sustainability</b>	How realistic is implementation (land ownership, permits, partners, timing)? Can we demonstrate this project will be maintained and sustained into the future?	0-5
<b>Total</b>		0-30

**Example PCA Project Scoring Matrix**

<b>Project</b>	<b>PCA Alignment (0-10)</b>	<b>Partnerships (0-5)</b>	<b>Urgency (0-5)</b>	<b>Regional &amp; Community Impact (0-5)</b>	<b>Feasibility &amp; Sustainability (0-5)</b>	<b>Total (0-30)</b>
<b>Quarry Road</b>						
<b>Acre Lot 96 above Firth Canyon</b>						
<b>Native Seed Bank</b>						
<b>Peking-Handicraft Property Acquisition</b>						

Erin Becker

## PCA Grant Program Summary

- **The Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Grant Program** is an MTC/ABAG initiative (in collaboration with the State Coastal Conservancy) and is administered by the San Francisco Estuary Partnership. It's funded through the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program to **protect, restore, and enhance open space/ag lands, improve outdoor access and urban greening, and build regional climate resilience within designated Priority Conservation Areas.**
- **What are PCAs?** Regionally significant places designated by ABAG (nominated locally) for conservation and recreation benefits: natural habitats, farms/rangelands, recreation areas, urban green spaces, and locations that help fight climate change. PCA designation supports [Plan Bay Area 2050 goals](#).
- [PCA 2024 Guidelines](#)
- [PCA Grant Letters of Interest are due 12/19, and Full Applications are due 3/20/26.](#)
  - **Step 1:** Interested applicants submit a Letter of Interest form providing a concise overview of the project scope, schedule, and budget and how the project aligns with PCA Program Objectives.
  - € **Step 2:** Selected applicants will be invited to submit a full proposal for further evaluation, which will include a more detailed project description, scope of work, budget, schedule, maps and images.
- **Eligible project types (examples):**
  - Protection of natural resources/open space or agricultural lands
  - Habitat restoration/enhancement
  - Trail, pedestrian & bicycle access improvements
  - Urban greening & stormwater improvements
  - Visual enhancements (2024 cycle)
- **How it's evaluated (recent cycles):**
  - Alignment with **PCA goals**
  - Regional significance
  - Multiple benefits
  - Partnerships/Equity & Performance Committee (EPC) benefits
  - Likelihood of success

### **PCA Grant Program Priorities (one or more)**

1. **Open Space / Habitat Protection:** preserves natural lands, biodiversity, endangered species.
2. **Climate Adaption/Resilience:** wildfire recovery, flooding/stormwater, erosion/landslide prevention.
3. **Access & Connectivity:** trails, safe routes, recreation, equitable access.
4. **Urban Greening/Community Benefit:** nature-based solutions in/near developed areas.

5. **Regional Significance:** aligns with Plan Bay Area 2050 - regional benefits. Multi-county projects are allowed and encouraged. "Projects should serve a *greater than-local* need."
6. Accurate and verified **geographic boundaries**.

## Projects for Consideration

### 1. Quarry Road Improvement Project

- Why
  - Safe route to school focus including easier bicycle access
  - Connects to Crocker Trail + area wide shuttle/transit stops nearby.
  - Provides walking route connecting Central Brisbane to Crocker Industrial Park and the Northeast Ridge.
  - Trail access - already a popular recreational area – connects with Army Road and leads to Buckeye and Owl Canyon trailheads.
  - History of landslides and flooding.
- What
  - Addresses water drainage, flooding, and stormwater issues.
  - Planting natives, addressing dying Monterey pine trees.
  - Retention of roadway for emergency access to mountain and school.
  - Holds back significant landslide potential; erosion control.
  - Protects wildland–urban interface.
  - Re-vegetation downslope with more resilient plants to reduce erosion.
  - Smooth pavement
  - Add benches to make path more age-appropriate

### 2. Restoration and Resiliency of Brisbane Acres Lot 96 above Firth Canyon

- Why
  - Lot 96 was recently acquired by the City of Brisbane. It is in Firth Canyon above Firth Park and the San Bruno Mountain Firth Canyon Trailhead.
  - The canyon washed out in 2023 and 1982, destroying public and private property.
  - Likely tied to erosion/flood prevention and land stability.
  - Helps protect canyon site with one of the oldest Bay trees in San Mateo County.
  - Protects Firth Canyon Trail access - already a popular recreational use.
  - Protects wildland–urban interface.
  - History of landslides and flooding.
- What
  - Conservation + hazard mitigation potential.
  - Possibly for building of retaining walls (need engineering assessments)
  - Re-vegetation with more resilient plants to reduce erosion.
  - Trail improvements

### 3. Establishment of Native Seed Bank (Fire Restoration)

- Why
  - Fire restoration tactic; supports all 9 Bay Area counties.

