

**CITY COUNCIL WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**  
**DATES: 2/17/2022-3/3/2022**

**From:** Earthhelp <[earthhelp@earthlink.net](mailto:earthhelp@earthlink.net)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 3, 2022 5:31 PM  
**To:** Padilla, Ingrid <[ipadilla@ci.brisbane.ca.us](mailto:ipadilla@ci.brisbane.ca.us)>  
**Subject:** Item "E"

For the council members and record:

Brisbane City Council, item "E" on the consent calendar

I was pleased when we decommissioned our military bases. It was heart-warming to watch the Presidio be transformed into a cultural Mecca, that we had repurposed our valuable asset to the benefit of future generations. I am concerned that this is a way of re-commissioning the military, one police force at a time.

Without discussion, many questions come to mind about protecting the citizens, costs, and the true need. Who takes responsibility for accidents? When will you use force? etc.

This needs more discussion, perhaps a dedicated meeting?

Thank you,

Dana Dillworth

**From:** Steven Goodale <[steven.goodale@gmail.com](mailto:steven.goodale@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Thursday, March 3, 2022 4:18 PM

**To:** Padilla, Ingrid

**Subject:** Redeveloping the former Sierra Point landfill site for affordable housing

Dear council members,

Please see the attached letter regarding the Affordable Housing Strategic Plan Workshop and Housing Element Update.

Thanking you in advance.

--

Very best,

Steven Goodale

Ms. Mayor and Council Members:

From the Brisbane City Council Agenda for March 3, 2022, it appears that Brisbane, through the Affordable Housing Strategic Plan, may be preparing to redevelop the former Sierra Point landfill site for affordable housing.

First and foremost, the Brisbane city officials need to be completely transparent and inclusive with the community in any process to redevelop Sierra Point and especially the former landfill area. The city's deliberation process should include the critical question of whether permitting affordable housing on a closed, minimally capped landfill site on the bay shoreline is not only safe, sustainable and equitable but also fiscally prudent in light of the city's recent Climate Emergency Declaration and the certainty of Sea Level Rise vulnerabilities. City officials are supposed to be working for the community, with the community, to develop a shared vision for Brisbane. **Community Involvement should be the guiding principal**, not just a required formality or as a box to check off, but to genuinely embrace.

Both the Regional Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the San Mateo County Department of Environmental Health Services (EHS) have regulatory oversight for the former Sierra Point landfill, which received waste from 1965 through 1972. The RWQCB issued initial closure requirements in 1982, and subsequently issued updated closure requirements in 1996. These requirements specify only a minimal soil cap.

The waste that went in these dumps/landfills was **undifferentiated waste**, unlike current day municipal waste landfills. In the past people sent their old lead acid car batteries, used motor oil, and old pesticides and chemicals. Businesses sent commercial wastes there, factories were still doing the same, etc. It is illogical to think of an old municipal dump or an old municipal landfill as benign and not as a potentially serious environmental health threat waiting to become realized in a horrible way.

The fact is that the Sierra Point landfill **has no meaningful lateral containment** to offer protection against the spread of contamination through simple erosion and migration through groundwater.

Before any plans to build are considered we should be pursuing the regulatory authorities to come back with updated closure requirements, either to excavate and haul away all this waste, or to establish more meaningful containment features and resiliency in the context of climate change.

Respectfully,  
Steven Goodale

To: Brisbane City Council, Staff, and Residents

From: Dana Dillworth

Re: Refinancing the BofA Property

March 3, 2022

I believe that the purchase of the Bank of America Property was a wise decision. I also understand why you consolidate debt. What bothers me is that we haven't produced much new affordable housing in 10 years. Housing should be a priority. I'm disappointed.

Having been a business manager for a company that received Federal and State funds for infrastructure upgrades, I'm aware that each loan and contract has clauses and conditions that need to be met. Does this effect any of your retiring obligations? If paying down old debt, it seems the old debt should show up as payments required at closing.

In your "Agreement for Funding" document dated March 24, 2022, page 2, item 2 "Use of Funds" states that the funds are to "replace the existing City Hall ("the Project")" and to pay \$101,950 in fees.

Projects are legislative acts. Where is the public discussion for this newly announced project? Does that need to be agendaized first?

You are encumbering the library. Do the San Mateo County Libraries need to be informed and agree to this change?

