B. AESTHETICS

The Setting discussion in this section describes existing visual conditions as a baseline against which project impacts are identified and evaluated under Impacts. It describes the existing visual character of the Project Area and its visual setting within San Francisco Bay; presents and describes photographic views showing existing visual conditions of the Project Area; and identifies visual resources within the Project Area that would be potentially affected by implementation of the Proposed Project.

The Impacts discussion identifies the considerations applied when evaluating the significance of impacts on aesthetic resources, and describes and evaluates impacts on scenic vistas, visual and scenic resources and visual quality with reference to visual simulations prepared for the Proposed Project.

SETTING

VISUAL CHARACTER OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY

Views of the Bay that include the Project Area are of particularly high visual quality. San Francisco Bay is a prominent and unique scenic resource, comprising one of the most scenic areas of the world. This is particularly so at the central portion of the Bay, where water, dramatic topographic features, weather conditions, and distinctive built environment features combine to form highly recognizable, even iconic, scenic vistas. The wide, flat expanse of Bay water opens panoramic vistas across it and provides a visual counterpoint to the varied and dramatic topography that surrounds the Bay. The Bay water unifies the landforms within it (such as Yerba Buena Island, Alcatraz Island, and Angel Island) and surrounding it (such as the hills of San Francisco, Mt. Tamalpais and the Marin Hills, and the East Bay Hills), providing linear continuity along the shoreline. Reflectivity, color, and movement are also properties of water that contribute visual interest and variety to the visual setting. Views of the Bay are often enhanced by the movement of dense coastal fog and by dramatic light conditions that contribute to the distinctiveness of scenic vistas.

Distinctive and recognizable built environment features within the landscape (“landmarks” in the visual sense) provide a clear sense of geographic orientation. Waterside views of the “City by the Bay” are highly readable and coherent, characterized by a strong visual hierarchy. The familiar San Francisco skyline is a clear visual marker of San Francisco’s regional importance. The compact high-rise San Francisco skyline rises abruptly from the western Bay shoreline, echoing the landforms that surround the Bay and providing a dramatic counterpoint to the flatness of the Bay water. The Golden Gate Bridge and the Bay Bridge west span are suspension bridges characterized by lightness, structural clarity, and the graceful parabolic curves of their suspension cables. As linear features in the landscape, they bound and direct views. These bridges converge...
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at, and radiate from, the City, visually reinforcing the centrality of San Francisco as a regional node. These features of the built environment contribute to the visual coherence and quality of San Francisco Bay, providing the viewer with a clear sense of orientation.

Panoramic scenic vistas of San Francisco Bay that include Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island are also available to motorists from major transportation corridors such as the Golden Gate Bridge, the Bay Bridge, and Interstate 80 in Emeryville, Berkeley, and Albany. Passengers on ferries, tour boats, cruise ships, and recreational craft are also afforded excellent views of the Bay that include Treasure Island and Yerba Buena, as are visitors to Alcatraz and Angel Islands.

SCENIC VISTAS OF THE PROJECT AREA FROM AROUND SAN FRANCISCO BAY

The Planning Department has selected photographic views from eight locations as representative of existing visual conditions of the Project Area and its visual setting within San Francisco Bay as viewed from publicly accessible vantage points within and around San Francisco Bay. See Figure IV.B.1: Viewpoint Locations. In the subsequent figures, each existing view (denoted as “Existing”) is presented at the top of the page to show the existing visual setting of the Project Area. Below this image is a representative simulation of the maximum allowable massing (height and bulk of proposed buildings) for the proposed new construction superimposed onto the same view (denoted as “Proposed”), discussed later in this section under “Impacts.” Representative massing simulations illustrate the general location, height, and overall massing of development under the Area Plan/Special Use District (“SUD”). They do not represent any specific design for individual buildings, which would be determined in the future.

Due to the prominent position of the Project Area within scenic vistas of the Bay, the area that may be potentially affected by visual changes under the Proposed Project is regional in scope. Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island’s position in the middle of San Francisco Bay, surrounded by a broad, flat, unobstructed expanse of water, allows Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island to be visible from numerous public vantage points around the rim of the Bay, as well as from numerous elevated public vantage points away from the Bay shoreline (like San Francisco’s hills to the west, the East Bay Hills to the east, and the Marin Hills to the north and northwest).

Scenic vistas of the Project Area and beyond are also available to the public from the surface of the Bay (i.e., from ferries, cruise ships, tour boats and private recreational craft). Such views are similar in character to views from the Bay shoreline, although the Yerba Buena Island landform and the existing buildings of Treasure Island are more prominent within such views, while distant features beyond are comparatively less so. Views from boats are
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FIGURE IV.B.1: VIEWPOINT LOCATIONS
transitory, changing through time as the boat moves through space. Surrounded by flat expanses of water on all sides, persons on boats have access to views that are not available to viewers on land.

**Views from the San Francisco Peninsula**

San Francisco’s eastern waterfront affords panoramic vistas of the Bay, the Bay Bridge, and the East Bay Hills rising in the distance. See Figure IV.B.2: Viewpoint A – View from The Embarcadero at Rincon Park (Existing). In this view, the lawn of Rincon Park occupies the foreground. In the middleground are Herb Caen Way and the Bay water beyond. At the far left in the photograph is the Port of San Francisco’s pedestrian-access Pier 14. See also Figure IV.B.2a: Viewpoint Aa – View from Pier 7 (Existing). In this view, the railing at the eastern end of Pier 7 occupies the foreground.

The Bay Bridge bounds views to the southeast, directing views to the western slopes of Yerba Buena Island rising prominently in the distance (about 1.6 miles). The western and southern shoreline of Treasure Island is visible as a flat expanse to the north of Yerba Buena Island (left in this view). Because of their size, prominent location, and light color, Buildings 1 and 2 are recognizable in the distance. The East Bay Hills rise in the distant background (about 10 miles away).

From the elevated vantage point atop Telegraph Hill, the regional geography of the Bay is readable. See Figure IV.B.3: Viewpoint B – View from Telegraph Hill at Pioneer Park (Existing) – Yerba Buena Island and Treasure Island are more clearly seen as islands surrounded by water on all sides. The East Bay waterfront (in the cities of Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, and Oakland) is visible at the western shoreline of the Bay. The ridgeline of the East Bay Hills is visible rising in the distance. Mt. Diablo (about 28 miles away) is visible rising beyond the East Bay Hills. From Twin Peaks, the Project Area (about 6 miles away) is not prominent. See Figure IV.B.4: Viewpoint C – View from Twin Peaks (Existing). Much of the northern portion of Yerba Buena Island and all of Treasure Island are obscured beyond the high-rise downtown core of San Francisco.

