TREASURE ISLAND AND YERBA BUENA ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT
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1.0 PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.1 Background
The proposed Redevelopment Plan Area includes all of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island (collectively, “the Islands”) in San Francisco Bay. The Islands are the site of the former Naval Station Treasure Island (NSTI), owned and operated by the U.S. Navy until its closure in 1997 as part of the Base Realignment and Closure process. The proposed Redevelopment Area encompasses approximately 400 acres of land on Treasure Island, approximately 150 acres of land on Yerba Buena Island, and about 645 acres of tidal and submerged lands adjacent to the Islands. The Navy is in the process of conveying most of these areas to the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA), a single-purpose public agency responsible for the Redevelopment Plan Area.

1.2 Proposed Project
The Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan would provide the basis for redevelopment of most of the NSTI lands from a primarily low-density residential area with vacant and underutilized nonresidential structures to a new mixed-use community with a retail center, a variety of open space and recreation opportunities, new and upgraded on-site infrastructure, and public and community services. The proposed Redevelopment Plan and other planning documents would establish general land use controls and design standards for the project site. The Redevelopment Plan includes supporting studies that address project design concepts, transportation, infrastructure, community services, affordable housing, jobs, and other aspects of the development. A major component of the proposed Redevelopment Plan is the Sustainability Plan, which includes goals, strategies, and targets for the sustainable redevelopment of the Islands. The proposed Redevelopment Plan would consist of approximately 6,000 residential units, 270,000 square feet of commercial and retail space, 400 to 500 hotel rooms, 300 acres of parks and open space, transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, a ferry terminal/transit hub, public and community services, and utilities. Other components of the proposed redevelopment include supplemental remediation to allow the proposed uses, geotechnical stabilization, and renovation and adaptive re-use of existing designated historic structures. The Redevelopment Plan would be implemented in four phases from approximately 2009 through 2018.

1.3 Environmental Review
The San Francisco Planning Department is the lead agency implementing environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the proposed Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan. The Planning Department’s Major Environmental Analysis Division (MEA) is directing preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project. CEQA requires that the decision-making body and the public be informed about the significant effects of a project and identify ways to avoid or reduce those effects prior to project approval. When a proposed project may have significant effects that are not reduced by mitigation measures included in a project, an EIR must be prepared. As part of the EIR process, the Planning Department conducted public scoping in February 2008 to obtain input from agencies and the public regarding the scope and focus of the EIR.
Following consideration of the public comments received during the scoping process, the Planning Department will prepare a Draft EIR on the proposed Project. The Draft EIR will include a description of the existing environmental conditions on and around the project site, and will identify significant impacts on the physical environment that could be caused by construction or operation of the proposed project. The issues raised during the public scoping process will help to identify potentially significant impacts that should be studied in the EIR and the alternatives that should be discussed in the EIR. The Draft EIR will be circulated for public comment, and written responses will be prepared to comments raising physical environmental issues. Following certification of a Final EIR by the Planning Commission and TIDA as joint lead agencies, actions on the Redevelopment Plan will be considered by TIDA, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors.

Other public agencies that will be involved in reviewing the project include the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California State Lands Commission, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, Caltrans, and possibly the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

2.0 SCOPING PROCESS

The purpose of scoping is to provide the CEQA lead agency with the opportunity to consult directly with interested public agencies, the public, and organizations and other interested parties on matters related to environmental effects associated with the project. The scoping process helps identify alternatives and mitigation measures that should be considered in the EIR. It also assists with the coordination of regulatory agencies, local agencies and other stakeholders who may have different views and concerns regarding environmental issues. Scoping activities can also serve as a means to engage a community, resolve issues early in the EIR process, and foster public participation in the environmental review process.

2.1 Public Notification
On January 26, 2008, the San Francisco Planning Department issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings for the Project. The public comment period extended from January 26 through February 26, 2008. Public notice was provided in a number of ways.

- NOP and Scoping Meeting Notice Mailing
Over 500 copies of the NOP and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting were sent to affected public agencies and by U.S. mail to interested groups and individuals on January 26, 2008. The mailing list included the following project stakeholder groups:
  - Elected Officials: 7 Full NOP / 5 NOP Cover Notice
  - Public Agencies: 32 Full NOP / 150 NOP Cover Notice
  - Interested Parties: 32 Full NOP / 192 NOP Cover Notice
  - Native American Nations: 1 NOP Cover Notice
  - State Clearinghouse: 15 Full NOP
- Informational Repositories (e.g., libraries): 12 Full NOP / 9 NOP Cover Notice
- Media Outlets: 8 Full NOP / 15 NOP Cover Notice
- Individuals: 40 Full NOP / 44 NOP Cover Notice

Copies of the NOP and the NOP cover letter are given in Appendix A.

- Legal Notices
As additional notification, legal notices were placed in the San Francisco Chronicle (run date January 26, 2008), Alameda Times-Star (run date January 26), and the Oakland Tribune (run date January 26). Copies of the legal notices are given in Appendix B.

- Project Website Information
NOP information related to the project was posted at the San Francisco Planning website at:

http://www.sfgov.org/site/planning/mea

- Copies of the NOP
A copy of the NOP was available to anyone requesting one from the San Francisco Planning Department.

2.2 Scoping Meeting Overview
Two, 2-hour public scoping meetings were held to solicit input regarding project issues of concern to the community and identify potential environmental effects and potential alternatives to be considered in the environmental review process. The first meeting was held on February 11th at the Port of San Francisco hearing room on Pier 1, and the second meeting was held on February 13th on Treasure Island. The meetings were attended by approximately 9 people (San Francisco: 7 attendees, and Treasure Island: 2 attendees). Meeting proceedings were documented electronically, audio recorded, and transcribed by a court reporter who made a verbatim written transcript of each meeting (Appendix E).

In addition to the meetings described above which were conducted by the San Francisco Planning Department, the Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Citizens’ Advisory Board (CAB) included a public comment agenda item in its regular meeting held on February 12, 2008. A written transcript of the audio tape of this meeting was prepared and is attached (Appendix E).

2.3 Scoping Meeting Presentations
The meeting format consisted of an overview of the CEQA process provided by Rick Cooper, EIR Coordinator with the San Francisco Planning Department, and a brief description of the proposed project presented by Michael Tymoff of the Mayor’s Office representing Treasure Island Development Authority.

2.4 Scoping Meeting Comments
During the public comment portion of the scoping meetings, attendees were given an opportunity to provide input regarding issues of concern to the community and identify environmental effects and potential alternatives to be considered in the environmental review process. Those individuals wishing to speak at the meeting filled out speaker cards, and those who did not wish to speak publicly were encouraged to fill out comment cards or provide written comments.
directed to the Planning Department to document their concerns related to physical environmental issues (speaker cards were not used at the Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island CAB meeting). Meeting attendees were also reminded that project comments could be submitted by U.S. mail, electronic mail, and by facsimile to San Francisco Planning Department representatives (Bill Wycko, Acting Environmental Review Officer) through February 26, 2008 (the conclusion of the public comment period). Copies of the sign-in sheets and speaker cards are given in Appendix C.

2.5 Oral Comments
At least 13 individuals (there were several unidentified individuals in the CAB meeting transcript) spoke at the three scoping meetings.

2.5 Written Comments
As noted at the scoping meetings, written comments were accepted via U.S. mail, electronic mail, and fax addressed to Bill Wycko at the San Francisco Planning Department. Thirteen comment documents were received during the public review period. Copies of the comments received are given in Appendix D.

3.0 LIST OF COMMENTERS

3.1 Oral Comments
Oral comments were given by at least 13 individuals. The commenters are listed below and their comments are summarized in Table 1: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR NOP Comment Summary, Oral Comments.

- Alice Pilram
- Rob Black
- Liz Hirschhorn
- Suzanne Kim
- Wilma Pang
- Mike DeLane
- George Brown
- Kevil Holl
- Gene Brodsky
- Tim Molinare
- Heather Gallagher
- Eve Bach
- Unidentified speaker(s) at CAB meeting

3.2 Written Comments
Written comments were received from 13 interested parties and agencies. The commenters are listed below and their comments are summarized in Table 2: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR NOP Comment Summary, Written Comments.

