

Capasso, Julia

From: clara johnson <clara-a-johnson@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2016 6:59 PM
To: Swiecki, John; Capasso, Julia
Cc: Miller, Anja
Subject: message for Planning Commission Meeting June 9, 2016

Thanks for passing it along.

Dear Planning Commissioners

I appreciate your message requesting input from interested parties regarding your deliberations on the Brisbane Baylands Specific Plan FEIR.

This is what I have to offer. There are some circumstances that relate to the land and UPC's plans for the land that are well established and the consequences of those circumstances directly impact the degree of intensity of use or type of use that should be placed on that land. They are:

Traffic Impacts
Sea Level Rise
Toxic Contaminants
Brisbane's Small Town Character

Traffic Impacts

The EIR says that many important intersections will be at Level F, the worst level possible under that scheme before this development is added.. The truth is that the traffic can't be mitigated to a better situation that this development in its larger configurations will result in terrible traffic and terrible delays which will impact the lives of all Brisbane residents one way or another. It will lower the quality of life in Brisbane. The renewable energy alternative is the most environmentally beneficial and the logical choice.

Sea Level Rise

Whatever is built on this land will be subject to impacts from sea level rise. Someone has to pay to protect or to mitigate those impacts on whatever is built. The renewable energy solar and wind generators can be initially built or later modified to accommodate rising seas. The likely sea level rise is now five feet. The sea level rise will have impacts on the toxic contaminants and any ongoing remediation. The developer's plans do not address how infrastructure will be effected by what the inundation underneath will do to the soil and that impact could cost a fortune. Who will pay for all the resulting repairs? Will the City be found liable for irresponsibly approving an intense development at this location?

Toxic Contaminants

As stated above, seal level rise may jeopardize remediation ongoing remediation plansand may expose the public to dangerous toxic chemicals. If that happens, someone has to pay to remedy that situation. Who will pay? The developer will be long gone.

The regulatory agencies will be watching over this land for 30 years or more. It will be reviewed five years. It is likely that there will be new future costs to pay for the chemicals that are present that are determined, in the future, to be more toxic to humans or the environment than we now know. Who will pay to remediate them? There are many unknowns with the contamination present because we are always learning more about chemicals and their impacts. It is not wise to put large numbers of people in a position to be exposed to potential risk. why not be prudent and minimize the risk. The renewable energy alternative does just that.

Brisbane's Small Town Character

Our town's character is in harmony with our Mountain and Bay environment. If any of the highly urbanized alternatives of this project are built, we're sunk. You cannot recover the human connections and intimacy with the natural environment that we now enjoy. Millions of square feet at the foot of our town do impact those qualities because such a huge change will change everything. I suggest the only choice that respects our community is the renewable energy alternative.

I hope that you will agree and recommend that alternative. There is so much at stake.

Sincerely

Clara Johnson