**View from the Marin Headlands**

Vista Point is a popular scenic viewpoint within the Marin Headlands at the northern landing of the Golden Gate Bridge. See Figure IV.B.5: Viewpoint D – View from the Marin Headlands at Vista Point (Existing). The foreground in this view is occupied by Horseshoe Bay at Vista Point. The San Francisco skyline and Telegraph Hill/Coit Tower are prominent and recognizable.
features at the northern end of the San Francisco peninsula (about 5 miles away), as is Alcatraz Island in the Bay. The East Bay shoreline and hills beyond are visible in the background. Yerba Buena Island (about 6 miles away) is a prominent feature at the midpoint of the Bay between the East Bay and the San Francisco Peninsula, flanked by the east and west spans of the Bay Bridge. The low and flat Treasure Island is not a prominent feature in this view.
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FIGURE IV.B.3: VIEW POINT B - VIEW FROM TELEGRAPH HILL AT PIONEER PARK
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FIGURE IV.B.5: VIEW POINT D - VIEW FROM THE MARIN HEADLANDS AT VISTA POINT
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Views from the East Bay

Views from the East Bay Shoreline

The Berkeley Marina, Shorebird Park, and the Berkeley Municipal Fishing Pier are located at the foot of University Avenue on the Berkeley shoreline. Panoramic west-facing views of a vast expanse of water and of familiar visual landmarks are available from this and other locations along the East Bay shoreline. See Figure IV.B.6: Viewpoint E – View from the Berkeley Marina (Existing). In this view, the Bay Bridge east span is seen landing on Yerba Buena Island (the Bay Bridge west span is obscured beyond Yerba Buena Island). The San Francisco skyline rises from the opposite shore of the Bay. Familiar skyscrapers, such as the Transamerica Pyramid and the Bank of America Building, are recognizable. Twin Peaks rises beyond. The Golden Gate Bridge spans the gap between the San Francisco peninsula and the Marin Headlands. This visual setting is often enhanced by dramatic red skies at sunset.

Except for Buildings 1, 2, and 3, Treasure Island is generally not prominent to viewers from the East Bay shoreline because of its distance from the shoreline (about 3.5 miles) and its low and flat position in the Bay. This allows the island to be a minimal visual presence within the foreground of the San Francisco skyline. From this Bay-level vantage point it is difficult to visually discern Treasure Island as a separate landform from the San Francisco peninsula, although Yerba Buena Island is prominent.

Views from the East Bay Hills

The scenic turnout along Grizzly Peak Boulevard is a popular public viewpoint in the Berkeley Hills, with panoramic distant vistas of the northern Bay Area region unobstructed by vegetation and structures. See Figure IV.B.6a: Viewpoint Ea – View from the Berkeley Hills (Existing). The foreground in this view is occupied by undeveloped foothills, and the East Bay flatlands beyond. The Bay is visible in the distance (about 4.8 miles away) as well as familiar features of the Bay including the Bay Bridge, Yerba Buena Island, and Treasure Island (about 8.5 miles away). On the opposite shore of the Bay rises the San Francisco skyline (about 11 miles away) and the hills of San Francisco. The Golden Gate Bridge (about 14.5 miles away) links San Francisco to the hills of Marin County. From this elevated vantage point, Bay water is visible separating Yerba Buena Island and Treasure Island from the San Francisco peninsula (unlike water-level East Bay shoreline locations, in which Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island are not clearly discernible as features distinct from San Francisco).
Views from the Bay Bridge East Span

The visual quality of scenic vistas of the Bay from the Bay Bridge east span will change considerably when the new Bay Bridge east span (now under construction) is completed and opened to the public. See Figure IV.B.7: Viewpoint F – View Looking West from the New Bay Bridge East Span (currently under construction) (Existing). This is particularly so for passengers of commuter and tour buses who would be seated high above the guard rail and would not be driving. This view from the new Bay Bridge east span would be from an open viaduct segment, without the lattice of steel beams that support the existing cantilever segment of the old east span through which westbound travelers on the Bay Bridge east span now view the Bay. Bay water is seen in the foreground. Treasure Island is seen in the middle-ground as a flat expanse of land. From this vantage point, Building 2 and Building 3 are the most prominent visual features, occupying the southern edge of Treasure Island at Clipper Cove. The northern waterfront of San Francisco (with Telegraph Hill and Russian Hill rising beyond), the Golden Gate Bridge, and hills of Marin County are seen in the background in this view.
EXISTING

- New Bay Bridge East Span (Under Construction)
- Yerba Buena Island
- Old Bay Bridge East Span

PROPOSED

- New Bay Bridge East Span Tower (Photo-Simulation)
- Bank of America Building
- Transamerica Pyramid
- Treasure Island
- Golden Gate Bridge
- Berkeley Municipal Pier
- Marin Hills
- Yerba Buena Island
- New Bay Bridge East Span (Under Construction)
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FIGURE IV.B.6a: VIEW POINT Ea - VIEW FROM BERKELEY HILLS
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FIGURE IV.B.7: VIEW POINT F - VIEW LOOKING WEST FROM THE NEW BAY BRIDGE EAST SPAN (CURRENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION)
VISUAL CHARACTER AND SCENIC RESOURCES OF THE PROJECT AREA

Treasure Island

Treasure Island has a rectilinear form oriented generally north/south. Its northwest, northeast, and southeast corners are chamfered (cut off at a 45 degree angle). Topography on the island is low and flat. Existing development is characterized by various low-scale, widely spaced military support facilities of a generally utilitarian character without a strong sense of spatial or design cohesiveness. (See Section IV.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, “D.2, Historic Architectural Resources,” pp. IV.D.36 - IV.D.38.) Large expanses of open land contribute to a sense of spaciousness.

Treasure Island’s approximately 3 miles of shoreline is protected by a rock-filled berm. The berm height, relative to existing finish grades in the interior of the island, limits ground-level views of the surrounding Bay from many Treasure Island locations. Pier 23, a public access fishing and sightseeing pier, is on the west side of the island across from the San Francisco’s northern waterfront. Public access is restricted at the pier on the island’s southeast corner where Navy vessels were once moored. Clipper Cove is a protected area with a private marina on the east side of the causeway connecting Treasure Island with Yerba Buena Island.