- San Francisco Bay Trail (Association of Bay Area Governments)
- Arc Ecology
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District
- Ilana Bar-David
• Bay Conservation and Development Commission
• Caltrans
• U.S. Coast Guard
• East Bay Municipal Utilities District
• Ruth Gravanis
• SF Bicycle Coalition
• San Francisco Department of the Environment
• Sierra Club
• California State Lands Commission

4.0 SCOPING COMMENTS SUMMARY

See Table 1: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR NOP Comment Summary, Oral Comments, and Table 2: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR NOP Comment Summary, Written Comments.
### Table 1: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR NOP Comments Summary

**Public Comment Period January 26, 2008 to February 26, 2008**

#### Oral Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Molinare, Tim</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: EIR should consider a wastewater treatment alternative that provides higher level of treatment and does not require an outfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: EIR should describe alternatives to the proposed project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Bach, Eve</td>
<td>Feb. 13 Scoping Meeting: Smaller project alternative should not be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Bach, Eve</td>
<td>Feb. 13 Scoping Meeting: EIR should consider an alternative but feasible project that has less impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>Pilram, Alice</td>
<td>Feb. 11 Scoping Meeting: EIR should include global warming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Kim, Suzanne</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: Concerns regarding introduction of non-native species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Holl, Kevin</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: EIR should describe existing archaeological resources and identify their importance; whether discovery would delay construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Hirschhorn, Liz</td>
<td>Feb. 12 CAB Meeting: Mitigation should include full build-out of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Hirschhorn, Liz</td>
<td>Feb. 12 CAB Meeting: Transportation impacts should compare proposed project with current transportation conditions, not the active naval base conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Bach, Eve</td>
<td>Feb. 13 Scoping Meeting: EIR should be master EIR instead of project-level EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Holl, Kevin</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: EIR should include information about geotechnical stabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Brodsky, Gene</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: EIR should include information about safety of existing Navy housing, including liquefaction and existing building foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>Kim, Suzanne</td>
<td>Feb. 12 CAB Meeting: EIR should address pollution from cars in stormwater runoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, Land Use and Employment</td>
<td>Brown, George</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: EIR should include information about future employment, including goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Pang, Wilma</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: EIR should provide description of improvements to the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Gallagher, Heather</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: EIR should describe how demolition debris will be removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Bach, Eve</td>
<td>Feb. 13 Scoping Meeting: EIR should provide rationale for size of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>DeLane, Mike</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: Identify proposed facilities for the San Francisco Fire Department, and what type of water supply system is planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Black, Rob</td>
<td>Feb. 12 CAB Meeting: EIR should include impact of construction vehicles on transportation, including on Bay Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Kim, Suzanne</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: Concerns related to transportation including shared pedestrian/bike paths (specific comments inaudible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Pang, Wilma</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: Clarify and analyze amount of parking proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: EIR should describe enabling legislation for congestion-management program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Bach, Eve</td>
<td>Feb. 13 Scoping Meeting: EIR should consider traffic on streets and highways beyond Bay Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Feb 12 CAB Meeting: EIR should include information about bypassing treatment for stormwater flows exceeding five-year storms and regarding effectiveness of treatment for smaller volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Molinare, Tim</td>
<td>Feb. 12 CAB Meeting: EIR should analyze impacts of secondary treatment for wastewater and also an alternate system with a higher level of treatment, using wetlands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR NOP Comments Summary

**Public Comment Period January 26, 2008 to February 26, 2008**

**Written Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 02-1: Reduced density alternative could have bigger impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 09-1: Lower-density alternative won't necessarily have fewer impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 09-2: EIR should include car independence mobility alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 10-1: No-Trust Exchange Alternative would not meet objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 1-1: No purpose in studying No Trust Exchange Alternative: doesn't meet project greater impacts on YBI, inconsistent with BCDC policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 1-2: EIR should include Maximum Sustainability Alternative (MSA) that keeps pro; includes targets to minimize environmental harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 1-3: MSA could have 1/4 parking spaces of proposed project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 1-4a: MSA could have measures to increase car independence such visitor-serving with bus/ferries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-3: Treating storms larger than 5-year would eliminate erosion problems on YBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-4: MSA would include on-island renewables above 5% goal, distributed energy urban core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-5: MSA would include LEED Platinum as standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-6: MSA would include variant with re-use or reconfiguration of Job Corps campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-10: MSA would include target for 1% increase in Bridge traffic, not 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-12: Alternatives analysis should include simulations, with view of the islands frvc vantage points, and points of reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-13: Alternatives analysis should include discussion of compliance with Transit F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-14: Alternatives analysis should include annual carbon emissions after buildout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-15: Alternatives analysis would include ecosystem damage from management c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 3-1: EIR should include alternative based on no approval of congestion managem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 3-2: EIR should include alternative based on opportunities after Caltrans finishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 1-1: EIR should analyze impact of reducing parking spaces to 3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 1-1: Less intensive development might not mean fewer impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 1-2: Less intensive development might result in less residential support for comm transit, resulting in more auto trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 2: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR NOP Comments Summary

**Public Comment Period January 26, 2008 to February 26, 2008**

## Written Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 1-3: EIR should include minimum impact alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 1-4: Minimum-impact alternative should include less use of private cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 1-5: Minimum-impact alternative should include higher energy-efficiency goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 1-6: Minimum-impact alternative should include higher CO2 neutrality goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 1-8: Alternatives analysis should include annual GHG emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 1-9: Alternatives analysis should include annual criteria pollutant emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-01: Minimum-impact alternative should include reduction in parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-02: Minimum-impact alternative should include lower VMT targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-08: Minimum-impact alternative should include higher renewable-energy generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-09: Minimum-impact alternative should include higher green building standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-16: Minimum-impact alternative should include ecosystem-related bio-diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 1-01: Wants alternatives that reduce impacts related to cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 1-03: EIR should analyze carbon emissions impact of all alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 1-04: Alternatives analysis should include comparison of all impacts, using compa example provided (Also pp 3-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 2-03: EIR should include off-peak access fee alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 2-04: Off-peak access fee alternative should include same features Sierra club su-proposed project, plus off-peak access fees to provide $$ for alternative modes, plus roq from meters and garages to MTA for transit service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 2-06: EIR should include reduced parking/no ferry alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 2-07: Reduced parking/no ferry alternative should include same features Sierra C proposed project and off-peak access alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 2-08: Reduced parking/no ferry alternative should include reduced parking (suggested)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 2-09: Reduced parking/no ferry alternative should include only retail needed for resident visitors, w/retail uses only on ground and lower floors of residential buildings. Lim that 50% of workers are TI/YBI residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 2-10: Reduced parking/no ferry alternative should replace reduced retail and flex w/residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 2-11: Reduced parking/no ferry alternative should devote fee revenue to greater instead of ferry service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 2-12: Reduced parking, less retail, more residential could result in fewer trips, less be divided among more people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 3-1: Purpose of reduced parking/no ferry alternative is to show high energy use c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 3-2: Purpose of reduced parking/no ferry alternative is to show how ferry subsidy used for transit, reducing trips?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 3-3: Purpose of reduced parking/no ferry alternative is to explore alternative use!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 3-4: Alternatives analysis should be based on estimated CO2 emissions per passenger, and cars, for assumed average trip length and load factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 3-5: Alternatives analysis should include total GHG produced per year for each option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 3-6: Alternatives analysis should include total daily passenger volumes from TI/YBI and East Bay, for each mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 3-7: Alternatives analysis should include daily, discount, and monthly bus and ferry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 3-8: Alternatives analysis should include travel times at peak and off-peak for each walking, waiting, boarding, riding, unboarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 3-9: EIR should include alternative with use of some or all of Job Corps site for retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 11-3: AQ study area should correspond to traffic study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 1-1: EIR should include attainment status and implications of non-compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 1-2: EIR should include discussion of health effects of pollution on sensitive receptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 1-3: EIR should discuss proposal by EPA to lower ozone standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 1-4: EIR analysis should be based on BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR NOP Comments Summary

