2.4 AESTHETICS

2.4.1 REPRESENTATIVE MASSING

Comments

1. The massing reflected in Volume I, Pg. IV.B.2, in no way reflects the massing that has been presented to the CAB over the past 10 years, far exceeding previous programmatic parameters that have been presented to us. To say that the CAB is disappointed by these massing images is an understatement. To be brutally honest, the CAB was rather “horrified” by the images in the DEIR. We would like it clarified to reflect more clearly the images that the CAB has previously seen. (Although we fully understand that this massing picture is used in all DEIRs, it is no less disturbing to see buildings pictured in this massing simulation manner.) (Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Citizens’ Advisory Board) [8.1]

Vol. 1, IV.B.2, Aesthetics: The reference to the simulation of the maximum allowable massing (height and bulk) needs to be consistent with the ‘slender’ building simulations shown in all published plan documents, over the past year or two. We request that all simulations are being redone to fit the project as described in this DEIR. (Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.10]

Vol. 1, IV.B.13, Aesthetics: View Points G & H show over-bulky massing simulations, not in keeping with the overall plan intent of ‘slender’ towers. New buildings as simulated dwarf and minimize the iconic view of historic buildings. Why does View Point G omit simulating the new Ferry Terminal? (Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.17]

Vol. 1, IV.B.20, Aesthetics: Figure IV.B.10: Proposed Representative Massing Diagram - what is shown here is vague, and suggestive. If there is uncertainty in the proposed plan where buildings actually will be sited, then the Visual Analysis needs to evaluate the range of impacts, simulate all possible variants and analyze the full range of possible impacts. (Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.19]

- Relabel Figure IV.B.10 “Proposed Representative Massing Diagram” as “A Range of Possible Height and Bulk Scenarios”, or remove it entirely as misleading since many people who read an EIR are mainly guided by the diagrams;
- Add a new graphic (not outlines but fully blocked in) at this same scale to show that the worst case scenario is what is being studied in this EIR, as required by CEQA. (Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow) [38.5]

How were the photographic views simulated, given the fact that the location and siting of the tower volumes has not yet been determined? Please explain the method used in light of the fact that, as stated in the DEIR, “the construction program allows for flexibility in the siting of tower volumes.” “Wire-frame” boxes are presented in a massing diagram to “represent the spatial limits within which the tower volumes may shift when the development program is implemented and specific building designs are proposed.” This uncertainty makes the photographic views vague and potentially misleading. (Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers) [39.24]
Would hope "Main Tower" would truly be a beautiful structure. I can remember when the GGIE’s “Tower of the Sun" glowed golden towards the city. The illustrated views in your EIR show the high rise buildings on T.I. colored (if that is the word) in a dreadful grayish-black, appropriate for an oil well, steel mill, or power plant, but not for what will be one of the finest urban settings in the world.  *(Neil Malloch)* [44.1]

**Response**

Comments express concern for the conceptual massing representations presented in the EIR. As explained in EIR Section IV.B, Aesthetics, on p. IV.B.2, for the purposes of the EIR, representations of the general location and maximum allowable height and bulk of proposed buildings are provided in the EIR. Such massing representations do not represent any specific building designs, which are to be determined in the future. The actual building designs would be shaped, articulated, and detailed, pursuant to the building design standards described in Section T5, Building Design on pp. 177-202 of the proposed *Design for Development*. As noted on EIR p. IV.B.26, when specific building designs are developed, either the Planning Commission or TIDA, depending on the location of the building, would review the proposed design against the standards and guidelines provided in the proposed *Design for Development* to ensure that it contributes visual interest, texture, and variety to the public and pedestrian realm. Figure IV.B.10: Proposed Representative Massing Diagram, on EIR p. IV.B.20, shows the maximum building volumes as “wire frame” boxes to delineate the spatial limits within which building volumes may be located when specific designs are proposed. To clarify, under no development scenario would the proposed buildings occupy the entire mass of the “wire frame” boxes; rather, the frames define the field in which a smaller or narrower structure may be sited. Although specific building locations are not yet determined, this massing diagram delineates the limits of potential building locations with sufficient specificity for analysis of visual impacts under CEQA. Furthermore, as shown on Figure T3.d: Key Plan to the Treasure Island Land Use Table, and Figure T4c: Development Block and Easement Plan, on p. 155 and p. 159, respectively, of the proposed *Design for Development*, the area and maximum allowable development footprint has been established from a permitted land use and two-dimensional land plan perspective. As such, massing simulations and massing diagrams are appropriately used as the basis for analysis of visual impacts under CEQA.

Massing simulations tend to overstate the actual aesthetic impact of the Proposed Project, because actual building designs would be less massive and have greater visual articulation and interest than the massing studies used in preparing the EIR. In this respect, the EIR provides a conservative, “worst-case” analysis of the visual impact of the Proposed Project.

In response to comments, to provide the reader with additional information to aid in the understanding of the general intent of the proposed *Design for Development* for building sculpting and articulation, the second full paragraph of EIR p. IV.B.26 is revised as follows to
present new representative isometric images reproduced from the proposed Design for Development (new text is underlined):

As a regulatory document, the proposed 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.

New Figures IV.B.17, IV.B.18, and IV.B.19 are shown on the following pages.

### 2.4.2 SETTING

#### Comments

1. Please state why views of the Bay, including the project area, are of particularly high visual quality.

2. Please state why, the dramatic topographic features of the central portion of the Bay contribute to “highly recognizable, even iconic, scenic vistas.”

3. Please state why, the distinctive built environmental features of the central portion of the Bay contribute to “highly recognizable, even iconic, scenic vistas.” *(Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law) [13.1]*

Treasure Island today is so low and inconspicuous that it almost disappears into the Bay, and that is its greatest aesthetic tribute. Its flatness is its greatest beauty; its flatness echoes the surrounding expanses of Bay water. Its flatness is in perfect contrast to the natural ruggedness of Yerba Buena Island, and the other islands and hills, in every direction, surrounding the Bay. It sinks into the Bay like a great barge at anchor. It is in harmony with its surroundings. *(Chris Stockton, Architect) [42.1c]*
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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(NEW) FIGURE IV.B.18: CITYSIDE DISTRICT ISOMETRIC VIEW
Response

The Setting discussion in EIR Section IV.B, Aesthetics, on pp. IV.B.1-IV.B.2, supports the conclusion that existing views San Francisco Bay are of high visual quality, describing the visual characteristics that contribute to the distinctive visual setting of the Bay. The EIR describes how the Bay water and topographic features (e.g., Yerba Buena Island, Angel Island, San Francisco Hills, Mt. Tamalpais and the Marin Hills, and the East Bay Hills) combine with built features (e.g., San Francisco’s skyline, Golden Gate Bridge, and the Bay Bridge) to create a distinctive, recognizable and coherent visual setting.

The Setting discussion on EIR pp. IV.B.12-IV.B.15 describes in detail the existing visual character of Treasure Island to establish the baseline against which the visual impacts of the proposed project are compared. It states,

Topography on the island is low and flat. Existing development is characterized by various low-scale, widely space military support facilities of a generally utilitarian character without a strong sense of spatial organization…Large expanses of open land contribute to a sense of spaciousness.