The visual gateway to Treasure Island is the Treasure Island Causeway. See Figure IV.B.8: Viewpoint G – View Looking North to Treasure Island from the Causeway (Existing). This view is the “first impression” upon arriving at the island. Buildings 1, 2, and 3, at the southern end of Treasure Island, are remnants of the 1939 - 1940 Golden Gate International Exposition. They are each listed on the National Register of Historic Places as individual resources for their historic and architectural significance. Building 1 is a three-story Art Deco building. This building was originally constructed as the administrative headquarters for the Exposition and was intended for use as an airport passenger terminal after the Exposition closed. The most prominent and architecturally significant building on Treasure Island, Building 1, functions as the island’s visual centerpiece. It is U-shaped in plan. See Figure IV.B.9: Viewpoint H – View Looking East to Building 1 (Existing). A colonnade of vertical pilasters that alternate with double-height vertical window openings is arranged across the central portion of the façade as a counterpoint to the overall horizontality of the building’s profile. Buildings 2 and 3 were originally constructed as exhibition halls for the Exposition and were intended for use as airplane hangars after the Exposition closed.

Avenue of the Palms (also a remnant of the Exposition but not included on the National Register) is a roadway along the western edge of Treasure Island. See Figure IV.B.8 (Existing). Its bayward side is lined with regularly spaced palms, which lend it a formal character that defines
FIGURE IV.B.8: VIEW POINT G -
VIEW LOOKING NORTH TO TREASURE ISLAND FROM THE CAUSEWAY
FIGURE IV.B.9: VIEW POINT H - VIEW LOOKING EAST TO BUILDING 1
the western edge of Treasure Island. The Clipper Cove Marina occupies the protected cove between Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island to the east of the causeway (right in this view). The marina currently has about 100 slips for pleasure craft. (As discussed in Chapter II, Project Description, p. II.9, improvements and expansion of the marina to 400 slips was fully analyzed in the 2005 Transfer and Reuse of Naval Station Treasure Island FEIR.) Rising from beyond the masts of the marina and east of Building 1 (right in this view) is Building 180, constructed by the Navy during World War II as an airplane hangar.

Yerba Buena Island

In contrast to Treasure Island, Yerba Buena Island is a natural island characterized by high topographic relief. It is a prominent landform contributing to scenic vistas of the Bay. Most of the island is steeply sloped, with a few low-lying areas of fill along its eastern side. Considerable soil erosion and disturbance are visible as exposed rock bluffs in the vicinity of the ramps and causeway on the steep west-facing slopes of the island. In contrast to the regular rectilinear street grid of Treasure Island, the street pattern of Yerba Buena Island is characterized by curves and switchbacks that follow the contours of the island’s steep topography.

The island has a variety of buildings constructed by the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard. Buildings on Yerba Buena Island are generally not prominent when viewed from off-island locations, due to their low scale, distance, and the screen of vegetation covering much of the island. Likewise, buildings on Yerba Buena Island are not prominent to travelers on the Bay Bridge/Interstate 80 due to the raised position of the roadway high above the eastern end of the island, although motorists on the Bay Bridge/Interstate 80 may have transitory glimpses of buildings and structures that are located near the Interstate 80 roadway.

The upland portions of the island are occupied by attached, two-story townhouse residential units constructed in the 1960’s. Toward the lower and flatter eastern end of the island is the Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District, or “the Great Whites,” a distinctive and cohesive concentration of historic buildings that is listed as a historic district on the National Register of Historic Places. The district is comprised of distinguished Colonial Revival houses and associated outbuildings and landscape features that were constructed in 1900-1903 for senior military officers and their families. U.S. Coast Guard facilities occupy the eastern shoreline of the island south of the Bay Bridge/Interstate 80. The Torpedo Assembly Building, built in 1891, is at the easternmost point of Yerba Buena Island.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

San Francisco General Plan

As discussed in Chapter III, Plans and Policies, “San Francisco Plans and Policies,” p. III.1, although Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island are located within the jurisdictional boundaries
of the City and County of San Francisco, they are not included in the *San Francisco General Plan (General Plan)* and its related planning and policy documents, or in the San Francisco Planning Code (Planning Code).

As discussed in Chapter II, Project Description, “Proposed General Plan and Planning Code Amendments,” p. II.34, the Area Plan, SUD, and *Design for Development* documents would establish the land use controls and design standards for the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project includes amendments to the text and maps of the *General Plan* and Planning Code that would identify the geographic and physical boundaries of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, and incorporate the land use controls and design standards specified in the Area Plan, SUD, and *Design for Development*.

**San Francisco Bay Plan**

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission’s *San Francisco Bay Plan* contains the following policies related to “Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views” that are applicable to the Proposed Project:

- **Policy 1:** To enhance the visual quality of development around the Bay and to take maximum advantage of the attractive setting it provides, the shores of the Bay should be developed in accordance with the Public Access Design Guidelines.

- **Policy 2:** All bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay. Maximum efforts should be made to provide, enhance, or preserve views of the Bay and shoreline, especially from public areas, from the Bay itself, and from the opposite shore. To this end, planning of waterfront development should include participation by professionals who are knowledgeable of the Commission’s concerns, such as landscape architects, urban designers, or architects, working in conjunction with engineers and professionals in other fields.

- **Policy 3:** In some areas, a small amount of fill may be allowed if the fill is necessary—and is the minimum absolutely required—to develop the project in accordance with the Commission’s design recommendations.

- **Policy 4:** Structures and facilities that do not take advantage of or visually complement the Bay should be located and designed so as not to impact visually on the Bay and shoreline. In particular, parking areas should be located away from the shoreline. However, some small parking areas for fishing access and Bay viewing may be allowed in exposed locations.

- **Policy 8:** Shoreline developments should be built in clusters, leaving open area around them to permit more frequent views of the Bay. Developments along the shores of tributary waterways should be Bay-related and should be designed to preserve and enhance views along the waterway, so as to provide maximum visual contact with the Bay.

- **Policy 10:** Towers, bridges, or other structures near or over the Bay should be designed as landmarks that suggest the location of the waterfront when it is not visible,
especially in flat areas. But such landmarks should be low enough to assure the continued visual dominance of the hills around the Bay.

Policy 12: In order to achieve a high level of design quality, the Commission’s Design Review Board, composed of design and planning professionals, should review, evaluate, and advise the Commission on the proposed design of developments that affect the appearance of the Bay in accordance with the Bay Plan findings and policies on Public Access; on Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views; and the Public Access Design Guidelines. City, county, regional, state, and federal agencies should be guided in their evaluation of bayfront projects by the above guidelines.

Policy 13: Local governments should be encouraged to eliminate inappropriate shoreline uses and poor quality shoreline conditions by regulation and by public actions (including development financed wholly or partly by public funds). The Commission should assist in this regard to the maximum feasible extent by providing advice on Bay-related appearance and design issues, and by coordinating the activities of the various agencies that may be involved with projects affecting the Bay and its appearance.