**Public Comment Period January 26, 2008 to February 26, 2008**

### Written Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 1-5: [list of what should be analyzed - std]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 2-1: URBEMIS 2007, 9.2.4 should be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 2-2: EIR should include analysis of TACs on sensitive receptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 2-3: EIR should include quantitative analysis of construction exhaust emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 2-4: Construction dust emissions should be consistent with BAAQMD Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 2-5: EIR should include feasible construction exhaust mitigation (includes exampl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 2-7: Mitigation for AQ and energy impacts should include minimum level of green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 2-8: EIR should analyze GHG emissions, using CAPCOA report as guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 2-9: Mitigation for GHG should include all feasible measures, including VMT reduc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>Coast Guard</td>
<td>Page 1-4: Additional traffic could cause AQ impacts of concern to USCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-07: Minimum-impact alternative should include goal for carbon-neutral remediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-05: Bay Plan Map 4, Policy 19 is specifically for TI (mentions public access, wildlife)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-01: Bay Plan ferry policies: terminal location criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-05: EIR should analyze impacts of increased transportation use (all modes) on bio resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 3-5: EIR should not assume that USCG would respond quickly to spills in Clipper C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 3-6: Bio resources inventory should not rely on EIS data (mentions California quail, woodpecker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 3-7: EIR could coordinate with Habitat Management Plan for YBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-17: Minimum-impact alternative should include highest-rated Bay-friendly land:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 02-2: Partial project buildout could have greater impacts than analyzed (also p. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 03-1: Funding uncertainties could lead to greater impacts than analyzed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 03-3: EIR should be MEIR, not project level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 08-4: EIR should analyze impacts prior to full buildout, assuming self-mitigating measures have been implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 10-2: Baseline should be NOP date, not base closure decision date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Bar-David, Ilana</td>
<td>Page 1-1: Live-work artisan colony should include pre-industrial crafts, would entice visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Bar-David, Ilana</td>
<td>Page 1-1: High-density residential community would be consistent with congestion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Page 4 of 11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Bar-David, Ilana</td>
<td>Page 1-2: live-work colony would complement green emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Bar-David, Ilana</td>
<td>Page 1-4: Green biz ctr might attract employees who walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Coast Guard</td>
<td>Page 1-5: YBI road network to BB EB on-ramps goes through USCG property - increase cause impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-11: MSA would focus on deconstruction rather than demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 3-3: Wants us to refer to &quot;sewage&quot; instead of &quot;wastewater&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 1-0: See general note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 06-7: Concern that funding not available for long-term dredge disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards</td>
<td>Coast Guard</td>
<td>Page 2-3: Project could affect USCG facility and residents/personnel security during con operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-01: Bay Plan ferry policies: terminal location criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-02: Ferry terminal should not rapidly fill with sediment, avoid frequent dredging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-13: Bay Plan sea level rise policies: Structures at shoreline or on fill should be expected water level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-14: Bay Plan sea level rise policies: local governments should assure that new to existing or future flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-15: New fill for construction and geotechnical stabilization must be consistent with level rise policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-1: Maximum Sustainability Alternative would assume that all sewage is treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-2: Maximum Sustainability Alternative would treat storms larger than 5-year de additional LID measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 1-7: Minimum-impact alternative should include higher WQ goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-10: Minimum-impact alternative should include higher WQ storage, treatment, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-13: Minimum-impact alternative should include accommodation of flows greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>ABAG</td>
<td>Page 1-1: EIR should discuss ABAG Trail Plan and policies as they relate to the proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR NOP Comments Summary

**Public Comment Period January 26, 2008 to February 26, 2008**

**Written Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 1-1: BCDC has Bay and shoreline jurisdiction in project area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 1-3: SF Bay Plan Map Policies relevant to YBI, TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 1-4: BCDC will review proposed fill placement against stated criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-02: Public access improvements should include maintenance program and signa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-07: EIR should analyze whether project is consistent w/max feasible public acce policies, Map policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-09: Bay Plan marina policies: facilities for which fill permitted if minimum and i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-11: Plan Map 4, Policies 20 and 21 should be included in project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-04: Public transport, bike systems would be consistent if developed in accordan policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Coast Guard</td>
<td>Page 2-2: Project could affect USCG parking near Hilltop Park at YBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>State Lands</td>
<td>Trust 1: Provides description of legislation transferring trust properties to TIDA, includin and submerged lands, limitations on use, and exceptions to those limitations. (pp. 1-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>State Lands</td>
<td>Trust 2: Land exchange parameters summarized (p.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Coast Guard</td>
<td>Page 1-3: Additional traffic could cause noise impacts of concern to USCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 04-2: Wanted IS to be prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 10-5: Transportation scoping should be publicly reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>ABAG</td>
<td>Page 1-2: EIR should provide detail on trail connections to BB East Span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>ABAG</td>
<td>Page 1-3: Proposed trail design should consider likely user population (tourists, familien skaters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 04-1: Bridge ramps should be part of project (also later on p. 4, and p. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 05-1: Which features of Development Plan are part of the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 05-4: Concern that affordable housing commitment could be less than 30% (with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 08-2: Project should not begin before WWTP is fully funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 08-5: Some required approvals omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 08-6: Approvals needed for early transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Bar-David, Ilana</td>
<td>Page 1-3: Suggested design of artisan colony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-04: Public access improvements should be permanently guaranteed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-08: EIR should analyze whether new transportation facilities would require Bay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR NOP Comments Summary

**Written Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Page 1-2</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 1-4</td>
<td>Encroachment permit cannot be issued until Caltrans concerns addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 4-1</td>
<td>Project needs to cover costs related to placement of water pipe on BB East S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 4-2</td>
<td>Project needs to include connection to water pipe termination points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 5-1</td>
<td>Would project not use new wastewater line on BB East Span?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 5-2</td>
<td>Would project not use new reclaimed water line on BB East Span?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>EBMUD</td>
<td>Page 1-2</td>
<td>EBMUD service must continue to be used only in case of emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>EBMUD</td>
<td>Page 1-3</td>
<td>Minimum flows in pipe to maintain WQ are ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>EBMUD</td>
<td>Page 1-4</td>
<td>EBMUD will not grant connection and meter in Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>SF Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 1-2</td>
<td>EIR should analyze impact of including bike path on BB West Span as part of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 1-02</td>
<td>Wants variants that reduce impacts related to cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 1-06</td>
<td>Buses should be given absolute priority on YBI, TI roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 1-10</td>
<td>Bridge access fees should fund West span bikeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Desc</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 2-02</td>
<td>Specified rates at meters on project area streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 1-2</td>
<td>Bay Plan designates YBI as waterfront park priority use area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 1-5</td>
<td>Project must provide max feasible public access to gain BCDC approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-01</td>
<td>Public access improvements should encourage Bay-related activities and m shoreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-03</td>
<td>Public access improvements should include connection to parking or transit, trails, and access for disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-05</td>
<td>Bay Plan Map 4, Policy 19 is specifically for TI (mentions public access, boat wildlife)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-06</td>
<td>Bay Plan Map 4, Policy 22 is specifically for YBI (public access and recreatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-07</td>
<td>EIR should analyze whether project is consistent w/max feasible public access policies, Map policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-08</td>
<td>Bay Plan Recreation policies: close to population, clustered for joint use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-10</td>
<td>EIR should analyze project impacts on recreation, esp. public access to within shoreline band on TI, and impacts to public marina and boat launching facilities fi intensity of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-13</td>
<td>Bay Plan transportation policies: projects should enhance physical/visual a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-03</td>
<td>Bay Plan ferry policies: terminal parking location criteria (for public access'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-06: EIR should analyze impacts of increased transportation uses (all modes) on shoreline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-07: EIR should analyze impacts of increased transportation uses (all modes) on shoreline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 03-2: Traffic study area should include all roads affected by Bay Bridge traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 05-2: Traffic analysis should be based on committed transit improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 05-3: Trip generation should reflect higher trip rates from SF units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 06-1: Economic inefficiency of operating a school on an island w/3,800 dwelling units questions as to whether there will be a school (with implications for traffic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 06-2: Concern that school might not be built (leading to traffic impacts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 06-3: Concern that commitment to community programs not real (leading to traffic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 06-4: EIR should analyze street hierarchy and potential excess road capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 06-5: EIR should analyze walking time for YBI housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 06-6: EIR should include measures for safe walking and bike connections on YBI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 07-1: Mode split should be based on committed transit improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 07-2: EIR should analyze whether proposed parking exceeds demand (and thus lead to congestion pricing should be identified)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 08-1: Replacement for congestion pricing should be identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 10-3: Traffic analysis should be based on committed transit improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 10-4: Traffic mitigation should emphasize parking supply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 10-6: Weekend traffic should be analyzed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 10-7: Trip shift to off-peak hours should be analyzed, considering off-peak bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 11-1: Cumulative analysis should include congestion on roads feeding the Bay Bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 11-2: Traffic analysis should include truck impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 11-4: Ambulances need dedicated access to Bay Bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 11-5: Cumulative analysis should include all projects affecting Bay Bridge feeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-12: Bay Plan transportation policies: projects should include trails that connect other trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 1-1: Planning Department responsible for mitigation of impacts to state highways fair share, financing, scheduling, and implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 1-2: Mitigation details shall be discussed for all measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 1-3: Any required improvements to be completed before occupancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR NOP Comments Summary