- Many seeds are endangered species.
- Regional impact beyond Brisbane and San Bruno Mountain.
- Aligns with climate resilience, biodiversity, and wildfire recovery.
- What
  - Grant funds to pay to set up program
  - Partnership with Mission Blue Nursery/SBMW
    - Fund intern?

**4. Peking Handicraft Property Acquisition**

- Why
  - Holds back landslide potential; erosion control.
  - Trail access to San Bruno Mountain State & County Park from Public Transit.
  - Protects wildland–urban interface.
  - Provides flyway and habitat for endangered Callippe Silverspot butterfly.
  - Re-vegetation with more resilient plants to reduce erosion.
- What
  - Involves purchase of property (conservation acquisition) and deed restrictions

**Example PCA Project Scoring Criterion**

Criterion	Description	Points
<b>PCA Alignment</b>	How well does the project advance PCA priorities (open space, climate resilience, equitable access, urban greening, regional significance)?	0-10
<b>Partnerships OR Equity Priority Community Benefits</b>	The extent to which the proposal describes EITHER the project’s partnership activities OR its potential benefits for Equity Priority Communities (EPCs).	0-5
<b>Urgency / Threat</b>	Is there an immediate need (e.g., acquisition window, hazard risk, failing infrastructure, safety issue)?	0-5
<b>Regional &amp; Community Impact/ Multiple Benefits</b>	Does it benefit only Brisbane or also the wider Bay Area? Does it improve access, equity, or recreation for the community?	0-5
<b>Feasibility / Readiness/ Sustainability</b>	How realistic is implementation (land ownership, permits, partners, timing)? Can we demonstrate this project will be maintained and sustained into the future?	0-5
<b>Total</b>		0-30

### Example PCA Project Scoring Matrix

<b>Project</b>	<b>PCA Alignment (0-10)</b>	<b>Partnerships (0-5)</b>	<b>Urgency (0-5)</b>	<b>Regional &amp; Community Impact (0-5)</b>	<b>Feasibility &amp; Sustainability (0-5)</b>	<b>Total (0-30)</b>
<b>Quarry Road</b>						
<b>Acre Lot 96 above Firth Canyon</b>						
<b>Native Seed Bank</b>						
<b>Peking-Handicraft Property Acquisition</b>						

**File Attachments for Item:**

F. 8:00 PM 2026 OSEC Workplan Discussion



**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT**

**Meeting Date:** May 15, 2025

**From:** Karen Kinser, Deputy Director of Public Works

**Subject:** OSEC 2025 Work Plan

**Community Goal/Result**

Ecological Sustainability - Brisbane will be a leader in setting policies and practicing service delivery innovations that promote ecological sustainability

**Purpose**

To review this year’s goals for the Open Space and Ecology Committee (OSEC), a Council-appointed citizen advisory committee.

**Recommendation**

Receive OSEC’s 2025 Work Plan.

**Background**

With new members joining OSEC this year, development of a proposed workplan by the committee was somewhat delayed. On April 9, 2025, Council liaisons to OSEC, Council Members Coleen Mackin and Terry O’Connell, met with the OSEC Chair and Vice Chair to discuss the Work Plan.

**Discussion**

Council liaisons shared their support of OSEC and staff for their work to date. Council liaisons provided direction on the attached Work Plan.

**Fiscal Impact**

No fiscal impact.

**Measure of Success**

OSEC has a blueprint for their endeavors for the remainder of 2025.

**Attachments**

- 1. 2025 Work Plan

Karen Kinser, Deputy Director of Public Works

Randy Breault, Public Works Director

Jeremy Dennis, City Manager

# 2025 OSEC Work Plan

The Open Space and Ecology Committee provides policy and programmatic recommendations on environmental issues.

## Priority projects:

- Provide input on Quarry and Baylands Developments
- Consider strategies to reduce emissions from existing buildings and transportation
- Support the health and growth of the urban tree canopy utilizing the recent Tree Inventory, via education and outreach, grants and potential other means. Consider setting a canopy coverage goal.

## Routine/ongoing efforts:

- Review and approve annual vegetation management plan for Brisbane Acres
- Review Open Space Plan and its implementation and update as necessary
- Review and recommend plans to meet Climate Emergency Declaration goals
- Provide input on three to four habitat restoration days per year
- Improve/maintain Crocker Trail frog habitat
- Education and Outreach
  - Day in the Park community festival
  - Bike to Work Day
  - Lipman Science Fair
  - Library display
  - Publications through City e-blast, Star, website, social media sites and MCTV
  - Outreach to targeted areas, e.g. on trash

## Long-term policy issues (to be addressed if/when they arise):

- Coordinate Climate Action Plan update with Baylands Specific Plan
- Provide input on design of Baylands open space upon Council approval of land use
- General Plan - Review of future proposed updates to Open Space Element