Policy 14: Views of the Bay from vista points and from roads should be maintained by appropriate arrangements and heights of all developments and landscaping between the view areas and the water. In this regard, particular attention should be given to all waterfront locations, areas below vista points, and areas along roads that provide good views of the Bay for travelers, particularly areas below roads coming over ridges and providing a “first view” of the Bay (shown in Bay Plan Map No. 8, Natural Resources of the Bay).

Policy 15: Vista points should be provided in the general locations indicated in the Plan maps. Access to vista points should be provided by walkways, trails, or other appropriate means and connect to the nearest public thoroughfare where parking or public transportation is available. In some cases, exhibits, museums, or markers would be desirable at vista points to explain the value or importance of the areas being viewed.

IMPACTS

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The City and County of San Francisco has not formally adopted significance standards for impacts related to visual quality. The Planning Department’s Initial Study Checklist form provides a framework of topics to be considered in evaluating a project’s impacts under CEQA. Implementation of a project could have a potentially significant impact related to aesthetics if it were to:

- Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
- Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and other features of the built or natural environment that contribute to a scenic public setting;
• Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; or
• Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties.

Design and aesthetics are, by definition, subjective and open to interpretation by decision-makers and members of the public. A proposed project would be considered to have a significant adverse effect on a scenic vista or on visual quality under CEQA only if it would cause a substantial and demonstrable negative change.

**APPROACH TO ANALYSIS**

Because of the island location of the Project Area at the center of San Francisco Bay, construction-related impacts on scenic vistas and on visual quality would not be visually prominent from surrounding off-site vantage points around the Bay, if discernible at all. Buildout of the proposed project would occur incrementally over 15 to 20 years, so that construction and operational impacts on visual quality would occur simultaneously over this period. The impacts analyzed here are those at buildout of the proposed Area Plan/SUD.

An independent consultant has photographed the Project Area from a range of publicly accessible vantage points. From these, the Planning Department has selected eight representative views. These views are presented and described above on pp. IV.B.2 – IV.B.15 (denoted on the figures as “Existing”). The existing view represents the existing baseline visual condition of the Project Area, viewed from distant public vantage points along the shoreline of San Francisco Bay as well as from areas within the Project Area from which views would be most affected by the construction of new buildings under the Proposed Project.

Below this image of existing conditions, a representative massing simulation of the Proposed Project is superimposed on the same view. This allows the reader to compare existing photographic views with massing-level visualizations of the Proposed Project. It should be noted that the representative massing simulations are simple diagrams illustrating the maximum overall height and volume of proposed new construction. The simulations depict the general location, height, and overall massing of future development under the Area Plan/SUD. They do not represent any specific design or exact location for individual buildings, which would be determined in the future, subject to the standards and guidelines in the Proposed Project’s *Design for Development*. 
PROJECT IMPACTS

As described in Chapter II, Project Description, “Building Heights,” p. II.24, the Design for Development associated with the originally proposed Redevelopment Plan envisions construction of a dense cluster of up to 19 high-rise towers on Treasure Island. The highest densities and tallest buildings are proposed for the Island Center at the southern portion of Treasure Island. Proposed new buildings within the Island Center would include a residential tower up to 650 feet tall adjacent to Building 1 to its north and east. Note that the construction program allows for some limited flexibility in the siting of tower volumes. See Figure IV.B.10: Proposed Representative Massing Diagram. In this figure, the “wire-frame” boxes above the representative building volumes do not represent maximum height and bulk. Rather, they represent the spatial limits within which the tower volumes may shift when the development program is implemented and specific building designs are proposed.

Buildings 1, 2, and 3 would be retained and reused, and would become part of the Island Center District, a dense mix of retail, restaurant, office, hotel, residential, transit, and community services uses located in the southern part of Treasure Island. New infill buildings would be constructed in the vicinity of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 south of California Avenue. The Island Center would include a Ferry Terminal east of Building 1 at the water’s edge. A tall residential tower, up to 650 feet, is proposed north of Building 1. The Island Center would also permit high-rise towers up to 450 feet tall. Within two residential districts, the Cityside and Eastside Districts, individual blocks would consist primarily of a dense, low-rise podium (up to 70 feet) punctuated by mid-rise buildings (between 70 and 130 feet) and neighborhood high-rise towers (up to 240 feet).

As described in Chapter II, Project Description, “Yerba Buena Island District,” p. II.22, new construction on Yerba Buena Island would be placed primarily on the sites of existing buildings and would be predominantly low-rise, stepping down hillsides. A mid-rise building up to 80 feet in height would be permitted in zone Y3. Building height limitations would be established by the Design for Development to ensure that development would not substantially interfere with existing views from hilltop public park areas, as provided for in the Trust Exchange legislation. The historic Nimitz House and eight other Senior Officers’ Quarters and the Torpedo Assembly Building would be rehabilitated and programmed for public uses.

Approximately 300 acres of proposed open space would be constructed within the Development Plan Area as part of the Proposed Project. The open space would include a variety of programmed and natural habitat elements, including public parks and recreation areas; shoreline trails and access improvements; a stormwater wetland; Urban Agricultural Park; Cultural Park, adjacent to Building 1; a plaza adjacent to the Ferry Terminal and Transit Hub; a pedestrian promenade along Clipper Cove; preserved and new wildlife habitat on Yerba Buena Island; and Hilltop Park, with vista points, overlooks, and trails, on Yerba Buena Island.
Impact AE-1: Development under the Proposed Project would adversely alter scenic vistas of San Francisco and San Francisco Bay from public vantage points along the eastern shoreline of San Francisco, Telegraph Hill, the East Bay shoreline, and from the Bay Bridge east span. *(Significant and Unavoidable)*

As discussed above under “Setting,” p. IV.B.1, views of San Francisco Bay are among the most scenic and recognizable in the world. The position of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island at the center of San Francisco Bay provides unobstructed views of the Project Area from numerous public vantage points along the Bay shoreline, as well as upland areas around the Bay. Views of the Bay that include the Project Area are highly coherent. Distinctive natural and built environment features combine to create a visual setting that is highly readable, geographically orienting the viewer.

Implementation of the proposed Area Plan/SUD would create a prominent new cluster of high-rise buildings on Treasure Island at the center of San Francisco Bay. The tallest of the proposed buildings (650 feet) would be comparable to the height of the suspension towers of the Bay Bridge west span. As discussed under Setting, p. IV.B.1, panoramic views of the Bay and familiar visual landmarks within and surrounding the Bay are available from various locations around the shoreline of the Bay and from elevated inland locations. The particularly scenic quality of Bay views relies on the arrangement of distinctive natural and built environment elements in readable and recognizable patterns, and on a clear visual hierarchy of built forms that conveys the regional importance of San Francisco.