**Public Comment Period January 26, 2008 to February 26, 2008**

**Written Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 2-1: [comments on EIR transportation scope - not repeated here] (pp. 2-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 3-1: EIR should coordinate traffic study with DPH walkable-bikeable TI study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 3-2: Wants transit, ped, bike trips to be modeled and multimodal LOS used in analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 3-3: Impacts of mitigation measures on peds and cyclists should be discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 3-4: Mitigation for ped/cyclist conditions resulting from traffic improvements should be discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 3-5: Ramps PSR does not include scope, cost, schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Coast Guard</td>
<td>Page 1-2: Increased traffic and modified traffic patterns during construction and operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Coast Guard</td>
<td>Page 1-6: USCG ability to access its facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Coast Guard</td>
<td>Page 2-1: Project could alter public transit service to islands during construction and operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 1-4b: MSA could have measures to increase car independence such as takehome measures to reduce car ownership, residential marketing geared toward car-free residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-7: MSA would include programs to keep residents and employees on the island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-8: MSA would include ample carsharing pods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Gravanis, Ruth</td>
<td>Page 2-9: MSA would include fees for auto use all day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>SF Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 1-3: EIR should consider design TICD design strategies for bike/ped connections!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>SF Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 1-4: EIR should analyze BB bike shuttle and its impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>SF Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 1-5: EIR should analyze impact of limiting cars on neighborhood streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>SF Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 1-6: EIR should analyze different types of bike facilities on neighborhood and arterial streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>SF Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 2-1: EIR should analyze impacts of traffic calming features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>SF Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 2-2: EIR should analyze &quot;robust&quot; bike parking program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>SF Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 2-3: EIR should analyze impact of bike-sharing program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>SF Bike Coalition</td>
<td>Page 2-4: EIR should analyze separate bike and ped pathways around central terminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-03: Minimum-impact alternative should include additional incentives for minimi:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-04: Minimum-impact alternative should include lockers at transit hub</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR NOP Comments Summary

**Public Comment Period January 26, 2008 to February 26, 2008**

**Written Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-05: Minimum-impact alternative should include weather-protected spaces for bi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-06: Minimum-impact alternative should include bus service that minimizes trans: on islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 1-05: Impacts analysis should be based on same transit fares as on the SF mainl: Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 1-07: Buses should have priority to access the Bay Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 1-08: Basic ferry fares should be 2x Muni adult fare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 1-09: Project should include peak-hour access fees to limit bridge congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 2-01: Garage parking fees should be at least what is charged in City CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Page 2-05: Off-peak access fee alternative may need to include fees from SF to TI and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>State Lands</td>
<td>Trust 3: &quot;Competitive transportation management plan&quot; must not discriminate among ‑ not give preferential treatment to TI residents (p2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Arc Ecology</td>
<td>Page 08-3: Design of WWTP should account for potential Job Corps expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Page 2-06: EIR should include estimate of increased project and cumulative energy use, construct additional power-generating capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Coast Guard</td>
<td>Page 1-1: Concern that installation of electric substations, replacement of telecommuni replacement of WWTP on TI, replacement of YBI water tanks could interrupt utility servi construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>EBMUD</td>
<td>Page 1-1: Emergency water from EBMUD should not exceed capacities planned for TI/γ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-12: Minimum-impact alternative should include minimum use of domestic water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-12: Minimum-impact alternative should include maximum use of recycled water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-14: Minimum-impact alternative should include graywater systems in residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>SF Dept of Environment</td>
<td>Page 2-15: Minimum-impact alternative should include climate-appropriate landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 2-13: Bay Plan transportation policies: projects should enhance physical/visual a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR NOP Comments Summary

**Public Comment Period January 26, 2008 to February 26, 2008**

**Written Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-09: Bay Plan visual policies: bayfront development should enhance bay user/view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-10: Bay Plan visual policies: views of Bay shall be maintained, enhanced, or preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-11: Bay Plan visual policies: shoreline development should be clustered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Page 3-12: Project should be consistent with Bay Plan policies on Design and Scenic View</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

NOP
RE:  CASE NO. 2007.0903E – TREASURE ISLAND AND YERBA BUENA ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND NOTICE OF PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

To Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, and Interested Parties:

The San Francisco Planning Department has issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and a Notice of Public Scoping Meetings for the above-referenced project, described below. The detailed NOP/Notice of Public Scoping Meetings is either attached or is available upon request from Rick Cooper, San Francisco Planning Department, at the above address or at (415) 575-9027. The NOP/Notice of Public Scoping Meetings is also available on-line at www.sfgov.org/site/planning/mea.

Project Description: Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island (collectively, “the Islands”) are in San Francisco Bay, about halfway between the San Francisco mainland and Oakland. The Islands are the site of the former Naval Station Treasure Island (“NSTI”), which was owned by the United States Navy. NSTI was closed on September 20, 1997 as part of the Base Realignment and Closure III program. The Islands also include a U.S. Coast Guard Station and land occupied by the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and tunnel structures.

The proposed Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan (“Redevelopment Plan”) would provide the basis for redevelopment of most of the NSTI lands (the “Redevelopment Plan Area” or “project site”) from a primarily low-density residential area with vacant and underutilized nonresidential structures to a new mixed-use community with a retail center, a variety of open space and recreation opportunities, on-site infrastructure, and public and community services. The proposed Redevelopment Plan and other planning documents would establish general land use controls and design standards for the project site. The Redevelopment Plan includes supporting studies that address project design concepts, transportation, infrastructure, community services, affordable housing, jobs, and other aspects of the development. A major component of the proposed Redevelopment Plan is the Sustainability Plan, which includes goals, strategies, and targets for the sustainable redevelopment of the Islands. The proposed Redevelopment Plan would consist of approximately 6,000 residential units, 235,000 square feet of commercial and retail space, 400 to 500 hotel rooms, 300 acres of parks and open space, transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, a ferry terminal/transit hub, public and community services, and utilities. Other components of the proposed redevelopment include supplemental remediation to allow the proposed uses, geotechnical stabilization, and renovation and adaptive re-use of existing historic structures. The Redevelopment Plan would be implemented in four phases from approximately 2009 through 2018.

As stated in the NOP, the Planning Department has determined that an EIR must be prepared for the proposed project prior to any final decision regarding whether to approve the project. The purpose of the EIR is to provide information about potential physical environmental effects of the proposed project, to identify ways to minimize significant effects, and to describe and analyze alternatives to the proposed project. Preparation of an NOP or EIR does not indicate a decision by the City to approve or to disapprove the project. However, prior to making any decision, the decision makers must consider the information contained in the EIR.

The Planning Department will hold two PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS on the EIR. The first will be held on Monday, February 11, 2008, at the Bayside Conference Room, Port of San Francisco, Pier 1, The Embarcadero, San Francisco, CA 94111 from 6:00 to 8:00 pm, and the second on Wednesday, February 13, 2008, at the Ship Shape Building, Building 497, Avenue M and 11th Avenue, Treasure Island, San Francisco, CA 94130 from 6:00 to 8:00 pm. Written comments will be accepted until the close of business (5 PM), February 26, 2008 and should be sent to Bill Wycko, Acting Environmental Review Officer, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103-2479.

