

1 [Urging City Agencies to Monitor and Review Any Development Proposal for the Brisbane  
2 Baylands Area and Urging the City of Brisbane to Prepare a Complete Environmental Impact  
3 Report and Approve a Responsible Land Use Plan]

4 **Resolution urging the City and County of San Francisco and all relevant agencies to**  
5 **closely monitor and review any development proposal for the Brisbane Baylands Area**  
6 **to ensure that the City of Brisbane prepares a comprehensive and complete**  
7 **Environmental Impact Report, which includes legally required analysis of all impacts,**  
8 **including transportation, air quality and greenhouse gases, water supply and**  
9 **wastewater, and housing and population needs, in particular significant impacts that**  
10 **will occur within San Francisco; and urging Brisbane to adopt a responsible Land Use**  
11 **Plan for this area that will include needed workforce housing.**

12  
13 WHEREAS, The Brisbane Baylands is a site that contains 684 acres of vacant,  
14 underutilized land that is largely inaccessible to the public as a result of the legacy of  
15 geotechnical and contamination issues resulting from its former use as a landfill and railyard;  
16 and

17 WHEREAS, The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) developed the “Plan  
18 Bay Area 2040” which identified the Brisbane Baylands as a Priority Development Area as it  
19 presents the prospect of contributing to the responsible growth and vitality of the region; and

20 WHEREAS, The Baylands site presents a rare opportunity to develop the land in a  
21 responsible and environmentally-sustainable way that can reestablish useable open and  
22 recreational space, protect existing wetlands and ecosystems, encourage active pedestrian  
23 and bicycle use in its interior streets, and create residential and commercial space that is high  
24 in density and in close proximity to public transportation facilities to minimize the impact on  
25 our already-congested regional roadways; and

1           WHEREAS, The Developer of the Baylands site, Universal Paragon Corporation,  
2 applied to develop the site with approximately 7 million square feet of office, industrial and  
3 commercial uses, 4,434 units of housing, and over 300 acres of open space and lagoon area;  
4 and

5           WHEREAS, The Developer subsequently requested analysis of a second development  
6 scenario, which included more entertainment-oriented uses for the Site but retained the same  
7 4,434 units of housing and amounts of open space and lagoon area; and

8           WHEREAS, The Brisbane Planning Commission recommended on August 25, 2016,  
9 that no housing be allowed on this site and that only non-residential development be  
10 permitted; and

11           WHEREAS, The Mayor of the City of Brisbane, Clifford Lentz, was quoted in the San  
12 Francisco Chronicle as saying, “We’ll provide the commercial...San Francisco will provide the  
13 housing;” and

14           WHEREAS, San Francisco is in close proximity to the Brisbane Baylands site and will  
15 be significantly impacted by any project developed on the Baylands, especially if the project  
16 contemplates building *no* new housing for the inevitable influx of workers that will ensue from  
17 building 7 – 8 million square feet of new commercial-industrial-institutional-retail-entertainment  
18 space; and

19           WHEREAS, State law recognizes the critical responsibility of each local government in  
20 the supply and affordability of housing and mandates that each local government in California  
21 adopt a Housing Element as part of its General Plan that shows how the community plans to  
22 meet the existing and projected housing needs of people at all income levels; and

23           WHEREAS, State law also mandates a process to determine the total number of  
24 housing units, by affordability level, that each jurisdiction must accommodate in its Housing  
25

1 Element which is known as the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) and is measured  
2 by permits issued; and

3 WHEREAS, For the 2007-2014 RHNA, Brisbane was responsible for 401 new units of  
4 housing and met 36% of its assigned housing goals whereas San Francisco was responsible  
5 for 31,193 units and met 64% of its goal; and

6 WHEREAS, For the 2015-2022 RHNA, Brisbane’s RHNA allocation was 83 units total  
7 and one year into this cycle, Brisbane has issued permits for 3 units; and

8 WHEREAS, The Draft Preferred Scenario for Plan Bay Area published by ABAG in  
9 September 2016 allocates growth of 4,400 housing units to Brisbane; and

10 WHEREAS, The San Francisco Planning Department’s residential pipeline report that  
11 tracks the completed units and entitled units in the current residential pipeline to the first  
12 quarter of 2016 (Q1) shows that San Francisco has already met 79% or 22,806 out of its  
13 assigned 28,869 housing units according to the RHNA production goals for the period 2015-  
14 2022 to date; and

15 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco, which is only 49 square miles, is  
16 already attempting to address the lack of affordable housing in the region but cannot  
17 physically absorb thousands of new workers without significant negative impacts to its already  
18 heavily-used streets, its increasingly unaffordable housing market, public utility use,  
19 overstrained childcare and educational institutions, and other vital city services and  
20 infrastructure; and

21 WHEREAS, The Brisbane Baylands also present a unique and extremely rare  
22 opportunity for a local jurisdiction to create new housing—and meet its regional responsibility  
23 for creating 4,400 new housing units--without displacing current tenants or other uses of land  
24 and actually would afford an opportunity to make an existing brownfield useable; and

25

1           WHEREAS, The development plan that the Brisbane Planning Commission has  
2 recommended does not provide jobs/housing balance in any way and is irresponsible in the  
3 face of the housing crisis throughout the Bay Area and the State of California; and

4           WHEREAS, Brisbane’s Planning Commission has recommended disapproval of  
5 residential uses, potentially violating the California Housing Accountability Act and other State  
6 laws that attempt to address the California housing crisis throughout the State; and

7           WHEREAS, The City of Brisbane is considering certification of an Environmental  
8 Impact Report (EIR), as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which  
9 was initiated in early 2006, over ten years ago, continuing through August 2016 and now  
10 pending before the Brisbane City Council, and the EIR lacks the required consideration of the  
11 numerous and significant changes in the region over the last ten years, including but not  
12 limited to climate change, private and public transit options, density and migration of the  
13 workforce and significant housing needs, and the significant environmental impacts that will  
14 occur in San Francisco if no housing is built on the Baylands site as part of this development;  
15 and

16           WHEREAS, Brisbane has not adequately considered significant environmental impacts  
17 that will occur as a result of the new water supply demands and has not set forth a realistic  
18 plan to provide the new water supply necessary for this site; now, therefore, be it

19           RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco urges and directs its Planning  
20 Department, the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development, the Public Utilities  
21 Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, Department on the Environment, and any  
22 other relevant City Departments, to closely monitor, review, participate and comment upon all  
23 actions proposed to be taken by the City of Brisbane for any development of the Brisbane  
24 Baylands site; and, be it

1           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco, including the City  
2 Attorney, should explore all possible legal actions available both to encourage consideration  
3 and approval of lawful, responsible development on the Baylands Site, or, alternatively, to  
4 prevent development of the Brisbane Baylands site that does not include a balance of  
5 affordable and market-rate housing along with non-residential development; and, be it

6           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco should investigate  
7 the viability of annexing Brisbane so that it is fully incorporated into the County of San  
8 Francisco should the City of Brisbane continue to contemplate building no new housing as  
9 part of any project on the Brisbane Baylands; and, be it

10          FUTHER RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco urges the City of  
11 Brisbane to commit to a responsible project for the Brisbane Baylands that includes a rational  
12 jobs and housing balance that would result in the creation of a sufficient number of housing  
13 units to accommodate new workers for any projected new jobs that would be generated by  
14 new office, industrial, institutional, entertainment or other commercial development on the  
15 Baylands site.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25