Proposed new construction on Treasure Island would adversely alter scenic vistas of San Francisco Bay from the eastern waterfront of San Francisco (see Figure IV.B.2: View Point A – View from The Embarcadero at Rincon Park (Proposed), and Figure IV.B.2a: Viewpoint Aa – View from Pier 7 (Proposed)), and from Telegraph Hill (see Figure IV.B.3: View Point B – View from Telegraph Hill at Pioneer Park (Proposed)). From these vantage points new construction on Treasure Island would be a prominent new visual presence within scenic vistas of San Francisco Bay, occupying a wide expanse of an individual’s field of view.

New construction on Treasure Island would not have a substantial adverse impact on scenic vistas from more distant off-site locations. From Twin Peaks, the proposed new construction on Treasure Island would not be prominent, if discernible at all. (See Figure IV.B.4: View Point C – View from Twin Peaks (Proposed).) It would be largely obscured beyond dense, high-rise development of Downtown San Francisco. From the hills of Marin, the proposed new construction on Treasure Island would not be a dominant visual presence in the context of panoramic scenic vistas of the Bay that include the San Francisco skyline, the Golden Gate Bridge, and other familiar Bay landmarks.
Bridge, the Bay Bridge, Yerba Buena Island, and the East Bay Hills. (See Figure IV.B.5: View Point D – View from the Marin Headlands at Vista Point (Proposed).) Similarly, from the East Bay Hills the proposed new construction on Treasure Island would not be a dominant visual presence in the context of panoramic scenic vistas of the Bay that include the East Bay flatland and shoreline, the San Francisco skyline, the Golden Gate Bridge, the Bay Bridge, Yerba Buena Island, and the hills of Marin County. (See Figure IV.B.6a: View Point Ea – View from the Berkeley Hills (Proposed).) From this elevated location, Treasure Island would continue to be visibly discernible as a feature distinct from San Francisco.
Views from the East Bay shoreline would be significantly altered. (See Figure IV.B.6: View Point E – View from the Berkeley Marina (Proposed).) Considerably nearer to the viewer than the San Francisco skyline, the proposed development on Treasure Island would appear as large or larger than the skyscrapers of Downtown San Francisco. To the extent that segments of the San Francisco skyline would continue to be visible in the background between and around proposed new buildings on Treasure Island, proposed new buildings would eclipse the San Francisco skyline in visual importance. The new cluster of high-rise buildings on Treasure Island would visually merge with the San Francisco skyline, creating visual ambiguity as to what the viewer is actually observing the San Francisco skyline or the Treasure Island skyline. The resulting view would thus be less readable and less coherent when viewed from the East Bay shoreline.

The Proposed Project would affect scenic vistas available to the public from the surface of the Bay (i.e., from ferries, cruise ships, tour boats, and private recreational craft). Viewed from some positions within the Bay, the impacts of the Proposed Project on scenic vistas would be similar in character to those described above for shoreline viewpoint locations on land, although the Yerba Buena Island landform and the proposed buildings on Treasure Island would be more prominent within such views, while distant features beyond would be comparatively less so. Unlike scenic vistas from fixed positions on land, views from boats are transitory, changing through time as the boat moves through space. Surrounded by flat, unobstructed expanses of water in all directions, persons on boats in the Bay would continue to have access to panoramic scenic vistas of the Bay that are unaffected by the Proposed Project and that are not available to viewers on land. For these reasons, the impact of the Proposed Project on scenic vistas from the surface of the Bay would be less than significant.

Viewed from the new Bay Bridge east span (currently under construction), new construction on Treasure Island would be prominent in west- and northwest-facing views of the Bay from the Bay Bridge. See Figure IV.B.7: Viewpoint F – View Looking West from the New Bay Bridge East Span (currently under construction) (Proposed). Much of the southern and western portion of the island would have buildings with a base height of 50 to 70 feet, punctuated by 125- to 450-foot-tall-towers and a 650-foot-tall signature tower near the southwest corner of the island. Heights of towers would follow a general pattern of stepping down gradually to the east and north from the 650-foot-tall signature tower. The 650-foot tower would be comparable in height to the cable stay tower of the new Bay Bridge east span. The Proposed Project would introduce new prominent large-scale development in the middle-ground of scenic vistas of the Bay when viewed from the Bay Bridge east span. Views of familiar visual features in and around Bay (the Golden Gate Bridge, Alcatraz Island, Angel Island, and the Marin Headlands) would be obstructed or partially obstructed by the proposed development. The obstruction of views from the Bay Bridge to these other familiar visual landmarks around the Bay would diminish the existing visual reciprocity that exists between these familiar visual landmarks that contributes to a clear sense of spatial orientation and coherence within the City.
Given the familiarity and exceptionally high quality of the existing San Francisco Bay scenic resource, the regional prominence of the Project Area within views of the Bay, and the scale of proposed new development on Treasure Island, the effect of the Proposed Project on scenic vistas of the Bay when viewed from the eastern waterfront of San Francisco, Telegraph Hill, the East Bay shoreline, and from the Bay Bridge east span would be considered significant. This effect on a scenic resource is also considered unavoidable because no effective mitigation measure is available that would avoid or substantially reduce a significant impact on scenic Bay vistas resulting from construction of a new, high-density urban community on Treasure Island.

**Impact AE-2: The Proposed Project would affect existing features that are considered scenic resources on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. (Less than Significant)**

As described above under Setting, and for the purposes of this analysis, the following features within the Project Area are considered scenic resources: Buildings 1, 2, and 3; historic buildings and associated landscape features of the Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District; the Torpedo Assembly Building; Avenue of the Palms; and the Yerba Buena Island landform.

Under the proposed Area Plan/SUD, Buildings 1, 2, and 3 on Treasure Island, buildings and landscape features within the Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District, and the Torpedo Assembly Building on Yerba Buena Island would be retained, rehabilitated, and reused in a manner that conforms to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. (See Section IV.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, “D.2, Historic Architectural Resources,” pp. IV.D.52 – p. IV.D.61). Conformity with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards would ensure that the essential historic and architectural character of these visual resources would be preserved.

New infill buildings would be constructed in the vicinity of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 south of California Avenue (see Figures IV.B.7 through IV.B.9). West of Building 1, a proposed new Ferry Terminal (up to 50 feet tall) at the water’s edge and proposed retail pavilions (up to 20 feet tall) would be constructed. Between Building 1 and Building 2, new mixed-use buildings (various heights from 50 to 450 feet tall) would be constructed. South of Buildings 2 and 3 along Clipper Cove, new residential buildings (30, 50, and 125 feet tall) would be constructed.