While the staff report mentions this private placement bank opportunity at 3.5%, interest only for five years, what are the rates of our prior obligations that are being giving up?

Having lived through the Savings and Loan crisis (17% interest to buy a car) and have heard the words "too big to fail," the debt service system created for municipalities, i.e. bonds, might be a more secure avenue. Do we have those figures for comparison?

Please re-notice as the "New City Hall Remodel Funds." That's what the document says...

Thank you.

**From:** Earthhelp <[earthhelp@earthlink.net](mailto:earthhelp@earthlink.net)>

**Sent:** Thursday, March 3, 2022 11:57 AM

**To:** Padilla, Ingrid

**Subject:** Housing element WS

Hi Ingrid,

I have prepared the following. Thank you for making it available to the council. I've had some computer issues and can only send in line, vs an attachment.

Dana

TO: Brisbane City Council, Staff, and Members of the Public

From: Dana Dillworth

RE: Affordable Strategic Plan Goal Setting Workshop and Housing Element Update

March 3, 2022

When we had women leading this town, low-income units got built.

I think your low-income and very low-income housing strategy should be general, across the board, not to single out one developer to focus on. I do not think you should focus on marketrate or workforce housing, just the truly underserved population.

I think you should consider a program to assist low-income people with repairs to their homes. Rebuild Peninsula is limited to a volunteer force. Last I checked there is no county program to help make improvements to the low-income housing stock.

I think ADU's should be required to meet the needs of lower-income people (by size or deed restriction) and not be a potential speculative tool.

I think all housing should include an environmental review of sustainability and include the recreation (sq ft. open space per unit), environmental, and safety goals of the town as mentioned in our 1994 General Plan.

I question your Balance Brisbane results as it only reflects citizens who do surveys with computers. Unless you supply the computers, these numbers may not be reflective of this town as a whole.

When a friend was questioned at the Farmer's Market, they declined to state. I don't see any notations of people who refused information. But a postage-paid ballot might weed out people who may not be residents.

Please inform the public of the SB 9 regulations that make this exercise moot or potentially more urgent.

Please also add a column for citizen acceptance. That is part of CEQA.

Where are the alternative style choices... houseboats vs. live-aboard, off-grid eco parks, transitory or Veterans housing? Were any of those choices in your survey?

This exercise seems to have a predetermined result that may only temporarily solve a numbers problem. Without a full CEQA review, and all the facts and competing interests considered, nobody can make an informed decision.

If you don't see that 2,200 units approved for they Baylands becomes 4,400 units once you apply the ADU (with no restrictions) ... and they have already studied 4,400 units... Don't understate the issue.

If you are not aware, that is exactly what happened on the Schlage Lock site. Universal Paragon's EIR studied more than approved. They came back, claiming it doesn't pencil out and got the full lot they studied.

Please recognize that omissions are dangerous.

**From:** Dana Dillworth <[earthhelp@earthlink.net](mailto:earthhelp@earthlink.net)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 2, 2022 7:56 AM

**To:** Mackin, Coleen; Lentz, Cliff; Cunningham, Karen; Davis, Madison; O'Connell, Terry; Padilla, Ingrid

**Subject:** Housing element workshop

This was submitted to the Planning Commission on 2/24. It didn't have time to be part of the agenda packet.

I may still have comments for the 3/3 council meeting and will try not to duplicate.

TO: Planning Commissioners

FROM: Dana Dillworth

RE: Housing Element Workshop February 24, 2022

Balanced Brisbane?

Spot-rezoning the entire town for no-limit housing without sufficient reference to other General Plan Elements, Goals, and Plans and ignoring State laws in motion is not balanced.

Something fishy here. If the Tuntex Speculation Group doesn't submit a plan by date certain for the Baylands, then we have to rezone other property, give away OUR Public Trust-endowed waterfront Open Space to meet a planning goal that admittedly doesn't work. We've rezoned our entire town with a shopping list of overriding considerations of environmental impacts to meet this same goal. But we can't guarantee that the Baylands will meet any RHNA's?

We voted, or not questioned, doubling the size of our town over and over, with ADU ordinances (which at 1 ADU per R-1 unit city-wide, should produce more than 274 units and should be considered affordable), with overlay zones, with rezoning our Bayshore thoroughfare to mixed-use while ignoring unsafe neighbors (Tank Farm,) known landslides, opportunities for potential habitat corridors and that still doesn't meet the goal?