Likewise, in describing views of the Project Area from various viewpoints around the rim of the Bay, Treasure Island is described as a low and flat expanse of land in contrast to the vertical relief of Yerba Buena Island. “…Treasure Island is visible as a flat expanse to the north of Yerba Buena Island…” (EIR p. IV.B.4). “The low and flat Treasure Island is not a prominent feature in this view” (EIR p. IV.B.4). Given the exceptionally high visual quality of existing views of the Bay, and the visual prominence of the Proposed Project, the EIR concludes that the proposed development would result in a significant adverse impact on scenic vistas of San Francisco and San Francisco Bay from various public vantage points (EIR pp. IV.B.21-IV.B.23).

2.4.3 VIEWPOINTS

Comments

4. Please describe the impact, and nature and extent thereof, of a series of high-rise towers in the project area on the panoramic vistas across the wide, flat expanse of open water from the perspective of three publicly accessible shoreline locations in each of (a) San Francisco; (b) East Bay; and (c) North Bay.

5. Same as Question # 4, except approximately one mile from the shoreline in the subject locations.

6. Same as Question # 4, except approximately two miles from the shoreline in the subject locations.

7. Same as Question # 4, except approximately five miles from the shoreline in the subject locations. (Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law) [13.2a]
9. Please explain whether the project will impact, reorient or affect the views that are currently bounded and directed by the Golden Gate Bridge and the Bay Bridge from the perspective of three publicly accessible shoreline locations in each of (a) San Francisco; (b) East Bay; and, (c) North Bay.

10. Same as Question #9, except approximately one mile from the shoreline in the subject locations.

11. Same as Question #9, except approximately two miles from the shoreline in the subject locations.

12. Same as Question #9, except approximately five miles from the shoreline in the subject locations. (Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law) [13.2c]

16. Under the San Francisco Planning Dept. Initial Study Checklist form, please explain how the proposed project’s high-rise towers would not have a substantial affect on scenic vistas from each of the following locations: (a) Rincon Park on the Embarcadero; (b) Telegraph Hill at Pioneer Park; (c) Twin Peaks; (d) Nob Hill; and, (e) Russian Hill. (Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law) [13.6a]

20. Please list each and every location from which the photographer identified in response to Question #19, photographed the project area.

21. Please describe the methodology used by the Planning Department to select from all the locations listed in response to Question #20, to choose the eight representative views shown in the DEIR. (Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law) [13.10]

25. Please describe the nature and extent of how, “Proposed new construction on Treasure Island would adversely alter scenic vistas of San Francisco Bay” from each of the following vistas: (a) San Francisco waterfront; (b) The Embarcadero at Rincon Park; (c) Telegraph Hill; (d) Russian Hill; and, (e) Nob Hill.

26. Please describe the nature and extent of how “East Bay shoreline views would be significantly altered by the project from each of the following vistas: (a) Albany; (b) Berkeley; (c) Emeryville; (d) Oakland; and, (e) Alameda.

27. Please describe in detail how views of the project’s proposed new buildings from each of the five East Bay Shoreline locations listed in Question #26, “would eclipse the San Francisco skyline in visual importance.” (Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law) [13.13a]

Pursuant to Transportation Policy No. 5, the FEIR should state whether the proposed design would provide adequate clearance for vessels and how the Ferry terminal breakwaters would affect visual access of the Bay from the ferry terminal and Building One. (Karen Weiss, Coastal Program Analyst, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission) [17.6]

**Appearance, Design and Scenic Views.** Sections IV.B pages 16-17 of the DEIR cites Bay Plan policies regarding appearance, design and scenic views applicable to the Project. While the DEIR shows eight locations as representative of proposed visual conditions of the Redevelopment Plan Project Area, the FEIR should include visual impacts from the downtown financial core near the Ferry Building toward Treasure Island and the visual impacts from the City of Oakland near the Bay Bridge, and the City of Emeryville at the Emeryville Marina. (Karen Weiss, Coastal Program Analyst, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission) [17.7]
Chapter IX
2. Comments and Responses
4. Aesthetics

Vol. 1, IV.B.3, Aesthetics: View Locations need to include views from the Embarcadero Promenade starting at the Ferry Building to Pier 39, an iconic sequence of eye level views. *(Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission)* [20.12]

Vol. 1, IV.B.5, Aesthetics: View Point A: Existing and Proposed, needs to simulate views on a clear day, where the impact on long views to the East Bay Hills can be clearly evaluated. Using Photoshop to hide the hills is not a way to avoid showing impacts. We request that the view simulation is being redone. *(Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission)* [20.14]

Vol. 1, IV.B.10, Aesthetics: Why is the Berkeley Marina the only East Bay location for simulating impacts on the East Bay? The DEIR needs to add East Bay View Simulation to address impacts as seen from other prominent vantage points like views from the Flat Lands as well as views from the Hills. *(Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission)* [20.16b]

Vol. 1, IV.B.19, Aesthetics: Why is the 80 ft building proposed for YBI not shown in 3D anywhere in the DEIR? There needs to be a view simulation. *(Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission)* [20.18]

Vol. 1, IV.B.6, Aesthetics: Figure IV.B.3: View Point B: Proposed, doesn’t include the simulation of the proposed Ferry Terminal. Why is the ferry terminal not shown? *(Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission)* [20.15]

Vol. 1, IV.B.24, Aesthetics: YBI - Impacts of New Construction: the DEIR fails to provide visual analysis to substantiate the findings. Why is there no view simulation? *(Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission)* [20.24]

The diagrams on page II.23 are not useful for understanding what the views will be from YBI. Please extend the view cones all the way out to whatever the viewer would actually be looking at. Would any of these view corridors include views of the Bay? Please show renderings and or photographs of the actual views from these locations, looking in the directions specified. Also, please describe and illustrate the impacts on these view corridors of the island’s trees, as they continue to grow over time. *(Ruth Gravanis)* [31.22]

There are two major ways that the public will experience this project: a) the distant view from San Francisco to the west, and the view from the East Bay cities; and b) the local internal views on the islands that island residents, visitors and other users will have of the new urban place that is created. Neither of these is well informed by the material that is presented in this DEIR.

There are presently no on-street views from within the new “downtown” Island high rise area to other parts of the development. Notably missing are visualizations of the row of massive medium and high-rise blocks along the southern shoreline park, as seen from the restored historic buildings and from the low-rise center-island area. *(Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow)* [38.21b]

**Recommendation:**

*Provide more views to give a sense of the vistas from the water and from the East Bay cities; (Jennifer Clary, President, San Francisco Tomorrow)* [38.22]

*Construct internal views to simulate the experience of looking down Island streets, walking along the shore within the linear shore park, within the low rise residential in the Central Island area*
The DEIR does not include adequate photographic views and visual simulations. Please include additional comparative views from each of the following vantage points:

1. From the surface of the Bay from ferries
2. From along the length of The Embarcadero along the Promenade and including at the following points:
   - Ferry Building (Ferry Terminal)
   - Exploratorium (end of Piers 15 & 17)
   - Open space designated at Pier 27
   - End of the Public Pier (Pier 7)
   - End of the Port’s pedestrian-access Pier 14
3. From the top of YBI looking to TI
4. From the top of Angel Island
5. From Alcatraz
6. From East Shore State Park
7. From Rincon Point from the railing on Herb Cane Way (eliminating the extensive foreground of lawn)
8. Other views from the Marin (including but not limited to Tiburon)

The angle of view in the photographs should be tightened to have less foreground.

Why are the East Bay hills not visible in the view from Rincon Point (View Point A)?