New infill construction south of California Avenue in the vicinity of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 would not damage these visual resources of the built environment. Building 1 would continue to be a prominent visual presence, functioning as the visual centerpiece of Treasure Island. Buildings 2 and 3 would become less prominent when viewed from the causeway and from the Bay Bridge east span due to proposed new construction south of these buildings along Clipper Cove and
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proposed new infill construction west of Building 2. Buildings 2 and 3 would no longer occupy the water’s edge at Clipper Cove. The basic form of Buildings 2 and 3, defined by the wide arched span of their roofs, and architectural features such as the distinctive corner pylons and upper fenestration would continue to be prominent, rising from beyond the proposed new buildings along Clipper Cove. As discussed under Impact AE-3 below, the Design for Development provides design standards for alterations and additions to historic buildings and for new construction in their vicinity. These standards are intended to preserve the historic character of these visual resources.

Although Avenue of the Palms is not considered a historical resource for the purposes of analysis in “D.2, Historic Architectural Resources” in Section IV.D, it is a familiar formal visual feature that now defines the western edge of Treasure Island. Under the proposed Development Plan, Avenue of the Palms would be removed and replaced by a proposed new palm-lined landscaped plaza (Waterfront Plaza) west of Building 1 at the proposed Ferry Terminal landing. Further north along the western edge of Treasure Island, a proposed new park (“Cityside Waterfront Park”) would be constructed. The proposed Waterfront Plaza and Cityside Waterfront Park would replace the existing Avenue of the Palms to define the western edge of Treasure Island, to provide greenery and texture to visually soften this urban edge, to provide recreational opportunities, and to provide access to the shoreline and scenic vistas of the Bay toward the San Francisco peninsula and the hills of Marin County.

As described above and in Chapter II, Project Description, “Yerba Buena Island District,” p. II.22, new construction on Yerba Buena Island would be placed primarily on the sites of existing buildings and would be predominantly low-rise, stepping down hillsides. See (New) Figure IV.B.2a: Viewpoint Aa – View from Pier 7, on EIR p. IV.B.5a. Existing residential buildings that are now visible on Yerba Buena Island from San Francisco would be replaced by new residential buildings of comparable scale (some new buildings would be 1-2 stories taller than the existing buildings). A mid-rise building would be permitted in zone 4Y stepping down the north slope of the island facing Clipper Cove. Building height and placement limitations established by the Design for Development (see Figure II.5: Yerba Buena View Corridors, p. II.23, and Figure II.6b: Yerba Buena Island Maximum Height Limit Plan, p. II.27 in Chapter II, Project Description) would ensure that development would not rise above the ridgeline of Yerba Buena Island to substantially alter the existing visual character of the Yerba Buena Island landform as a scenic resource of San Francisco Bay. Proposed new development on Yerba Buena Island would not be substantially more prominent than existing development when viewed from locations around the Bay, if discernible at all.

For these reasons, although the Proposed Project would introduce new development in the vicinity of existing features that are considered scenic resources, the impact is considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.
Impact AE-3: New construction on Treasure Island would alter the existing visual character and visual quality of the Project Area. (Less than Significant)

The proposed construction program would transform the existing visual character of Treasure Island. As described above under Setting, pp. IV.B.12 – IV.B.15, the existing visual character of Treasure Island is largely defined by Buildings 1, 2, and 3 (each individually listed on the National Register) at the southern end of the island, and by low-scale, widely spaced military support facilities of a utilitarian character. The island is not characterized by a strong sense of spatial or design cohesiveness.

New construction on Treasure Island would be considerably denser and more urban in visual character than existing conditions. New infill construction would be constructed in the vicinity of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 (see Figure IV.B.8 (Proposed)). From this viewpoint, Building 1 would continue to function as the prominent visual centerpiece at the entrance to Treasure Island. The tallest building, a 650-foot-tall residential tower in the Island Center, would rise from beyond Building 1, reinforcing the centrality of Building 1. The tall tower would be flanked on both sides by successively lower, rhythmically spaced towers in a pyramidal composition.

Figure IV.B.9 (Proposed) shows the view toward Building 1 from the open area west of Building 1. Low, 20-foot-tall retail pavilions in the foreground would symmetrically flank this view of Building 1. High-rise towers would rise from beyond Building 1. Its low horizontal form, curved façade, and distinctive architectural features would contrast with nearby new construction.

Presented below are representative perspective renderings of proposed development on Treasure Island, reproduced from the proposed Design for Development. These figures illustrate the urban design intent for Treasure Island as viewed from key public gathering spaces on Treasure Island. See Figure IV.B.11: Representative Rendering of the Ferry Terminal; Figure IV.B.12: Representative Rendering of Marina Plaza; Figure IV.B.13: Representative Rendering of Clipper Cove Promenade; Figure IV.B.14: Representative Rendering of Cityside Avenue and Shoreline Park; Figure IV.B.15: Representative Rendering of Eastside Commons; and Figure IV.B.16: Representative Rendering of Typical Garden Street.

As part of the Proposed Project, a Design for Development would be adopted and implemented.¹ The Design for Development is a regulatory document that would establish design standards and
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guidelines that would direct future development of the Project Area. The *Design for Development* articulates the vision for the future visual character of the Project Area. It establishes specific requirements for buildings, streets, open spaces, and parking and loading to encourage high-quality design and materials, an inviting pedestrian orientation, and visual variety and interest while maintaining a cohesive visual identity for the Project Area.

The *Design for Development* establishes a specific framework for the placement, layout, landscaping and visual character of public open spaces within the Project Area (Public Open Space Chapters T2 and Y2) to promote public spaces that are visually
FIGURE IV.B.14: REPRESENTATIVE RENDERING OF CITYSIDE AVENUE AND SHORELINE PARK
FIGURE IV.B.15: REPRESENTATIVE RENDERING OF EASTSIDE COMMONS
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FIGURE IV.B.16: REPRESENTATIVE RENDERING OF TYPICAL GARDEN STREET
appealing and inviting. Specific streetscape standards for each proposed street or street type (Streets Chapters T2 and Y2) specify street widths and configurations, the location, spacing, species of plantings, street furniture, and paving materials. Standards and guidelines governing the distribution of building heights, building massing, and building articulation (Building Envelope Chapters T4 and Y4) are provided to protect and enhance views, maintain appropriate pedestrian scale, and create a visually appealing skyline for Treasure Island, while minimizing visual impacts of new construction on Yerba Buena Island. Building design standards and guidelines (Chapters T5 and Y5) provide more specific direction for the design of façades, fenestration, commercial frontage, parking structures, signage, and building materials. Their objective is to promote buildings that contribute visual interest, texture, and variety to the public and pedestrian realm, while establishing a cohesive visual order and identity for the Proposed Project and its neighborhoods.