There is something specious about the premise and information you have been provided for engaging in this legislative planning, this discretionary act. I get it, no action tonight. But something wrong, something missing... by approaching this issue with the same reasoning that got us here and ignoring all we have already done.

"Insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results."

There is so much not being told here. I'm not a lawyer, but many of you are. You know about fairness and balance. You know about laws meant to protect the public, to serve the public where they haven't been or otherwise wouldn't be served.

Spot-zoning can be allowed to serve a specific class or under-served community... are biotech employees underserved, a protected class? Where are the statistics for that?

Is the City truly promoting Sierra Point and VWR (Southeast Bayshore) to include no- limits housing on a foundation of toxin-filled jell-o ... or to be down wind from an unknown source of persistent deadly toxic

vapors as meeting a mandate to serve the already underserved? There's a potential you may have to look at environmental justice laws if you answer yes.

When I saw Sierra Point on the list, I had so hoped that you were announcing a new live-aboard community, a car-free community, with regulations on size or ownership to prohibit mansion yachts, something to truly serve low and moderate income communities. A houseboat community might survive an earthquake, but a high-rise building full of thousands of 24/7 residents and employees must have a stellar evacuation plan in the event of an earthquake.

Were any alternatives of houseboat community or tiny home villages provided as options in the Brisbane Balance survey? Did you present it as one way in, one way out for many thousands more people? Adjacent to our designated Emergency Evacuation Area? Somehow Public Safety, Recreation, and the Environment gets overlooked in this Sacramento/Developer/City-driven quest to meet a questionably derived, bloated, unattainable housing number. How many times do we double this town without looking at the consequences?

By law, full disclosure is required. It is hard to believe that an housing application has been received from Sierra Point without knowledge of the conditions and reasons for its prohibition. Similarly, Southwest Bayshore is at the base of known slide areas. One could get the wrong impression by this exercise, absent the information required for the Public to make an informed decision. One could question, if you know, how many survey entries were city employees or tests.

From the tone of the Staff report, garbage in, garbage out, "everything goes" we'll do the environmental review piecemealed, later. I think that is still frowned upon under CEQA.

Isn't it time to stop the non-sense and reflect on the current conditions?

Please define Market Rate housing under today's conditions.

Significant studies, particularly a Sustainable Community Environmental Assessment should be required and the stability of Bayshore Boulevard from the Main Street to South San Francisco needs a look-see. It has been thirty years since we looked at the whole picture and even then, it was cursory.

Our community [imho] is getting unfair treatment in the guise of helping the poor. Will anyone consider whether the Sierra Point, Bayshore, and Brisbane acres soils can withstand impacts from future extreme climate, environmental, earthshaking events and the densities proposed? Your waffled language that can't guarantee 20% low-income housing is despicable. The 100-year model for Public safety is obsolete.

Housing, in the absence of any other General Plan Elements and site conditions not accurately reported, means you have failed to do the minimal requirement... of serving the underserved communities. There is not one mention of maintaining the units we create, as the 1 San Bruno property, formerly meeting our RHNA goals, is now out of service.

There is so much wrong with this procedure. Accurate information and a range of alternatives have not been utilized. I would hope that you can bring this back into balance.

Thank you.



Sorry for the re-formatting, there is a pdf attachment as well. I would appreciate that each commissioner gets a copy and all or portion be read into the record. I remain disabled and low computer capacity.

TO: Planning Commissioners  
FROM: Dana Dillworth  
RE: Housing Element Workshop  
February 24, 2022

## **Balanced Brisbane?**

**Spot-rezoning the entire town for no-limit housing without sufficient reference to other General Plan Elements, Goals, and Plans and ignoring State laws in motion is not balanced.**

Something fishy here. If the Tuntex Speculation Group doesn't submit a plan by date certain for the Baylands, then we have to rezone other property, give away OUR Public Trust-endowed waterfront Open Space to meet a planning goal that admittedly doesn't work. We've rezoned our entire town with a shopping list of overriding considerations of environmental impacts to meet this same goal. But we can't guarantee that the Baylands will meet any RHNA's?

We voted, or not questioned, doubling the size of our town over and over, with ADU ordinances (which at 1 ADU per R-1 unit city-wide, should produce more than 274 units and should be considered affordable), with overlay zones, with rezoning our Bayshore thoroughfare to mixed-use while ignoring unsafe neighbors (Tank Farm,) known landslides, opportunities for potential habitat corridors and that still doesn't meet the goal?

