

The [City Council Public Hearing on December 15th](#) was a continuation of the November 17th hearing, the discussion of Site Remediation. Lloyd Zola, the City's CEQA consultant, provided a high-level [presentation](#) to address the City Council's questions and the community's concerns from the previous hearing. See the [staff agenda for the full report](#) of the Q&A. Many of the questions asked were of hypothetical situations, as well a detailed overview of the remediation and regulatory oversight process.

After the presentation, the public was invited to provide comments. Many speakers were Brisbane residents that oppose the project, citing hazardous concerns and the need for additional testing. The council brought this concern and other topics back to the consultants at the conclusion of the meeting. As part of the staff report, a [list of studies](#) was provided and the consultants explained that although many of the studies were conducted prior to 2010, current testing methodologies "are essentially unchanged from those used in the studies cited". The consultants and the report verified that the studies conducted to date are adequate for the purpose of making a land use decision. This land use decision could be approval of the Brisbane Baylands plan with minor or major modifications, or denial. Once the Council makes their decision, UPC will conduct additional studies for the approved land uses and prepare a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) and Landfill Closure Plan for the approved uses for the review and approval of the regulatory agencies. Learn more [here](#). The City and community also have the opportunity to comment on the plans, similar to the process for the comment period with the Draft EIR. Development can commence only once these plans are approved. In addition, site-specific environmental analysis will be required for each phase of the project. The City's staff report explains:

"As noted in the November 17 staff report, each of the studies cited in the Draft EIR had been prepared consistent with industry standards at the time they were prepared, and while there were prepared at different times, for different areas of the site, and for different purposes, two different reviewed by CDM and a review by Dr. Susan Mearns undertaken on behalf of the City concluded that these studies paint an adequate overall picture of onsite contamination and wastes within the Baylands for use in the Baylands EIR, recognizing that both the land use planning and site remediation processes are in their early stages. It should also be noted that the results of ongoing monitoring of the Baylands have been consistent with the studies cited above, and that, except for existing industrial uses within the Baylands and recycling activities within the former landfill, the site has not been subject to activities that could have introduced new contamination."

Community members who spoke in favor of the project emphasized that remediation for similar has been done safely, and can be done safely for the Baylands. In his public comment, UPC's director of development Jonathan Scharfman recollected how 9-10 years ago, during the City of Brisbane speaker series community outreach program, Mayor of Pittsburgh Tom Murphy described the city's rebirth by leveraging site remediation and the benefits of brownfield redevelopment. Scharfman visited the redevelopment sites and saw the revitalization of the waterfronts, with steel slabs used for housing. Scharfman reminded the Council that he submitted [case study examples of several brownfield redevelopments](#) in the Bay Area where

thousands of people live, work and play such as Mission Bay in San Francisco, Mountain View and Emeryville. He concluded his statement with a question: "Do you really believe, in your hearts, those officials care less about the public health and safety of their citizens than you do?" He also invited the Council to take the time speak to their colleagues in these communities that had the same responsibility the Brisbane Council has now - and ask them hard questions about their comfort level and about concerns their constituents raised so that they can make a thoroughly informed decision