The Design for Development’s building design standards also provide design standards for alterations and additions to historic buildings and for nearby new construction (Chapters T5.10 and Y5.7). These standards require that alterations and additions conform to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The building design standards establish allowable building zones and height limits for additions to, and new construction in the vicinity of, historic resources. These standards are intended to preserve the historic visual character of historic resources on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, while allowing for their reuse and the redevelopment of adjacent sites.

As a regulatory document, the Design for Development is intended to ensure the enhancement of visual quality within the Project Area. It would inform the design and review of specific development projects within the Project Area. If the proposed Design for Development is adopted by the decision-makers, it would reflect the City’s long-term vision for the visual character and quality of the Project Area. Presented below for illustrative purposes are representative isometric renderings, reproduced from the proposed Design for Development. These figures illustrate the intent of the proposed Design for Development that buildings be sculpted and articulated to contribute visual interest, texture and variety to the public realm. See Figure IV.B.17: Island Center District Isometric View; Figure IV.B.18: Cityside District Isometric View; and Figure IV.B.19: Eastside District Isometric View. Note however, that they do not illustrate any particular building design or specific placement. New construction within the Project Area would be subject to design review by TIDA for conformity with the Design for Development as specific designs are proposed in the future.
Changes in visual character, even substantial and transformative changes such as those that would result from implementation of the Area Plan/SUD, do not in themselves constitute a significant adverse impact on visual character under CEQA unless they would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Implementation of the Area Plan/SUD would not cause a significant adverse change in the visual character and quality of the Project Area. Implementation of approved design guidelines in the *Design for Development* would ensure that the Proposed Project would not cause
This image is from the March 5, 2010 Draft Design for Development. The existing chapel is now being retained, and the Design for Development will be updated accordingly.
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FIGURE IV.B.18: CITYSIDE DISTRICT ISOMETRIC VIEW
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FIGURE IV.B.19: EASTSIDE DISTRICT ISOMETRIC VIEW
a significant adverse impact on the visual quality of the Project Area and its surroundings. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Impact AE-4: Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase the nighttime lighting requirements within the Development Plan Area, would affect nighttime views of the Bay from public areas, and would increase potential sources of glare. (Less than Significant)

Current levels of nighttime lighting within the Development Plan Area are relatively low, consistent with the relatively low intensity of existing land uses within the Development Plan Area. Current sources of nighttime light include exterior security lighting of buildings, yards, streets, parking lots, and light emitted from within occupied residential buildings. Given the distances to mainland locations around the Bay, the low-rise stature of buildings within the Development Plan Area, and a cover of vegetation, the Development Plan Area is not a prominent visual presence within nighttime views of the Bay from mainland locations around the Bay.

Implementation of the proposed Area Plan/SUD would increase the nighttime lighting requirements within the Development Plan Area. Lighting for the Proposed Project would include exterior lighting of streets, sidewalks, parking areas, public spaces, and building entrances. Light would also be emitted from the interiors of residential and non-residential buildings. The Proposed Project would also include a Sports Park located immediately north of the Eastside neighborhood. The Sports Park would include a range of sports facilities (e.g., for baseball, soccer, football, basketball, tennis, etc.). Nighttime use of the Sports Park would require elevated high-intensity outdoor lighting to illuminate the playing fields, creating the potential for spillover of intrusive amounts of light into nearby residential areas. The particular program and layout of the facility, the particular location and characteristics of Sports Park lighting, and of landscape screening around the facility have not been determined at this time.²

New sources of nighttime lighting on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island would affect nighttime views of the Bay as seen from various public locations around the Bay. Figure IV.B.20: Nighttime View from Calhoun Terrace on Telegraph Hill, and Figure IV.B.21: Nighttime View from the Berkeley Marina, are representative renderings of nighttime views of the Proposed Project within the Bay from San Francisco and the East Bay, prepared by an independent visual simulation consultant, Steelblue LLC.

² A typical soccer field would require four 40- to 70-foot-tall light poles. A typical softball field would require six 40- to 70-foot-tall light poles. A typical baseball field would require six 40- to 70-foot-tall light poles. A typical volleyball court would require four 40- to 70-foot-tall light poles. A typical batting cage would require four 40- to 70-foot-tall light poles. See TICD, Memorandum re: Responses to Outstanding Information Request, from Alex Galovich to YBI/TI RP EIR Team, December 1, 2009.
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FIGURE IV.B.20: NIGHTTIME VIEW FROM CALHOUN TERRACE ON TELEGRAPH HILL
IV.B.27b

**FIGURE IV.B.21: NIGHTTIME VIEW FROM BERKELEY MARINA**
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SOURCE: Steelblue
The existing character of nighttime lighting as a feature of views of the Bay from these locations is consistent with the role of the central Bay as a regional center of population, commerce, industry and transportation. In nighttime views from San Francisco, the most prominent existing illuminated features include street lights and lighted buildings on Treasure Island, the Bay Bridge West Span, transportation infrastructure along the opposite shoreline, commercial and industrial activities in the East Bay flatlands including the Port of Oakland, and residences in the East Bay Hills. In nighttime views of the Bay from the East Bay, the most prominent illuminated features of the Bay include Treasure Island, the Bay Bridge East Span, the San Francisco skyline, and the Golden Gate Bridge. Unlike daytime scenic views of this portion of the Bay (as described on EIR pp. IV.B.1-IV.B.11) in which dramatic topographic features around the Bay combine with recognizable built features, water, and sky to create readable and memorable scenic compositions characterized by spatial and geographic clarity, nighttime views of the Bay are not characterized by such clarity. Unlit features recede in prominence, while the prominence of illuminated features is elevated. As such, the character and enjoyment of nighttime views of the Bay are largely based on the visual effect of light sources and the play of light on water.

The proposed development on Treasure Island would be a prominent new illuminated presence within nighttime views of the Bay, rising from the Bay water and reflected in the Bay water adjacent to Treasure Island, particularly when viewed from San Francisco. However, viewed from the East Bay shoreline at the Berkeley Marina, against the background of San Francisco’s downtown skyline, the visual change from existing nighttime conditions would be less discernible. The perception of this change is largely subjective. Some viewers who have grown accustomed to existing nighttime visual conditions of the Bay may experience the change as an undesirable consequence of the Proposed Project. Other viewers may perceive the nighttime lighting of the Proposed Project as a new visual resource of the Bay. Light originating from the Proposed Project and visible from mainland locations would not contribute substantially to existing ambient light conditions on the mainland that could affect human comfort or disrupt sleep. The impact of Project lighting on mainland locations and on nighttime views of the Bay would therefore be considered less than significant.