There is something specious about the premise and information you have been provided for engaging in this legislative planning, this discretionary act. I get it, no action tonight. But something wrong, something missing... by approaching this issue with the same reasoning that got us here and ignoring all we have already done.

**“Insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results.”**

There is so much not being told here. I'm not a lawyer, but many of you are. You know about fairness and balance. You know about laws meant to protect the public, to serve the public where they haven't been or otherwise wouldn't be served.

Spot-zoning can be allowed to serve a specific class or under-served community... **are biotech employees underserved, a protected class?** Where are the statistics for that?

Is the City truly promoting Sierra Point and VWR (Southeast Bayshore) to include nolimits

housing on a foundation of toxin-filled jell-o ... or to be down wind from an unknown source of persistent deadly toxic vapors as meeting a mandate to serve the already underserved? There's a potential you may have to look at environmental justice laws if you answer yes.

**When I saw Sierra Point on the list,** I had so hoped that you were announcing a new live-aboard community, a car-free community, with regulations on size or ownership to prohibit mansion yachts, something to truly serve low and moderate income communities. A houseboat community might survive an earthquake, but a high-rise building full of thousands of 24/7 residents and employees must have a stellar evacuation plan in the event of an earthquake.

Were any alternatives of houseboat community or tiny home villages provided as options in the Brisbane Balance survey? Did you present it as one way in, one way out for many thousands more people? Adjacent to our designated Emergency Evacuation

Area? **Somehow Public Safety, Recreation, and the Environment gets overlooked** in this Sacramento/Developer/City-driven quest to meet a questionably derived, bloated, unattainable housing number. How many times do we double this town without looking at the consequences?

By law, full disclosure is required. It is hard to believe that an housing application has been received from Sierra Point without knowledge of the conditions and reasons for its prohibition. Similarly, Southwest Bayshore is at the base of known slide areas. One could get the wrong impression by this exercise, absent the information required for the Public to make an informed decision. One could question, if you know, how many survey entries were city employees or tests.

From the tone of the Staff report, garbage in, garbage out, "everything goes" we'll do the environmental review piecemealed, later. I think that is still frowned upon under CEQA.

**Isn't it time to stop the non-sense and reflect on the current conditions?**

Please define Market Rate housing under today's conditions.

Significant studies, particularly a Sustainable Community Environmental Assessment should be required and the stability of Bayshore Boulevard from the Main Street to South San Francisco needs a look-see. It has been thirty years since we looked at the whole picture and even then, it was cursory.

Our community [imho] is getting unfair treatment in the guise of helping the poor. Will anyone consider whether the Sierra Point, Bayshore, and Brisbane acres soils can withstand impacts from future extreme climate, environmental, earthshaking events and the densities proposed? Your waffled language that can't guarantee 20% low-income housing is despicable. The 100-year model for Public safety is obsolete.

Housing, in the absence of any other General Plan Elements and site conditions not accurately reported, means you have failed to do the minimal requirement... of serving the underserved communities. There is not one mention of maintaining the units we create, as the 1 San Bruno property, formerly meeting our RHNA goals, is now out of service.

There is so much wrong with this procedure. Accurate information and a range of alternatives have not been utilized. I would hope that you can bring this back into balance. Thank you.

**From:** Dana Dillworth <[earthhelp@earthlink.net](mailto:earthhelp@earthlink.net)>

**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2022 12:03 PM

**To:** Mackin, Coleen; Padilla, Ingrid

**Subject:** Status on landfill height

Madame mayor,

The Baylands landfilling operation used to be publicly reported. A while back it was determined that they had reached their height limit. From my home vantage point, there's a marker that signifies that height.

Since then, the operation has continued, there have been layers of material added. They show up as bands of specific invasive species... yellow for oxalis, buff for pampas grass, and another yellow for broom.

Now there is activity on the crest of the southern end and I wonder if they are exceeding their limit again and following their Water Board mandate? Or if there is some new law or permit that has been issued.

I would have expected a graduated mound, because the Water Board requires the surface to be at an angle for water to run off.

Could you please look into this matter? And report back to the Public?

Inquiring minds want to know.

Thank you,

Dana Dillworth