Should you have questions concerning the environmental review of the proposed project, please contact Rick Cooper at the number above. If you work for an agency that is a Responsible or a Trustee Agency, we need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information that is relevant to your agency’s statutory responsibilities. We will also need the name of the contact person for your agency.
NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND NOTICE OF PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

Date of this Notice: January 26, 2008

Lead Agency: San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Agency Contact Person: Rick Cooper
Telephone: (415) 575-9027

Project Title: 2007.0903E – Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan

Project Sponsor: Treasure Island Community Development, LLC (TICD) and Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA)

Contact Person: Alexandra Galovich (TICD)
Telephone: (415) 995-4813
Jack Sylvan (TIDA)
Telephone: (415) 554-5313

Project Address: Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island

Assessor’s Block and Lot: Assessor’s Block 1939, Lots 001 (Treasure Island) and 002 (Yerba Buena Island)

City and County: San Francisco

Project Description: See attached

THIS PROJECT MAY HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT. AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT IS REQUIRED. This determination is based upon the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary for Resources, Sections 15063 (Initial Study), 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), and 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance).

TWO PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS will be held pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code Section 21083.9 and California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15206 to receive comments concerning the scope of the EIR. The meetings will be held on February, 11, 2008, and February 13, 2008. Please see the attached for more information.

Written comments on the scope of the EIR will be accepted until the close of business (5 PM) on February 26, 2008. Written comments should be sent to Bill Wycko, Acting Environmental Review Officer, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103-2479.

Documents relating to the proposed project are available for review, by appointment, at the Planning Department’s Major Environmental Analysis office, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400. Please call Rick Cooper at (415) 575-9027.

State Agencies: We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency may need to use the EIR when considering a permit or other approval for this project. Please include the name of a contact person in your agency. Thank you.

January 25, 2008

Bill Wycko, Acting Environmental Review Officer
INTRODUCTION

The San Francisco Planning Department will prepare an environmental impact report (EIR) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the physical environmental effects of the proposed Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan (“Redevelopment Plan” or “the Plan”) and public and private projects and activities that would be implemented pursuant to the Plan (“Development Program”). The Redevelopment Plan and associated Development Program together are the “Proposed Project.”

This notice provides a summary of the Proposed Project, identifies environmental topics and issues anticipated to be analyzed in the EIR, and provides the time, date, and location of the public scoping meetings. The EIR will be a project-level EIR on the Redevelopment Plan and the Development Program. The Treasure Island Development Authority (“TIDA”), a single-purpose public agency responsible for the Redevelopment Plan Area, and Treasure Island Community Development, LLC (“TICD”), a private entity chosen as the master developer, are joint sponsors of the Proposed Project.

An Initial Study will not be prepared as part of the environmental review process for the Proposed Project; instead all topics will be addressed in the EIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(d) the San Francisco Planning Department has determined that an Initial Study is not necessary. In the absence of an Initial Study, the EIR will still focus on the significant impacts of the Proposed Project and explain more briefly why other issues would not be significant.

PROJECT LOCATION

Redevelopment Plan Area

The proposed Redevelopment Plan Area includes all of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island (collectively, “the Islands”) in San Francisco Bay. (See Figure 1: Regional Location.) The Islands are the site of the former Naval Station Treasure Island (NSTI), which was owned and operated by the United States Navy until its closure in 1997 as part of the Base Realignment and Closure process. The proposed Redevelopment Plan Area encompasses approximately 400 acres of land on Treasure Island, approximately 150 acres of land on Yerba Buena Island and about 550 acres of tidal and submerged lands adjacent to the Islands. The Navy is in the process of conveying most of these areas to TIDA, which currently manages a variety of interim residential, industrial, institutional and recreational land uses. The Redevelopment Plan Area includes Lots 001 and 002 within Assessor’s Block 1939.
Treasure Island, which consists entirely of filled land, was constructed during 1936 – 1939; the U.S. Navy took possession of Treasure Island from the City of San Francisco in 1941. Treasure Island currently includes approximately 720 occupiable housing units out of about 900 units total, and approximately 91 buildings containing approximately 2.3 million square feet of present and former non-residential uses. Treasure Island also includes the U.S. Department of Labor Job Corps site on approximately 36 acres in the center of the island. Yerba Buena Island is a natural island that has been used by private parties and the U.S. Army and Navy since the 1840s; the island is steeply sloped and highly vegetated. Within the Redevelopment Plan Area on Yerba Buena Island, there are currently about 80 occupiable housing units out of a total of about 100 housing units and 10 non-residential buildings. The U.S. Coast Guard occupies about 35 acres on the southeast side of Yerba Buena Island, and the California Department of Transportation (“Caltrans”) occupies about 20 acres of Yerba Buena Island with portions of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and tunnel.

The entire Redevelopment Plan Area is currently within a P (Public) Use District and a 40-X height and bulk district. In addition, the California Tidelands Trust Doctrine (“Tidelands Trust”) will apply to all portions of Treasure Island to be conveyed to TIDA by the Navy, as well as approximately 2 acres of land on Yerba Buena Island, and all of the tidal and submerged lands to be conveyed to TIDA within the Redevelopment Plan Area. The Job Corps, Coast Guard, and Caltrans properties will not be part of the area controlled by TIDA.

**Adjacent and Nearby Uses**

Land uses on the Islands that are within the Redevelopment Plan Area but are expected to remain unchanged include the Job Corps educational and training program on Treasure Island; the U.S. Coast Guard Station on Yerba Buena Island; and the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (“Bay Bridge”) and tunnel structures on Yerba Buena Island. Caltrans is building a new east span of the Bay Bridge, connecting to Yerba Buena Island; completion is expected by 2013.

The Islands are surrounded by San Francisco Bay waters; the San Francisco mainland is about 2 miles to the west and Oakland is about 2 miles to the east. Uses along and adjacent to the San Francisco waterfront include the Ferry Building, The Embarcadero Promenade, pier bulkhead

---

1 The Tidelands Trust limits the types of uses that can be developed on those properties. Under the 1997 Treasure Island Conversion Act (Cal. Health & Safety Code §33492.5), existing uses on Treasure Island that are inconsistent with the Tidelands Trust, such as the existing residential buildings, are permitted to continue for their remaining useful life, defined as no less than 25 years or no more than 40 years from the date of the Act. Later, the Treasure Island Public Trust Exchange Act, as amended, authorized a public trust exchange that would lift the Tidelands Trust restrictions on those areas designated in the proposed Redevelopment Plan for residential and other non-trust uses and transfer the Tidelands Trust to certain portions of Yerba Buena Island that are not currently subject to it.

buildings and sheds, and the San Francisco downtown financial district. Nearby uses to the east include Port of Oakland container terminal shipping facilities; the former Oakland Army Base, the MacArthur Maze junction of Interstate-80, I-580, and I-880; the joint Union Pacific Intermodal Terminal; the Oakland Naval Supply Center; and downtown high-rise buildings in Oakland. Also to the east are high-rise office and residential buildings, a marina, and regional shopping centers in Emeryville. The former Alameda Naval Air Station on the north end of Alameda Island is southeast of Yerba Buena Island.

Access and Transit

Access to the Redevelopment Plan Area is provided via the Bay Bridge ramps at Yerba Buena Island; a causeway links Yerba Buena Island to Treasure Island. One of the existing ramps is currently being rebuilt as part of the Bay Bridge eastern span replacement project. Improvement and/or replacement of the other ramps is currently under study by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority and the California Department of Transportation (“Caltrans”); improvement or replacement of these ramps, if undertaken, would be a separate project from both the Bay Bridge eastern span currently under construction and the Proposed Project. Impact analysis in the EIR on the Proposed Project will take into account conditions resulting from both the existing ramps and the potential improved or replaced ramps.

The Islands are served directly by San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) Line 108, which runs between the Islands and the Transbay Terminal in San Francisco. Currently, there is no direct transit service between the Islands and the East Bay, and no public ferry service to either Island.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The overall purpose of the Proposed Project is the conversion of approximately 364 acres on Treasure Island and approximately 95 acres on Yerba Buena Island from a former military base to a dense mixed-use development of residential, commercial, cultural, hotel, and retail uses centered around an Intermodal Transit Hub, with supporting infrastructure, public services and utilities, and a substantial amount of open space.