The potential for project impacts from nighttime lighting would be greatest for the existing residential uses that would remain (like the Job Corps site), and the new residential uses that would be constructed under the Proposed Project. However, project lighting would also be visible from distant mainland locations. Given the height and density of proposed new residential development on Treasure Island, a nighttime skyline of Treasure Island would become a prominent new visual presence within nighttime views of the Bay, as it would in daytime views of the Development Plan Area (see Impact AE-1 above). The intensity of project light when
viewed from mainland locations around the Bay would be diffused by distance. In addition, the lighting standards and guidelines established by the Design for Development (discussed below) would ensure that project light would not adversely affect nighttime views from the mainland nor substantially affect persons or properties on the mainland.

The Design for Development includes lighting standards and guidelines which are intended to conserve energy and resources, minimize light trespass and obtrusive light, and preserve the nighttime environment by minimizing light pollution. The lighting standards require that all new outdoor lighting fixtures include cutoff control, which limits the intensity of horizontal light emitted by lighting fixtures. The lighting standards also establish performance criteria which all new outdoor lighting must meet to minimize light trespass onto neighboring properties. These standards have been developed by the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America. The lighting standards identify four Lighting Zones: LZ1 - Dark (Park and Rural Settings); LZ2 - Low (Residential Areas); LZ3 – Medium (Commercial/Industrial, High Density Residential); and LZ4 – High (Major City Centers, Entertainment Districts). For each zone, the lighting standards establish the appropriate corresponding limits on the intensity of light (in foot-candles) as measured at the site boundary of the affected use. The Design for Development also includes lighting guidelines for the proposed Sports Park. Sports Park lighting guidelines call for lighting fixtures to adhere to the above standards. Compliance with the standards required by the Design for Development as part of the Proposed Project would ensure that the potential impact of light trespass from new project lighting on existing residents, including those at the Job Corps campus, and on proposed new residential uses on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island would be less than significant.

- The Proposed Project would not result in excessive glare that could substantially affect human comfort. The effect of glare, resulting from sunlight reflected off of building surfaces and reaching the eye of a viewer is a transitory phenomenon that changes with the position of the sun and the position of the viewer, time of year, and atmospheric conditions. As such, the quality and intensity of reflected sunlight is always in flux. The perception of this phenomenon is largely subjective. Some viewers who have grown accustomed to reflected sunlight from buildings located in the East Bay Hills as seen from San Francisco, or viewers who have grown accustomed to reflections of sunlight from buildings located in San Francisco as seen from the East Bay, the North Bay or other parts of San Francisco, may experience the change in sunlight reflected off building surfaces within the Proposed Project area as an undesirable consequence of the Proposed Project. Other viewers may perceive the same change as a new visual resource of the Bay.

---

3 Draft Design for Development, p. 197.
4 Draft Design for Development, p. 89.
Implementation of the Proposed Project could create excessive daytime glare if new buildings include highly reflective materials. The potential for excessive daytime glare would be greatest for receptors within the Development Plan Area and travelers on the Bay Bridge. The intensity of reflected daytime glare on mainland locations around the Bay would be diffused by distance. The proposed Design for Development prohibits the use of reflective or mirrored glass in new construction.\(^5\) (Please see Guidelines T5.4.27 and T5.4.33 in Section T5.4, Pedestrian Scale, on p. 186, of the March 5, 2010 draft Design for Development. The guideline numbers and the page number cited above could change as part of an update to the proposed Design for Development.) New buildings within the Project Area would thus include transparent or lightly tinted glass rather than reflective glass, to minimize reflection of sunlight. Conformity with the Design for Development would ensure that the potential for daytime glare from project buildings would be less than significant.

Light levels resulting from buildout of the Area Plan/SUD would be consistent with the urban character and associated ambient light levels of the City as a whole and would not exceed levels commonly accepted by residents in an urban setting. Implementation of the standards for

---

\(^5\) Draft Design for Development, pp. 184, 186, and 268.
project lighting established in the *Design for Development*, and compliance with the *Design for Development*’s prohibition on reflective or mirrored glass in new construction would ensure that the effects related to light and glare would be less than significant.

**CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

**Impact AE-5: The Proposed Project would not contribute cumulatively to impacts related to aesthetics when considered with nearby projects. (Less than Significant)**

Although the Proposed Project would have significant and unavoidable impacts on scenic vistas of the Bay, these impacts would not contribute to cumulative degradation of scenic vistas and visual quality when considered with anticipated projects on mainland locations around the perimeter of the Bay. There are no other development projects that are proposed nearby. The Project Area is located at the center of San Francisco Bay, physically separated from the surrounding mainland around the perimeter of the Bay by wide expanses of open water (distance from the San Francisco Peninsula, about 1.6 miles; from the East Bay shoreline, about 3.5 miles; from Marin, about 6 miles). To the extent that anticipated future development around San Francisco Bay would be visible when viewing the Proposed Project, it would be seen in expansive long-range views. Future development within these mainland areas would not be prominent (if discernible at all) when viewed in the context of the Proposed Project from distant vantage points around the perimeter of the Bay.

The Proposed Project would not contribute to cumulative degradation of scenic vistas and visual quality when considered with the new Bay Bridge east span. The new bridge’s simple single-level viaduct design and its single cable stay tower, together with the removal of the old Bay Bridge east span, would generally have a beneficial impact on scenic vistas and visual quality, improving scenic vistas and visual quality of the Bay when viewed from the new span itself.

The Proposed Project would not contribute to a cumulative degradation of scenic vistas or visual quality when considered with the Yerba Buena Island Ramps Improvement Project. Adverse impacts on the historic visual setting of historical resources on Yerba Buena Island are the result of the Ramps Project. The Proposed Project would not contribute to this impact. Historic architectural resources on Yerba Buena Island would be retained, rehabilitated, and reused consistent with Secretary of the Interior Standards, to ensure that their visual and architectural character is preserved.

The Proposed Project would not contribute to a cumulative degradation of scenic vistas or visual quality when considered with the Clipper Cove Marina project. That project would construct improvements at Clipper Cove to increase the capacity of the marina from about 100 slips to 400

---

slips. The enlarged marina would occupy a larger portion of the foreground in Clipper Cove when viewed from the causeway. Implementation of the Design for Development as part of the Proposed Project would reduce the Proposed Project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts on visual quality to a less-than-significant level.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not have significant cumulative impacts related to Aesthetics.