The DEIR contains no photographic views or visual simulations of the proposed new construction on YBI. Please include these and address each of the following comments and questions:

- Will any new construction on YBI be visible from San Francisco? Show in a visual simulation.
- Will any new construction on YBI be visible from any points on the Bay Bridge? Show in a visual simulation.

The DEIR reveals that: “a mid-rise building up to 80 feet in height would be permitted in zone Y3.” Where is zone Y3? How does an 80-foot building relate to the heights of the historic buildings on YBI, including the Nimitz House, the Torpedo Factory and all the buildings in the Senior Officers’ Quarters historic district?

From what points around the Bay will this 80-foot tall building be visible? Show in a visual simulation.

The DEIR reveals that: “Building height limitations [on YBI] would be established by the Design for Development to ensure that development would not substantially interfere with existing views from hilltop public park areas.” This means, in effect, that views from the hilltop public park areas would be impacted. Show exactly where all development on YBI is proposed...
and which buildings or areas of new development could interfere with views from the public hilltop park areas. *(Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers)* [39.31]

Include photographic views or visual simulations of the proposed new construction on YBI and TI from the public hilltop park areas. *(Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers)* [39.32]

As to whether the Redevelopment Plan would significantly alter existing scenic resources or impact the existing visual character and visual quality on YBI, the DEIR contains no photo views and does not contain sufficient information to reach a conclusion. We have requested additional information on YBI. See above. *(Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers)* [39.38]

Refer to: IV.B 1 to IV.B, 23 VISUAL IMPACT: Some specific impacts not mentioned Include Telegraph Hill: Views mainly for Union and Calhoun Streets, Alta St, Lombard St. Lombard and Greenwich Streets have largely lost th[e]ir views as a result of tree growth. Coit Tower (and the Mark Hopkins Hotel on Nob Hill remain important tourist spots for views. On Russian Hill, Lombard, Chestnut and Fr[a]ncisco streets (and the Fort Mason bluffs) are the main view sights: Not mentioned: The new Cruise Line Terminal at Pier 27-23. This is the closest spot in mainland S.F. to T.I., will be open to visito[r][s]: and residents and produce a fairly close-up view of the Towers.

Not mentioned: Main view loss from the city ,will not be of the Berkeley Hills generally, but of the UC Campus-Campanile possibly Grizzly Peak. *(Neil Malloch)* [44.7]

**Response**

Comments request that visual representations from additional viewpoint locations and distances be presented and described, and that impacts on views of the Bay from these particular locations be analyzed in the EIR. Given the regional prominence of the project site within scenic views of the Bay, potential public vantage points for photo-simulations are innumerable. The Planning Department selected the off-site viewpoints presented in the EIR to represent a reasonable range of directions and distances from key public locations around the Bay. Views from San Francisco are represented by Viewpoints A (from Rincon Park), B (from Telegraph Hill), and C (from Twin Peaks). Views from Marin are represented by Viewpoint D (from Vista Point). Views from the East Bay are represented by Viewpoint E (from the Berkeley Marina). Views from the Bay Bridge East Span are represented by Viewpoint F. In response to comments, additional views have been selected for presentation in the EIR, from the San Francisco shoreline, and from the Berkeley Hills. Views from other public locations around the Bay would be comparable to the views selected for analysis in the EIR.

The EIR also presents and describes existing views from two on-site locations within the Project Area (from the Causeway, and east of Building 1). The Planning Department selected the on-site viewpoints to show the existing and proposed visual conditions that greet a visitor to Treasure Island at this important “gateway” to the island, and to illustrate Buildings 1, 2, and 3 in the context of proposed nearby construction.
While the selection of viewpoints presented and discussed in the EIR is not exhaustive, it is adequate for the purposes of CEQA. *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15151, Standards for Adequacy of an EIR, states:

> An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decisionmakers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

The range of representative off-site viewpoints presented and described in the EIR is adequate to allow the reader to generalize visual impacts on views of the Bay from multiple locations around the Bay (from San Francisco, Marin, and the East Bay) and from the Bay Bridge, even if a particular viewpoint location is not provided. Generally, impacts on Bay views from further inland from the Bay shoreline would be lessened by greater distance from the project site (to the extent that Bay views are available from inland locations).

Comments request that photographic views be “tightened to have less foreground.” The foreground is included to represent the visual context of the viewpoint location that a viewer would perceive when viewing the Islands. Tightening the shot of the Islands would eliminate this visual context as well as the visual context surrounding the Islands. This would not accurately represent how the Islands are viewed with the unaided eye.

*Views from the Surface of the Bay*

Comments request that views from ferries be provided in the EIR. Impacts on such views can be generalized from the range of shoreline views provided in the EIR. As discussed in EIR Section IV.B, Aesthetics, p. IV.B.22,

> 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.

*Views from Angel Island and Alcatraz Island*

Comments request additional views from Angel Island and Alcatraz Island. These areas are accessible only by boat and are therefore potentially available to fewer persons than mainland locations. Visual effects on views from these areas can be generalized from the view and description provided for the Marin Headlands in the EIR (Figure IV.B.5: Viewpoint D – View from the Marin Headlands at Vista Point, EIR p. IV.B.8.).

*Views from San Francisco Shoreline*

Comments note that views of the East Bay Hills are not prominent in Figure IV.B.2: Viewpoint A – View from the Embarcadero at Rincon Park. From this angle and elevation, and under the climatic conditions under which this photo was shot, the East Bay Hills are not seen as prominent visual elements rising beyond Treasure Island, although they are more visible to the right of Yerba Buena Island in this view. In response, EIR p. IV.B.4 is revised to introduce a new figure entitled “Figure IV.B.2a: Viewpoint Aa – View from Pier 7.” From this angle, the East Bay Hills are seen more distinctly in the distance, rising beyond Treasure Island (see revised EIR text and new EIR figure introduced in the next paragraph).

Comments request additional views from the San Francisco shoreline. In response the first full paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.4 is revised as follows to introduce a new figure entitled “Figure IV.B.2a: Viewpoint Aa – View from Pier 7” (deletions are shown in strike through and new text is underlined):

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). At the far left in the photograph is the Port of San Francisco’s pedestrian access Pier 14.

New Figure IV.B.2a is shown on the following page.
The EIR is also revised to discuss impacts on views from Pier 7. The third paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.21 is revised as follows (deletions are shown in strike through and new text is underlined):

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: Viewpoint 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.

Views from the East Bay Shoreline

Comments request additional views from the East Bay shoreline. From the Oakland landing of the Bay Bridge, views of Treasure Island are limited by the existing bridge deck. This condition will be increased by the new Bay Bridge East Span, which curves further northward. From this location, views of the San Francisco skyline are partially obstructed by the vertical rise of Yerba Buena Island (likewise, in views from the Emeryville shoreline). The view from the Berkeley Marina was selected because it more clearly illustrates how topographic features of the Bay (Yerba Buena Island and the Hills of San Francisco and Marin) and built environment features (the San Francisco skyline, the Bay Bridge, and the Golden Gate Bridge) combine with views of water and sky to contribute to highly readable and memorable scenic vistas. However, impacts on scenic views of the Bay from the shoreline of other East Bay communities (Oakland, Emeryville, Albany and Richmond) can be generalized from the description and analysis provided by Viewpoint E from the Berkeley Marina.