The basis for the Development Program underlying the Redevelopment Plan is the Development Plan and Term Sheet for the Redevelopment of Naval Station Treasure Island endorsed by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in December 2006, which includes a draft Design Concepts and Strategies Plan, draft Transportation Plan, draft Sustainability Plan and draft Infrastructure Plan, among its many exhibits. Development Program activities carried out pursuant to the Redevelopment Plan would include, among other things, implementation of (1) the final Design Concepts and Strategies Plan and related agreements that address land use, urban form and open space; (2) the final Transportation Plan and related agreements that address measures and strategies related to transit service, parking supply and management, and transportation demand management; (3) the final Sustainability Plan and related agreements that address goals,
principles, strategies and actions to achieve a highly sustainable development; and (4) the final Infrastructure Plan and related agreements that address the infrastructure needs for development of the Islands. The Proposed Project would be implemented through a Disposition and Development Agreement ("DDA") between TIDA and TICD. Additional aspects of the Proposed Project would be implemented by TIDA either directly or through agreements between TIDA and other entities.

**Conceptual Land Use Plan**

The Proposed Project includes:

- Stabilization of Treasure Island and the causeway connecting it to Yerba Buena Island;
- Up to approximately 6,000 residential units;
- Up to approximately 270,000 square feet (sq. ft.) of new commercial and retail space;
- Adaptive reuse of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 with up to 325,000 sq. ft. of commercial space;
- Approximately 500 hotel rooms;
- New and/or upgraded public services and utilities;
- Approximately 300 acres of parks and public open space;
- Bicycle, transit, and pedestrian facilities; and
- An Intermodal Ferry Quay/Transit Hub.

The proposed land uses are shown in Figure 2, Conceptual Land Use Plan.

**Land Uses**

**Residential**

The Development Program would include up to approximately 6,000 residential units, including approximately 5,700 to 5,850 units on Treasure Island and approximately 150 to 300 units on Yerba Buena Island. Approximately 50 percent of all housing units would be in low-rise buildings (building height 65 feet and lower), 35 percent would be in mid-rise buildings (building height above 65 feet and less than 240 feet), and 15 percent in high-rise buildings (building height greater than 240 feet). The tallest buildings would be located near a densely developed southwest corner of Treasure Island in the “Urban Core” neighborhood, near the proposed Ferry Quay and transit hub. The proposed residences would include housing sized for families. Approximately thirty percent of all units would be affordably priced at a range of below-market rates, including an expansion from 250 to 435 residential units for the existing Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative (TIHDI) program.
FIGURE 2: PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN
Open Space and Recreation

The Development Program would include approximately 300 acres of publicly accessible pathways, parks, open space, plazas, and shoreline improvements. The recreational and open space uses would include perimeter shoreline and water access, a stormwater treatment wetland, a Great Park covering much of the northeast portion of Treasure Island, a regional recreational facility, and a variety of active and passive recreational areas.

Commercial

The Development Program commercial component would include: approximately 500 hotel rooms; approximately 325,000 sq. ft. of commercial uses in the renovated historic Buildings 1, 2, and 3; retail uses concentrated and organized as a main street between the Ferry Quay/Transit Hub, the Clipper Cove plaza, and historic Buildings 1 and 2; ancillary retail uses along the Clipper Cove marina and in the residential neighborhoods. The total amount of retail space provided in the Development Program’s commercial component would not exceed 270,000 sq. ft.

Institutional and Public Services

The Development Program would provide space for a variety of community programs in Building 1, in some of the proposed residential buildings, and possibly in a stand-alone community center. Space for child care also would be provided. The existing, closed public grammar school on Treasure Island would be improved and reopened for use by the San Francisco Unified School District. The existing wastewater treatment plant would be replaced (as discussed below under “Proposed Utilities”). A recycling program would be established and a recycling center/corporation yard would be provided. A joint police/fire station would be provided. The existing Job Corps facility would remain in use in its current location on Treasure Island, under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor. Similarly, the U.S. Coast Guard facility on Yerba Buena Island would remain in its current location.

Proposed Transportation Plan

Proposed Street System

The roadway system would consist of three levels of public roadways: arterial streets, collector streets, and neighborhood streets. The streets on Treasure Island would be new construction, and the street grid would be re-oriented to maximize the effects of sun and minimize the effects of wind. The street layout on Yerba Buena Island would generally follow the locations of the existing streets. Streets would be designed to prioritize walking, bicycling, and use of the intra-
island shuttle service. All of the proposed residential units on Treasure Island would be within a 15-minute walk of the proposed Intermodal Transit Hub.³

**Transit Facilities and Service**

The proposed Transportation Plan⁴ relies on the use of alternative transit modes (buses and ferries) for off-Island trips and shuttle/pedestrian/bike facilities for on-Island travel. The Development Program would include the construction of a new ferry quay and terminal and a bus transit facility on the western shore of Treasure Island. These two uses would anchor the proposed Intermodal Transit Hub, which would provide transportation facilities, services, and information. Proposed funding for ferry vessels would provide the opportunity for an operator to initiate ferry service to the Islands between San Francisco and Treasure Island, and the proposed bus transit facility would provide stops for Muni service to San Francisco and East Bay transit service. In addition, the Development Program would include a free shuttle service around the Islands.

**Walking and Biking**

Shared-use paths would be provided in open space areas, and the busiest roadways would incorporate shareable-width outside lanes or bicycle lanes as appropriate for the traffic volumes and street function. The Islands’ walkways and bicycle route network would connect to the planned shared-use path on the Bay Bridge east span and to the recreational paths around the Islands, and would be designed to allow for possible future connections to other pedestrian and bicycle paths. Bike parking would be available at all major destinations, and a bicycle library program would make bikes available for all Island and transit users.

**Bay Bridge Access**

Automobile access to the Redevelopment Plan Area is only available via the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge ramps at Yerba Buena Island. The Development Program’s design is based on the capacity of the existing ramps; accordingly, the Development Program assumes that the ramps would remain unchanged.

The City and Caltrans are separately studying the replacement or improvement of the ramps that connect the Islands to the Bay Bridge in order to improve traffic flow safety. Senate Bill 163 (Migden) chaptered October 13, 2007, requires the California Department of Transportation to work with TIDA on design and engineering of replacement ramps connecting Yerba Buena Island to the Bay Bridge. A Project Study Report was executed by Caltrans on December 19, 2007, ³

---


⁴ The Transportation Plan was prepared as part of the *Development Plan and Term Sheet for the Redevelopment of Naval Station Treasure Island* in 2006.
designating the San Francisco County Transportation Authority as the lead agency for this undertaking. Because the ramp improvements have not yet been approved and funded, the EIR on the Proposed Project will discuss the impacts of the Proposed Project with the existing ramps, and will consider new or improved ramps as part of the future cumulative conditions. Should funding be identified to replace or improve the existing ramps, Caltrans and the City would conduct a separate environment analysis of the selected design(s).

Parking

The Development Program includes the provision of approximately 8,250 parking spaces, all of which would incur a charge for use, on the Islands, of which approximately 6,000 spaces would be for the residential uses. Retail and hotel parking spaces would generally be located in off-street parking garages. Parking spaces would be provided for the other proposed uses through both on- and off-street parking. Visitors to these uses would pay for parking, and the revenues would be used in combination with revenues from transit passes and a congestion pricing program to offset the operating costs associated with the transportation program, such as the off-island transit service, the on-island shuttle service, and the “bicycle library” serving the Islands.

Encouraging Use of Transit and Discouraging Automobile Use

Automobile use would be discouraged through parking pricing, parking management, and congestion pricing as part of a comprehensive transportation management plan designed to discourage driving and promote alternative mode use. The mechanisms proposed include: transportation demand management (TDM) measures to support the use of transit, carpooling, walking and bicycling; trip reduction measures; the mandatory purchase of a comprehensive transit pass; parking pricing policy that all auto users incur a parking charge; implementation of a congestion pricing program; and ramp metering on the access ramps to the Bay Bridge. The congestion pricing program would allow for imposition of fees applicable to residents and other users of Treasure Island who drive on and/or off Treasure Island. The congestion pricing fees could be set and adjusted to reflect traffic patterns, congestion levels, time of day, and other conditions that affect the roadway system.

Proposed Utilities

Water

The Development Program would continue to use the existing primary water supply, which is provided by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) through a pipe attached to the western span of the Bay Bridge. The proposed secondary (emergency) water supply would be from the East Bay Municipal Utilities District (EBMUD), through a water main that is being constructed by Caltrans as part of the new eastern span of the Bay Bridge. The existing water storage tanks would be replaced with three new tanks on Yerba Buena Island. The existing water distribution piping on the Islands would be replaced with a proposed new water distribution
system. In addition, the Proposed Project would include the establishment of a backup Bay water supply system for use by the San Francisco Fire Department.