Views from the East Bay Hills

Comments request additional views from the East Bay Hills. In response, EIR p. IV.B.9 is revised to insert a new discussion entitled “Views from the East Bay Hills” immediately after the discussion “Views from the East Bay Shoreline” after the second paragraph and to introduce a new figure entitled “Figure IV.B.6a: Viewpoint Ea – View from the Berkeley Hills Along Grizzly Peak Boulevard. This distant view offers an unobstructed panoramic vista of the Islands and the larger regional visual context of the Bay from the Berkeley Hills. Project impacts on scenic views and visual quality are greater in the closer view from the East Bay shoreline. See Figure IV.B.6 on EIR p. IV.B.10. New text is underlined.
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).

New Figure IV.B.6a is shown on the following page.

The EIR is also revised to discuss impacts on views from the East Bay Hills. The last paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.21 is revised as follows (new text is underlined):

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, 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 of Yerba Buena Island and Views from Yerba Buena Island

Comments inquire why photosimulations of proposed new construction on Yerba Buena Island are not included in the EIR, including a proposed 8-story building. As discussed on EIR p. IV.B.24, visual changes on Yerba Buena Island would be minimally discernible to the unassisted eye, when viewed from mainland locations. That EIR discussion (the second full paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.24) is revised to refer to (New) Figure IV.B.2a: Viewpoint Aa – View from Pier 7,
Existing

Proposed

SOURCE: Square One Productions
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(NEW) FIGURE IV.B.6a: VIEW POINT Ea - VIEW FROM BERKELEY HILLS
presented on p. 2.4.14 of this Comments and Responses document, as follows (new text is underlined):

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.

Unobstructed scenic vistas of the Bay, the San Francisco skyline, and landforms beyond the Bay are not currently available from the ridgeline of Yerba Buena Island (the location of the proposed hilltop park). The peak of Yerba Buena Island is fenced and is not accessible to the public. From other areas along the ridgeline, publicly accessible views (from roads, lawn and parking areas) are limited by the mature cover of existing eucalyptus, and to a lesser extent by existing residences, on the surrounding slopes. To the extent that publicly accessible views are available from the ridgeline of Yerba Buena Island, they are intermittent, seen through gaps in vegetation and between buildings. For this reason, no photographic view from these areas was selected for presentation in the EIR. The proposed Design for Development includes restrictions on the height and placement of buildings that would ensure that existing scenic views of the Bay from the proposed new hilltop park on Yerba Buena Island are preserved. See Figure II.5: Yerba Buena View Corridors, in EIR Chapter II, Project Description, p. II.23. These restrictions also ensure that new buildings on Yerba Buena Island, including the proposed 8-story building, would be minimally discernible from mainland locations, remaining below the ridgeline of Yerba Buena Island on the north-facing slope overlooking Clipper Cove. Further, the proposed Habitat Management Plan as part of the project calls for the eventual phase-out of the non-native eucalyptus on Yerba Buena Island in favor of lower-growing native oaks. Implementation of the proposed Habitat Management Plan would thereby enhance and improve scenic vistas and visual quality from the proposed hilltop park, over that of existing conditions.

Although new construction on Yerba Buena Island would not be prominent when viewed from mainland locations due to building scale, placement, and distance, it would be visible to travelers on the Bay Bridge, particularly the westbound (top) deck of the Bay Bridge East Span. New buildings on Yerba Buena Island would be viewed against the backdrop of Yerba Buena Island.
and would not interfere with sustained scenic views of the Bay that would be available from the open viaduct segment of the new Bay Bridge East Span. Before entering the cable stay suspension segment, the roadway will veer southward toward the tunnel through Yerba Buena Island, at which point sustained scenic views of the Bay will no longer be readily available. New construction, including the proposed 8-story building, would be visible to the right of the tunnel opening (about 350 feet north of the tunnel opening) to westbound travelers. This view of Yerba Buena Island is neither scenic nor sustained.

Comments request that the EIR include photosimulations of proposed new construction on Treasure Island as seen from Yerba Buena Island. The impacts on views from Yerba Buena Island can be generalized from the view from the Causeway presented by Figure IV.B.8: Viewpoint G – View Looking North to Treasure Island from the Causeway, EIR p. IV.B.13.

Views of the Ferry Terminal

Comments request that the proposed Ferry Terminal be represented in figures and that impacts of the proposed Ferry Terminal on views from Building 1 be considered. Ferry Terminal structures are modeled in the photosimulations presented in the EIR. As with other proposed buildings on Treasure Island, the Ferry Terminal is represented in the EIR as conceptual massing volumes rather than a developed building design. The Ferry Terminal is most prominently shown in Figure IV.B.8: Viewpoint G – View Looking North to Treasure Island from Causeway, but also distantly visible along the western shoreline of Treasure Island in front of Building 1 in Figure IV.B.2: Viewpoint A – View from The Embarcadero at Rincon Park, on EIR p. IV.B.5; in Figure IV.B.3: Viewpoint B – View from Telegraph Hill at Pioneer Park, on EIR p. IV.B.6; and in new Figure IV.B.2a: Viewpoint Aa – View from Pier 7, introduced previously in “Views from San Francisco Shoreline.” The Ferry Terminal structures are also shown in Figure IV.B.10: Proposed Representative Massing Diagram, on EIR p. IV.B.20.

In response to these comments, EIR p. IV.B.25 is revised to introduce a perspective architectural rendering of the proposed Ferry Terminal, entitled “Figure IV.B.14: Representative Rendering of the Ferry Terminal,” reproduced from the proposed Design for Development, to illustrate the general design intent for the Ferry Terminal (see revised EIR text and new EIR figure introduced below, under the heading “Internal Views of Treasure Island”). As shown in this figure, the design of the Ferry Terminal is intended to consist of a high, wide, open span that is intended to maximize views of the water’s edge, ferries, and the Bay beyond from Building 1 and its Plaza. The design guidelines would also call for the Ferry Terminal to be designed as a low, transparent structure that would permit views over its roof from Building 1. See proposed Design for Development T5.10.13, p. 196. The breakwaters that would be part of the Ferry Terminal are shown in plan in Figure II.8 on EIR p. II.37. Final designs for the breakwaters are not expected to obstruct visual access to the Bay from the Ferry Terminal or Building 1. The southern breakwater may be open to public access, providing additional opportunities for viewing the Bay.
and features within and surrounding the Bay. As stated on EIR p. II.36, “public access to the northern breakwater is not proposed, as it could occasionally be overtopped by high waves.”

**Internal Views of Treasure Island**

Comments request that the EIR include close range internal views from Treasure Island to illustrate the proposed visual and urban design character of Treasure Island. Although massing-level photosimulations are an effective method of illustrating the visual effect of new building volumes within an existing distant or midrange visual context, they are not an effective method of illustrating close range streetscapes. In response to these comments, a new paragraph is added after the third paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.25 to introduce perspective architectural renderings to present streetscape perspective renderings reproduced from the proposed Design for Development, to assist the reader in understanding the urban design intent for Treasure Island (new text is underlined):

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. The Design for Development is a regulatory document that would establish design standards and guidelines that would direct future development of the Project Area...