Wastewater

The existing wastewater collection gravity lines, pump stations, and force mains would be completely replaced (in phases) with a new collection system, including gravity lines, force mains, and pump/lift stations. In addition, a new wastewater treatment facility would be constructed at or near the existing plant at the northeastern part of Treasure Island. The replacement wastewater treatment facility would be operated by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and would be designed to handle projected wastewater flows at buildout of the Proposed Project.

Recycled Water

The Development Program includes a program to use recycled water treated to tertiary levels to irrigate open space areas, the urban farm, roadside plantings, public open spaces, and landscape water features, and for appropriate plumbing fixtures within commercial buildings. The Development Program would provide a developable pad for an on-island recycled water plant (part of the proposed wastewater treatment facility), sized to meet the long-term demand. The facility would be implemented by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. New distribution piping for recycled water would be provided only on Treasure Island.

Stormwater

The existing stormwater collection system would be replaced with new gravity lines, lift stations, pump stations, and outfalls to the Bay. Stormwater volumes of 0.2-inch per hour (“treatment flows”) would be directed to the treatment facilities around the development prior to discharge to the Bay. Proposed treatment facilities may include bioswales, bio-retention areas, flow-through planters, mechanical filters and wetland areas. Flows larger than the treatment flows, up to the 5-year storm event, would flow in the pipes, bypassing the treatment devices, and flow directly to the Bay. Flows larger than 5-year storm events would flow overland through the proposed street system and drain to the Bay through proposed consolidated outfall structures.

Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications

Electricity supply for the Proposed Project would be provided through existing dual submarine cables from the Port of Oakland shoreline and replacement electrical lines on land in Oakland. New electrical substations would be constructed on the Islands. Natural gas would be supplied to the Islands through an existing Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) submarine pipeline. The telecommunication system on the Islands would be replaced as part of the Development Program. An underground distribution system in a proposed joint trench would accommodate the electric, natural gas, and telecommunications lines. The proposed Infrastructure Plan includes a renewable energy component, involving solar power and small vertical axis wind turbines. The
developed portions of the Redevelopment Plan Area would provide space that would allow installation of enough renewable energy generating capacity to meet, at a minimum, approximately five percent of estimated peak demand. The Proposed Project may also involve third party investors and power providers, through power purchase agreements, in the implementation of renewable energy systems that would produce significantly more than five percent of estimated peak demand.

Central Plant

As a means of increasing overall energy efficiency and improving sustainability, the proposed Infrastructure Plan includes a new central plant using Bay water. The proposed central plant would provide heating and cooling for certain buildings located at the “Urban Core” area. A distribution-piping loop would be buried under the street, and the new buildings would tie into the main piping.

Geotechnical Stabilization

The proposed geotechnical stabilization is intended to improve seismic safety on the Islands and to meet all applicable building and seismic safety standards. The proposed geotechnical stabilization is expected to include the following major components:

- Stabilization of the Viaduct structure and Causeway connecting Treasure Island, Yerba Buena Island, and the Bay Bridge;
- Shoreline stabilization of the Treasure Island perimeter, involving a combination of various techniques and the raising of the existing perimeter berm;
- Ground improvements to the interior of Treasure Island to stabilize utilities, access, and building foundations;
- Building foundations, which would include a range of techniques from mat foundations to pile foundations; and
- Necessary perimeter and building designs to address potential flooding and sea level rise.

Proposed Sustainability Plan

A major component of the Proposed Project is the Sustainability Plan. The Sustainability Plan documents the guiding principles for the Development Program and identifies implementation measures to be undertaken by TICD and other stakeholders. Many of these measures are integral to the Development Program, and are intended to facilitate progressively higher levels of sustainability over time. These include the proposed residential densities, proximity to transit facilities, orientation of streets and buildings, and green building specifications which would be incorporated into the Proposed Project’s Design for Development guidelines and conditions of approval. In addition the Development Program would include strategies intended to achieve Gold certification under the forthcoming Neighborhood Development program of the U.S. Green Building Council’s Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED-ND) rating system.
Because new technologies and higher performance standards would likely emerge during the phased build-out of the Development Program and beyond, the Sustainability Plan also describes goals, strategies, and targets that could be achieved through collaboration between TIDA, TICD, other government agencies, utility providers, and various organizations. These include a comprehensive transportation demand management program, including the establishment of an on-island transportation coordination office; provision of infrastructure to maximize the on-site production of renewable energy as technologies and delivery mechanisms become available; and a parks and open space program to create, restore and maintain habitat and landscape areas, and other features that would reduce potable water usage. The proposed transportation strategies, including transit-oriented development, parking capacity controls, congestion pricing, ramp metering, and other transportation demand management measures, are intended to achieve greater sustainability through reduced automobile use.

**PROJECT PHASING AND CONSTRUCTION**

Construction and buildout of the Development Program would be phased and would be anticipated to occur over an approximate 10-year period. Assuming that construction would begin in approximately 2009, the last building constructed would be ready for occupancy in about 2018. However, the actual timing of construction would depend on market conditions and other factors.

The Development Program is expected to involve four major phases. The first phase would include the installation of the infrastructure backbone and geotechnical stabilization; the subsequent phases would include the extension of infrastructure and development of the residential, commercial, open space/recreational, historic, and institutional and public uses. To ensure that existing households have the opportunity to benefit from the proposed redevelopment, the Proposed Project would include a transition housing program for all residents of the Islands at the time of project approval who continuously remain Island residents during the project development.

**REQUIRED APPROVALS**

Certification of the Final EIR (Planning Commission and TIDA as joint lead agencies, appealable to Board of Supervisors) would be required before any other approvals or permits would be issued. Ultimately, TIDA and the San Francisco Planning Commission would consider an action recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the Redevelopment Plan, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors would consider approval of the Plan. The Redevelopment Plan would define the boundaries of the Redevelopment Plan Area and set forth land use guidelines such as the basic land use designations and allowable land uses, and maximum development and heights. In addition, the Redevelopment Plan would authorize TIDA to adopt a Design for Development, which would establish specific land use controls, development standards and design guidelines. The Disposition and Development Agreement would include a Design Review.
and Document Approval Procedure, which would set forth the approval processes and standards for development. All City departments having jurisdiction over part or all of the Project site would also approve and enter into an Interagency Cooperation Agreement that would set forth the procedures and standards for permit review.

As described on page 3 above, the Islands include areas subject to the Tidelands Trust, which generally prohibits residential, general office, non-maritime industrial and certain recreational uses. Under the exchange authorized by the California State Legislature, the Trust would be lifted from the portions of Treasure Island that are planned for residential and other non-Trust uses and imposed on portions of Yerba Buena Island that currently are not subject to the Trust.

The required approvals for the Proposed Project include (but are not limited to) the following.

- **Planning Code** Section 101.1 (Priority Policies) findings for the **Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan** (Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors);
- Actions on Planning Code, Zoning Map and General Plan amendments (Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors);
- Approval of Disposition and Development Agreement and related transactional documents (TIDA, Board of Supervisors);
- Recommendation by TIDA to adopt Redevelopment Plan (TIDA);
- Filing of report and recommendation for approval of Redevelopment Plan to the Board of Supervisors by the Planning Commission (waived if no action within 30 days after receipt of Redevelopment Plan);
- Adoption of Redevelopment Plan by Board of Supervisors;
- Adoption of Design for Development Guidelines (TIDA, subject to final adoption of Redevelopment Plan by Board of Supervisors);
- Adoption of Owner Participation Rules (TIDA);
- Interagency Cooperation Agreements (San Francisco Planning Commission, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, SFMTA, SFPUC, SFFD, SFPD, SFDPW, Department of Building Inspection);
- Approval of subdivision maps (SFDPW, Board of Supervisors);
- Approval of Public Trust Exchange Agreement (TIDA, Board of Supervisors, State Lands Commission);
- Permit for fill and dredging in San Francisco Bay and improvements within the 100-foot shoreline band (San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission);
- Section 404 permit (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, after agency consultation);
- Water quality certification, NPDES permit, and waste discharge requirements (Regional Water Quality Control Board);
- Approval of new service connection and water meter in Oakland (EBMUD);
• Creation or designation of a Treasure Island Transportation Management Agency (Board of Supervisors);

• Approval of metering system for Bay Bridge ramps (Caltrans) if located on Caltrans property; and

• Demolition and building permits for individual projects within the Redevelopment Plan Area (Department of Building Inspection).