New Figures IV.B.11, IV.B.12, IV.B.13, IV.B.14, IV.B.15 and IV.B.16 are shown on the following pages.
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(NEW) FIGURE IV.B.14: REPRESENTATIVE RENDERING OF CITYSIDE AVENUE AND SHORELINE PARK

SOURCE: Perkins + Will
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(NEW) FIGURE IV.B.15: REPRESENTATIVE RENDERING OF EASTSIDE COMMONS
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(NEW) FIGURE IV.B.16: REPRESENTATIVE RENDERING OF TYPICAL GARDEN STREET
2.4.4 NIGHTTIME VIEWS AND GLARE

Comments

8. As to Questions # 4-7, please provide similar information relevant to nighttime vistas. *(Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law)* [13.2b]

13. Why are the selected photographic views from the eight locations of the project only during the daytime? *(Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law)* [13.2d]

14. Were nighttime photographic views of the project also considered or taken? If not, why not? If such nighttime photos were taken, describe each and every location from which said photographs were taken. *(Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law)* [13.3]

18. Under the San Francisco Planning Dept. Initial Study Checklist form, please explain how the proposed project’s high-rise towers:
   (a) would or would not create a new source of substantial light or glare;
   (b) the amount of light or glare that would be produced by each of the project’s proposed high-rise towers;
   (c) whether and to what extent, such light or glare would adversely affect daytime views; . . . *(Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law)* [13.7]

18. Under the San Francisco Planning Dept. Initial Study Checklist form, please explain how the proposed project’s high-rise towers: . . . (d) whether and to what extent, such light would adversely affect nighttime views. *(Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law)* [13.8]

22. Did the photographer identified in response to Question # 19 take any nighttime photos of the project?

23. If the answer to Question # 22 is in the affirmative, from what locations were the photographs taken? *(Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law)* [13.11]

31. Given that the project’s “nighttime skyline of Treasure Island would become a prominent new visual presence within nighttime views of the Bay”, why weren’t existing and proposed nighttime photographic views provided in the DEIR as were daytime photographic views?

32. If the project’s “nighttime skyline of Treasure Island would become a prominent new visual presence within nighttime views of the Bay”, how could lighting standards and guidelines established by the Design for Development ensure “that project light would not adversely affect nighttime views from the mainland”? *(Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law)* [13.14]

6. Please state why there are no illuminated night renderings of the proposed project’s high-rise towers. *(Judy Irving, Executive Director, Pelican Media)* [14.4]

Vol. 1, IV.B.7, Aesthetics: Why do View Simulations only simulate day-time views? We request that the EIR simulates Night Time Views from all view points and with additional views added as being suggested in other DEIR comments. *(Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission)* [20.16a]
Vol. 1, IV.B.27, Aesthetics: Why are Night Light impacts not analyzed? The visual impact assessment is incomplete. Night Light impacts need to address ALL planned uses, including the regional sports facilities. Comparable sports facilities in the region can provide data for prototypical nuisance levels of spill-over light to use for a complete assessment of night light impacts. We request an EIR revision to include this study. (Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.26]

Vol. 1, IV.B.28, Aesthetics: Where is the visual simulation of nighttime lighting? Night light impacts potentially are greater than impacts during the day. Standards established in the D4D do not create guarantees, they are merely guiding ideas. The statement that the intensity of project light when viewed from mainland locations would be diffused by distance is grossly incorrect - the main land is only 1.6 miles away from TI as the crow flies. (Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.27]

The aesthetic impacts at night could be even more significant. Please include comparative views from each of the above vantage points as well as from the vantage points included in the DEIR -- all against the night skyline. (Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers) [39.22]

- The significant impacts of the Proposed Project on the San Francisco’s skyline is also shown in the view from the Berkeley Marina (View Point E) which reveals that the San Francisco skyline will be altered and muddled and will no longer read as a clear visual marker. Please include nighttime views from this viewpoint. (Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers) [39.26]

Impact AE-4: We disagree with the DEIR conclusion that the implementation of the Redevelopment Plan would not significantly increase nighttime lighting, increasing potential sources of glare. It would further cause light pollution.

- We disagree that the project area is not a prominent visual presence within nighttime views of the Bay from mainland locations. As we have requested, please include nighttime photographic views from Telegraph Hill and other locations along the Northeast Waterfront, which will show that Building 1, with its subtle lighting has a lovely visual presence at night with the backdrop of the East Bay Hills. This scene with the subtle lighting of the Bay Bridge is a scenic visual resource that will be significantly impacted by the Proposed Project.

- What are the light impacts associated with a 25-40 acre regional sports complex?

- Please provide nighttime simulations from the mainland comparing the existing views to the proposed dense collection of 19 new high-rise buildings, together with the high-intensity nighttime lighting of the Sports Park. These simulations will show that the intensity of the light that will be caused by the project would be significant. We disagree with the subjective conclusion of the DEIR that this intense new light would somehow “be diffused by distance.” (Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers) [39.39]

- Please provide a visual analysis of the glare that will reflect back to San Francisco from the setting sun on the proposed new 19 high-rise structures, as well as from the new construction proposed on YBI. We disagree with the subjective conclusion of the DEIR that this glare would somehow “be diffused by distance.” This is simply untrue. We currently experience glare from Oakland and the East Bay Hills as well as from the current development on the west side of YBI (Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers) [39.40]
Chapter IX
2. Comments and Responses
4. Aesthetics

- The DEIR concludes that "the light levels resulting from build out of the Redevelopment Plan 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." We disagree. This is not a development in the City, but a new “suburban city” in the middle of one of the most scenic places in the world. Such new lighting will significantly and permanently impact a prominent and unique scenic resource. This is particularly so at the central portion of the Bay, where dramatic environmental features combine to form iconic scenic views. Reliance on the Design for Development and voluntary “lights out” programs cannot prevent this significant impact on the nighttime views.

- Nighttime views of the Development Area from the Bay Bridge should also be analyzed in photographic simulations. (Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers) [39.41]

- Please analyze all potential light pollution increases to locations along the NE Embarcadero and on Telegraph Hill. (Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers) [39.77]

Response

Comments request that the EIR include visual simulations of nighttime conditions to illustrate impacts on nighttime views. An independent expert in visual simulation, Steelblue LLC, has prepared nighttime architectural renderings to assist the reader in visualizing project impacts on nighttime views of the Bay, in the context of existing light conditions of the Bay. To date, the City has not provided nighttime visual simulations and is unaware of other EIRs that have done so. Nevertheless, based on the unique setting of the Proposed Project on an island in the middle of the Bay, and in response to comments requesting nighttime visual simulations, it was determined that illustrative nighttime simulations would be helpful in understanding the visual effect of the Proposed Project within the context of nighttime views of the Bay. Note, however, that the accuracy of nighttime visual representations is subject to numerous variables including existing light conditions at and around the project site; existing light conditions at the location of the viewer; the particular project lighting types and products used and their particular intensity and placement (not currently specified); a camera’s aperture and exposure settings; the ratio of solid wall to glazed area on a building façade; the reflectivity of surfaces; screening provided by vegetation; climatic conditions; and an individual viewer’s sensitivity to light and perception of light effects. Given these variables, objective accuracy in representation of existing and proposed nighttime views of the Bay is not possible. The visual simulations provided should be considered representative illustrations of the potential nighttime visual effect of the proposed project, as might be experienced by viewers in San Francisco and the East Bay shoreline.

The discussion of Impact AE-4, on EIR p. IV.B.27, is revised as follows to introduce and discuss two new figures entitled “Figure IV.B.20: Nighttime View from Calhoun Terrace on Telegraph Hill” and “Figure IV.B.21: Nighttime View from the Berkeley Marina” (deletions are shown in strike through and new text is underlined):

**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 Project 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.

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 Proposed Project within the Bay from San Francisco and the East Bay, prepared by an independent visual simulation consultant, Steelblue LLC.

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 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…. New Figures IV.B.20 and IV.B.21 are shown on the following pages.

Comments express concern for potential glare resulting from reflection of sunlight on reflective surfaces on Treasure Island. The second complete paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.28 is revised as follows to augment the discussion of potential impacts related to glare:

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. 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. (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.
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(NEW) FIGURE IV.B.20: NIGHTTIME VIEW FROM CALHOON TERRACE ON TELEGRAPH HILL
2.4.5 PLANS AND POLICIES

Comment

15. As to the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (“BCDC”) and its “Bay Plan” policies relating to “Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views”, please explain how:

(a) the project will enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay;
(b) the project will not impact visually on the Bay and shoreline;
(c) the project will assure continued visual dominance of the Hills around the Bay from the shoreline perspective of (1) San Francisco; (2) East Bay; and, (3) North Bay;
(d) the project’s proposed high-rise towers are in accordance with the Bay Plan; . . . (Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law) [13.4]

Response

An EIR must disclose inconsistencies with applicable plans and policies (CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d)). Applicable San Francisco Bay Plan (Bay Plan) policies are presented on EIR Section IV.B, Aesthetics, pp. IV.B.16-IV.B.17. The EIR finds no inconsistency with applicable Bay Plan plans and policies. As discussed in EIR Chapter III, Plans and Policies, p. III.12, the Bay Conservation and Development Commission will make the determination as to whether the Proposed Project is, on balance, consistent or inconsistent with Bay Plan policies as part of its actions on aspects of the Proposed Project that are within its jurisdiction. BCDC’s determination would occur after certification of the EIR.

The Bay Plan does not require that a project “will not impact visually on the Bay and shoreline,” but rather calls for new development in and around the Bay be designed to preserve and enhance the visual quality of the Bay. As discussed on EIR p. IV.B.25, the proposed project would transform the existing visual character of Treasure Island. As discussed on EIR pp. IV.B.25-IV.B.27, as part of the proposed project, a Design for Development would be adopted and implemented to ensure that visual quality within the project site is enhanced. At the center of the Bay, the proposed development on Treasure Island would not obstruct the visual dominance of the Hills that surround the Bay. They would continue to rise from beyond the Proposed Project to form the backdrop to views of the Bay.

2.4.6 IMPACT ANALYSES

Comments

For many, it is startling to see the nearly 600-foot One Rincon loom next to the Bay Bridge approach. What would it like to see, a series of towers, including one higher than One Rincon -- Treasure Island. Are we not comfortable with the historic scale of the buildings currently on the island? Is this not something to be maintained? Do we really want to alter the island profile with towers jetting up from the Bay, including a central tower exceeding the height of the Bay Bridge? (Tony Gantner) [TR.10.1]
17. Under the San Francisco Planning Dept. Initial Study Checklist form, please explain how the proposed project’s high-rise towers would or would not degrade the existing character or quality of Treasure Island.  (Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law) [13.6b]

28. Please describe the basis and methodology by which it was determined that from the East Bay shoreline, “the new cluster of high-rise buildings on Treasure Island...would create visual ambiguity as to what the viewer is actually observing—the San Francisco skyline or the Treasure Island skyline.”

29. Please describe in detail why, “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.”

30. Please state each and every reason why there is “no effective mitigation measure 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.”  (Anthony F. Gantner, Attorney-at-Law) [13.13b]

In particular, the density, massing and height of the proposed project would result in unacceptable impacts on one of the most iconic settings in San Francisco Bay.  (Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.1]

Vol. 1, IV.B.2, Aesthetics: Impact AE-1: Disagree with statement about impact on Views from Twin Peaks - views from Twin Peaks with the proposed development would be substantially altered, effecting views of the City’s icon skyline, with hills and valleys as its trademark. Proposed development would flatten out this distinct view of the skyline and of downtown, visually merging the two skylines and creating visual ambiguity.  (Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.20]

Vol. 1, IV.B.23, Aesthetics: Impact AE-2: the statement that new infill construction impacts in the vicinity of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 would be less than significant is wrong; the most prominent historic buildings appear dwarfed, diminished and overpowered by the excessive height and massing of the proposed buildings.  (Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.22]

Vol. 1, IV.B.25, Aesthetics: The DEIR text uses subjective interpretations to describe the visual character of the island as follows: the island is not characterized by a strong sense of spatial or design cohesiveness. The landform of the island is uniformly strong, a distinct green form punctuated by the view of the iconic form and massing of Building 1. We consider the impact of new construction to be Significant and request the findings to be revised.  (Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.25a]

Vol. 1, IV.B.26, Aesthetics: The assumption that the Implementation of Approved Design Guidelines will ensure that the Proposed Project would not cause a significant impact on the visual quality of the project area and therefore no mitigation measures are required, is false, unsubstantiated and not anchored in applicable codes. Guidelines, by definition, are there to guide, there are a statement of intent, not a guarantee. Guidelines don’t substitute for a CODE.  (Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.25b]

Even though the EIR admits that the Proposed Project would adversely alter scenic vistas of San Francisco and San Francisco Bay, it underestimates the regional and international impact this
project would have on the image of San Francisco.  \textit{(Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers)}  \cite{39.19}

- The DEIR’s discussion of the view from Twin Peaks (View Point C) overlooks the fact that this view shows that the Proposed Project will have the effect of leveling out the familiar shape of the San Francisco skyline, which the DEIR describes on page V.B.1 as follows: “The San Francisco skyline is a clear visual marker of San Francisco’s regional importance” and further describes the views of the skyline as being characterized by “a strong visual hierarchy.” As shown by Viewpoint C, the Proposed Project would significantly alter this important visual marker and visual hierarchy. The nighttime view from this viewpoint could be even more revealing. \textit{(Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers)}  \cite{39.25}

- The DEIR’s discussion of the view from New Bay Bridge East Span (View Point F) completely overlooks the fact that the Proposed Project will completely block the iconic, internationally famous “first view” one gets when arriving in San Francisco over the Bay Bridge, including views of the Golden Gate Bridge and the Marin Hills, and of the three most significant National Register-listed historic buildings on Treasure Island, which remain from the 1939-1940 Golden Gate International Exposition (views of Buildings 2 & 3 are completely blocked and Building 1 is obscured). Depending on the color of the buildings to be constructed on TI, Building 1 may not be at all visible. The nighttime view from this viewpoint will be further revealing. \textit{(Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers)}  \cite{39.27b}

- The DEIR does not contain any discussion at all of the view from the TI Causeway (View Point G), a view that is shocking as to what it reveals.  The Proposed Project appears as a new Walnut Creek right in the middle of our world-renowned Bay. Buildings 2 & 3 are buried beneath the proposed new high-rise buildings, and Building 1 is dwarfed by and is visually and aesthetically impacted by the surrounding super tall high-rise buildings. This view illustrates the severe visual impacts of the Proposed Project to the historic resources. The nighttime view from this viewpoint will be further revealing. \textit{(Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers)}  \cite{39.28}

- Explain in detail why the DEIR fails to identify the “Avenue of the Palms” as a prominent visual feature that will be impacted by the Propose Project? According to the DEIR, the Avenue of the Palms will be completely destroyed by the Proposed Project.

- Please refer to Figure 3-2 “Prominent Visual Features and Major Views” from the 2005 FEIR attached to these comments as \textbf{Exhibit A}, which specifically identifies the Avenue of the Palms as such a feature.

- Please include an analysis in this DEIR of each of the visual feature and major view identified on the attached \textbf{Exhibit A}. What has changed since 2006? Is the project sponsor EIR shopping?

- Consistent with the 2005 FEIR, the removal of the Avenue of the Palms must be identified as a significant aesthetic impact in this DEIR. \textit{(Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers)}  \cite{39.35}

- In addition to the Avenue of the Palms, what other “Prominent Visual Features” identified on the attached Figure 3-2 are proposed for demolition or removal as a part of the Proposed Project? Please describe in detail.
Please provide a detailed analysis of the impact of the Proposed Project on each “Major View” identified on Figure 3-2. (Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers) [39.36]

Why has no attempt been made to at least fundamentally discuss the aesthetics of Treasure Island as currently developed verses the aesthetics of the island as proposed? Are the authors of the Draft EIR unwilling to confront this issue? Is the issue too subjective? Too difficult? Too controversial? Or, simply, too insignificant? Is there no alternative to a bunch of massive high-rise buildings? (Chris Stockton, Architect) [42.1b]

To take that great barge and build 19 high-rise towers is aesthetically very significant. To build one tower 45-stories (or more) tall and 205-feet higher than Yerba Buena Island is aesthetically very significant. To even build towers that are only 125-feet to 450-feet or 30-stories tall is aesthetically very significant. (Chris Stockton, Architect) [42.2]

Response

The EIR, under Impact AE-1, in EIR Section IV.B, Aesthetics, pp. IV.B.21-IV.B.23, describes, analyzes, and evaluates impacts on scenic views of the Bay. It concludes that the Proposed Project would have a significant adverse impact on scenic views of the Bay from viewpoints in San Francisco, the East Bay shoreline, and the Bay Bridge East Span. This conclusion is based on 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.

See the response in Section 2.6, Historic Resources, for information regarding impacts on the visual and historic character of Buildings 1, 2, and 3, and 111.

See the response in Subsection 2.4.4, Nighttime Views and Glare, above, for a response to comments regarding nighttime views.

As discussed under Impact AE-3, EIR pp. IV.B.25-IV.B.27, changes in visual character, even substantial and transformative changes such as those of the Proposed Project, do not in themselves constitute a significant adverse impact on visual character and quality. The EIR concludes that although the Proposed Project would have a transformative effect on the existing visual character of Treasure Island, as seen from Treasure Island, it would not have a significant adverse impact on the visual quality and character of Treasure Island. This conclusion is supported by ample evidence and analysis. Additional support, in the form of new EIR figures to illustrate the intended visual character of Treasure Island, is presented above in Section 2.4.3, Viewpoints.

The discussion of Setting on EIR pp. IV.B.1-IV.B.11 describes how dramatic landforms, familiar built features, water, and sky combine to create views of the Bay that are among the most scenic and recognizable in the world, characterized by spatial clarity and coherence. Impact AE-1, on EIR pp. IV.B.21-IV.B.23, describes how this scenic Bay setting would be affected by the
Proposed Project, introducing prominent new high-rise development at the center of the Bay, creating visual ambiguity, and undermining the visual coherence of Bay views. As discussed on EIR p. IV.B.23, the effect on the Bay scenic resource is 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. However, unlike the One Rincon tower rising near the Bay Bridge footing, the proposed development on Treasure Island would be separated from the new Bay Bridge East Span by Clipper Cove (by about 2,000 feet).

As shown in Figure IV.B.4: Viewpoint C – View from Twin Peaks, EIR p. IV.B.7, proposed development on Treasure Island is minimally visible, obscured in the distance by San Francisco’s downtown Financial District. If discernible at all, the proposed development on Treasure Island would not detract from the visual primacy of downtown San Francisco in scenic views of the Bay from this vantage point.

As cited in the analysis of Impact AE-3, the discussion of Setting on EIR pp. IV.B.12-IV.B.15 describes the visual character of Treasure Island as viewed from Treasure Island. The existing visual character of Treasure Island is largely defined by Buildings 1, 2, and 3 at the southern end of the island, and by low-scale, widely spaced military support facilities of a utilitarian character. Given its disparate use as the site for the Golden Gate International Exposition and a Naval Station, the island is not characterized by a strong sense of spatial or design cohesiveness. The visual character of Treasure Island as a “green form punctuated by the iconic form and massing of Building 1” represents distant scenic qualities of the island within scenic views of the Bay, as viewed from mainland locations. Impacts on these qualities, as they contribute to scenic views of the Bay are addressed under Impact AE-1, on EIR p. IV.B.21.

The proposed Design for Development includes both design standards and design guidelines. Standards, including those governing building height, bulk, façade design and fenestration, and the like, are equivalent to Planning Code requirements, in that compliance with them is mandatory. Design guidelines, although not mandatory, are an effective and widely accepted regulatory tool to shape the future visual character of an area. They establish design standards at a level of specificity that is not typically appropriate for inclusion in zoning codes. Design guidelines inform project sponsors, designers, decision-makers and their staffs of the specific requirements and expectations for high-quality design. As defined in the proposed Design for Development, design guidelines are recommendations and preferred elements for projects; compliance with design guidelines is considered to implement the goals and objectives for improvements. TIDA will review all projects for consistency with the mandatory design standards and the design guidelines. Together, the standards and guidelines offer more, not less, regulatory control and predictability than the provisions of the Planning Code alone.
The EIR specifically identifies the Avenue of the Palms as a prominent visual feature that would be impacted by the Proposed Project. Visual impacts resulting from removal of the Avenue of the Palms are described and analyzed on EIR p. IV.B.24. Although it is a prominent and familiar formal visual feature that now defines the western edge of Treasure Island, the Avenue of the Palms was analyzed and found not to be a historical resource, as described in “D.2, Historic Architectural Resources” in EIR Section IV.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, pp. IV.D.25-IV.D.61. Therefore, impacts resulting from its removal do not, in themselves, result in a significant impact under CEQA, unless the Proposed Project would result in a significant degradation of the visual quality of the western shoreline of Treasure Island compared to existing visual conditions. The proposed Waterfront Plaza and Cityside Waterfront Park that would replace the Avenue of the Palms would not result in a significant degradation of visual quality with implementation of the requirements and standards of the proposed Design for Development.

See also the response above in Subsection 2.4.3, Viewpoints, for a discussion of viewpoints selected for presentation and analysis in the EIR. The 2005 EIR identifies prominent visual features and major views in Figure 3-2 on p. 3-10 of the 2005 EIR. The EIR for the Proposed Project is not bound to the scope of analysis and conclusions of the 2005 FEIR. The analysis and conclusions of the EIR for the Proposed Project are based on the specific information about the existing setting and impacts of the Proposed Project that were not available to the 2005 FEIR, including a detailed evaluation of the historic and architectural significance of the Avenue of the Palms (Prominent Visual Feature #5), and a proposed Design for Development which specifies the proposed visual character of the western edge of Treasure Island. Views from the shoreline perimeter of Treasure Island of the Bay and Clipper Cove (Prominent Visual Features #5, #8, and #2 on 2005 FEIR Figure 3-2) would not be substantially affected by the Proposed Project. Bay views from the Ferry Terminal are discussed above in the response under subheading “Views of the Ferry Terminal” in Subsection 2.4.3. Visual conditions at the entry of Treasure Island and Buildings 1, 2, and 3 (Prominent Visual Features, #3, #4, and #7) are discussed on EIR pp. IV.B.12-IV.B.13 and project impacts on these features are addressed on EIR pp. IV.B.23-IV.B.27. As discussed in EIR Chapter II, Project Description, pp. II.31-II.32, the Proposed Project includes a Habitat Management Plan, which identifies the approach for preservation, restoration, and enhancement of the vegetative cover of Yerba Buena Island (“Wooded Slopes of Yerba Buena Island,” Prominent Visual Feature #1 on 2005 FEIR Figure 3-2). The Conference Center Complex (Prominent Visual Feature #6 on 2005 FEIR Figure 3-2) is partially within the Job Corps campus. The portion of this feature that is within the Development Plan Area (bounded by Third Street to the north, Avenue F to the East, California Avenue to the south, and Avenue D to the West) now offers some landscaped visual relief from the built environment of Treasure Island. However, it is not identified as a scenic resource for the purposes of the EIR for the Proposed Project. As noted above, the EIR for the Proposed Project is not bound to the scope of analysis and conclusions of the 2005 FEIR. In any event, its aesthetic and recreational role of
this feature as a greenspace would be subsumed by the proposed open space program under the Proposed Project.

2.4.7 VIEWPOINT MAP CORRECTION

Comments
Vol. 1, IV.B.3, Aesthetics: Figure IV.B.1: View Point Locations needs to be corrected to show Alcatraz. Why is Alcatraz not being shown? (Commissioner Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.11]

Vol. 1, IV.B.3, Aesthetics: Figure IV.B.1: View Point Locations needs to show View Point D as Fort Baker, not Vista Point. (Commissioner Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.13]

Response
Figure IV.B.1: Viewpoint Locations, on EIR p. IV.B.3, is revised to show Alcatraz Island. It is also revised to show additional photosimulation views called for in these Comments and Responses. The revised figure is shown on the following page.

Viewpoint D is correctly identified as Vista Point, not Fort Baker. See the map of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area map at http://www.nps.gov/goga/planyourvisit/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&PageID=164520g

2.4.8 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Comment
Vol. 1, IV.B.29, Aesthetics: Cumulative Impacts under AW-5 fail to analyze the cumulative visual impacts of TI Development with the new TransBay Tower, the tallest building planned in Downtown, close to the Bay. Why doesn’t the analysis take into consideration the cumulative visual impact of the new TransBay and the bridge tower of East Span currently under construction? (Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.28]

With regard to the Draft-EIR for subject project, item IV.B. Aesthetics, I am stunned that the discussion is so cursory and glib, concluding on page IV.B.30 that, "the proposed project would not have significant cumulative impacts related to Aesthetics." (Chris Stockton, Architect) [42.1a]
Response

Cumulative impacts are discussed in EIR Section IV.B, Aesthetics, on p. IV.B.29, which states:

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 analysis of impacts from the East Bay and Bay Bridge East Span includes photosimulations, descriptions, and analysis of the cumulative effect of the Proposed Project considered with the new Bay Bridge East Span.

Views of the TransBay Tower would be largely obscured by the vertical rise of Yerba Buena Island, and/or blend into the distant background context in views of the Bay (see Figure IV.B.6: Viewpoint E – View from the Berkeley Marina, and Figure IV.B.7: Viewpoint F – View Looking West from the New Bay Bridge East Span). TransBay Tower, where visible at all within views of the Proposed Project, would not participate prominently. Likewise, the Proposed Project would not participate prominently in views that would include the TransBay Tower (see Figure IV.B.4: Viewpoint C – View from Twin Peaks). As such, the Proposed Project’s impact on scenic views of the Bay would not combine with those of the TransBay Tower to result in a significant cumulative impact.

In addition, as explained in section 15130(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, the discussion of cumulative impacts need not provide “as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone.” The analysis in the EIR is at the appropriate level mandated by CEQA.

2.4.9 BUILDING HEIGHTS

Comment

According to the DEIR, the northern part of TI currently contains almost exclusively two-story buildings, the central part contains buildings up to three or four stories tall in height, and the south end of the island contain five-story buildings and hangers that are the tallest structures on the island. These buildings are typically widely separated over the island.
• In addition to the more specific information requested under Impact CP-11 and CP-12, below under our comments on Historic Resources, please provide the following information:

• Please provide a list of the heights of all of existing buildings on TI, including the NR listed buildings 1, 2 and 3.

• What is the average height of all existing buildings on TI?

• Please provide in list format the heights of all of existing buildings on YBI, including the historic Nimitz House and Senior Officers’ Quarters and the Torpedo Factory.

• For both TI and YBI please show on a map a presentation of all existing buildings (with their heights) and indicate which buildings will be demolished as a part of the Proposed Project.

(Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers) [39.33]

The DEIR says that 50 percent of the new housing units would be in “low rise buildings up to 70 feet,” Punctuated by “mid-rise buildings from 70 to 130 feet and neighborhood high-rise towers up to 240 feet serving as neighborhood markers.” The DEIR states that the tallest building would be 650 feet.

• What is a “neighborhood marker”?

• On what basis does the DEIR conclude that 70 ft tall buildings are “low rise” buildings, particularly when the tallest building on TI is 50 stories tall? Low-rise buildings in San Francisco are usually considered to be less than 40 feet tall.

• On what basis does the DEIR conclude between buildings between 70-130 feet in height are “mid-rise” buildings? Please compare these heights to buildings in San Francisco.

• Please compare the proposed heights of the 20 highest buildings proposed to be constructed on TI to the height of the west span towers of the Bay Bridge; the vertical clearance under the Bridge; and the height of YBI. Illustrate these height comparisons side by side for a visual comparison. (Vedica Puri, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers) [39.34]

Response

The EIR, in Chapter II, Project Description, p. II.9, states “Outside of the Job Corps campus, Treasure Island alone currently has approximately 725 occupiable housing units … The housing units are mostly in two-, four-, and eight-unit two-story buildings; there are also barracks once used by military personnel (now unusable).” EIR Section IV.B, Aesthetics, states on p. IV.B.12 that Building 1 at the south end of the island is three stories. In discussing proposed building heights, the EIR, on p. II.24, states that “approximately 51 percent of all housing units are anticipated to be in low-rise buildings.”

The last sentence of the second paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.19 is revised as follows to delete the term “neighborhood marker” as redundant and unnecessary (deletions are shown in strike through and new text is underlined):

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) serving as neighborhood markers.
The EIR provides adequate information and analysis to enable decision-makers to make informed decisions that take into account the environmental consequences of the Proposed Project related to Aesthetics. The abstract numerical height comparisons and graphical material requested by the comment would not contribute substantially to the understanding of impacts on scenic views or visual character and quality, as the setting and impacts of the Proposed Project are not experienced in these terms, but would be viewed from an actual position on the ground in three dimensions in an actual visual setting.

See the response in Section 2.1, Project Description, Subsection 2.1.2.2, Height Limits, of this Comments and Responses document, for information regarding low- mid- and high-rise buildings as discussed in this EIR and regarding proposed height designations.

2.4.10 AVAILABILITY OF THE DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT

Comment

How come I can’t go online and look at the pictures of the high-rises of the Financial District that you guys are proposing to build in the middle of the Bay? How come the people from Berkeley and Alameda and Sacramento and Stockton and Tracy can’t look at what San Francisco? How come people can’t see that? How come the secrecy? (Paul Curriers) [TR.6.3]

Response

The proposed Design for Development includes numerous images of the proposed development. It was posted to TIDA’s website in March 2010, and is available to download as six separate pdf files under the heading Design for Development for Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island – March 5, 2010 on the Master Development submittals page: http://www.sftreasureisland.org/index.aspx?page=26.