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The Proposed Project could result in potentially significant environmental effects. The EIR will examine those effects, identify mitigation measures, and analyze whether proposed mitigation measures would reduce any significant environmental effects to a less than significant level as defined by CEQA. The EIR will be a project-level EIR on the Redevelopment Plan and the Development Program.

The EIR will identify and evaluate alternatives to the Proposed Project. It will analyze a No Project alternative, as well as a plan for a less-intensive development program. An alternative that does not include an exchange of Tidelands Trust properties between Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island will also be described and analyzed. Another alternative may be developed and addressed, based on the EIR analyses and the potential for the listed alternatives to reduce or avoid the impacts of the Proposed Project found to be significant, while meeting most of the project objectives.

Because the lead agency has determined that an EIR will clearly be required, an Initial Study will not be prepared (as permitted under the CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(d)). The EIR will address all of the environmental topics contained in the environmental checklist used by the City. Each of those topics is described below in relation to the Proposed Project.

Land Use

The Proposed Project is the adoption of the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan and implementation of the proposed Development Program, consisting of residential, retail, commercial, institutional and recreational facilities and associated infrastructure that would cover portions of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. The Proposed Project would result in changes in the types and intensities of land uses on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. Treasure Island would be converted from a former military base with interim residential, institutional, and industrial land uses to residential, retail, commercial, hotel, institutional, and open space uses. Because the Project site consists of two islands, separated from other communities by over a mile of open water, there would be few conflicts with existing land uses. The EIR will discuss the effects of the Development Program on the remaining uses on the Islands, including the U.S. Coast Guard and Jobs Corps facilities. The substantial changes in land use resulting from the Development Program would be the basis for many of the potential
physical impacts, such as transportation, air quality, noise, and growth inducement, to be analyzed in the EIR. Similarly, the mix of uses proposed under the Redevelopment Plan would be supported by a comprehensive multi-modal transportation system. Accordingly, the relationship of land uses to each other and to existing and potential future transportation facilities will be an important issue for analysis in the EIR. The EIR will also describe (for informational purposes) the military activities formerly conducted and any military services now offered on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island.

Visual Quality and Urban Design

The Islands are visible from many viewpoints in San Francisco, the East Bay, and Marin County. The Development Program would involve the demolition of approximately 1,000 residential units in low-rise buildings and approximately 100 existing non-residential buildings and the construction of low-rise, mid-rise, and high-rise buildings largely concentrated on the southwest corner of Treasure Island. Changes in the visual environment could occur from the development of taller and larger buildings than are now present, from removal of existing buildings, from changes in architectural character, from changes in landscaping, and from the creation of new sources of light or glare. The EIR will describe urban design features of existing structures, visual character, important visual features, and views from public areas on Treasure Island and from representative viewpoints around the Bay. The analysis will address changes in visual quality arising from the Development Program with respect to scenic views, scenic resources, visual character, and light and glare. Photomontages or other simulations will be used to illustrate the potential visual impacts of the Development Program.

Employment, Population and Housing

The Proposed Project could contribute to the growth and concentration of City and regional population. The Plan would result in a substantial increase in the number of residential units on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island (up to approximately 6,000 units) compared to existing conditions (about 1,000 existing units, about 80 percent currently occupiable), and therefore a sizable increase in the population on the Islands. The EIR will describe existing conditions related to employment, population, housing, and business activity, and estimate the changes the Development Program would create. It will compare the existing numbers of employees, residents, and visitors to the projected changes that would result with implementation of the Redevelopment Plan. The net new housing demand from employees of businesses that could locate on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island will be estimated. Demographic data describing population and households, and information regarding the relationship between jobs and housing in San Francisco and Oakland will be discussed. The EIR will examine whether the Proposed Project would have an effect on citywide job generation or housing demand. In addition, the EIR will discuss proposed housing production and transition plans to limit displacement of existing Island residents.
Archaeological Resources

Previous cultural resources investigations indicate a high likelihood for the presence of archaeological resources. Where development would encounter soils that have not previously been disturbed, there is the potential to disturb archaeological resources. The EIR will describe the prehistoric/historic context of Yerba Buena Island, identify the archaeological resources that may be present, assess potential effects of the Development Program on archaeological resources that may occur, and identify the appropriate mitigation for preservation of archaeological materials when/if encountered.

Historic Architectural Resources

The historic architectural resources on Yerba Buena Island and Treasure Island have been comprehensively studied as part of the property transfer planning process with the U.S. Navy. Treasure Island was designated as State Historic Landmark No. 987 in 1989. Three buildings on Treasure Island and five structures plus one group of buildings on Yerba Buena Island have been found to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. All of these historic architectural resources would be retained and reused under the proposed Redevelopment Plan in a manner consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Rehabilitation; thus, identification and evaluation of impacts related to the removal of these resources is not required. The EIR will evaluate the impacts from the proposed renovation and adaptive re-use of historic structures on the Islands, and will discuss the impacts of the proposed new buildings on the existing historic buildings and context. The EIR will also evaluate buildings that have reached or exceeded 50 years of age since the Navy’s evaluation occurred in 1997; identify those potentially eligible for the California Register of Historical Places or the National Register of Historic Places, if any; and explain why others were determined no to be eligible. For any identified as eligible, impacts of the Development Program on them will be described.

Transportation

Implementation of the Development Program, including demolition of existing uses and construction of the proposed residences and other uses, would result in changes in traffic volumes and traffic patterns. Since the development is proposed to be transit-oriented, ridership on existing public transit, provided by Muni, would increase, and new transit facilities and service, including the proposed new ferry service, bus service to the East Bay, and intra-island shuttle service would be provided. The primary vehicular access to the Redevelopment Plan Area would be via the Bay Bridge. The development and occupancy of new buildings would therefore affect traffic on the Bridge.

In a transportation report for the Proposed Project, the travel demand will be estimated by using population, square footage, and other relevant information. The EIR transportation analysis will follow the Planning Department’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental
Traffic impacts will be analyzed for the AM and PM peak periods. Traffic impacts will be analyzed in relation to existing conditions and in a future context that accounts for cumulative growth in volume of traffic on the Bay Bridge. The traffic analysis will assume that ramps leading to/from the Bay Bridge remain in their current configuration; the analysis of cumulative transportation impacts will consider conditions with the improved ramps that are currently under consideration by Caltrans and the City and without those ramp improvements.

The transportation report will also address impacts on transit and will describe parking and future pedestrian and bicycle conditions. The report will include a quantitative assessment of the project-related impacts to Muni Route 108, which serves Treasure Island, and will include an analysis of pedestrian and bicycle conditions within the area affected by the Development Program, as well as during the AM and PM peak periods in the vicinity of the San Francisco Ferry Building. The transportation report will examine the on-site parking supply, including the number and location of parking spaces. The parking demand and parking surplus/shortfall and potential secondary impacts of parking conditions will be identified. The analysis will take into account the new ferry service and expanded bus service identified in the Treasure Island Transportation Plan as well as proposed TDM measures.

The EIR will summarize the information and conclusions in the transportation report and will identify mitigation for any significant impacts.

**Noise**

Sensitive receptors on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, such as residences, schools, and wildlife, will be identified. The number of sensitive receptors would increase substantially with the proposed increase in the number of residential units. The EIR will analyze the existing sources and levels of noise on the Project site. Site reconnaissance, short-term noise measurements, and standard references will be used to quantify the existing noise environment. The EIR will discuss construction noise impacts on sensitive receptors. The EIR will also consider impacts from increased vehicle traffic and new stationary noise sources, such as building ventilation equipment. The noise analysis will also consider noise from emergency vehicles and from re-designed freeway ramps if the SFCTA/Caltrans Project Study Report findings are available.

**Air Quality**

The Development Program would result in changes in traffic volumes and traffic patterns. Increased traffic could generate additional air pollutant emissions on a regional scale. Increased traffic could lead to local “hot spots” with higher concentrations of carbon monoxide.
Construction activities associated with development, including demolition and ground disturbance could increase concentrations of particulate matter. The proposed new uses of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island could increase emissions from stationary sources such as boilers and emergency generators.

The EIR will describe existing air quality at the Project site and will discuss existing compatibility with regional air quality plans. In accordance with Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines, the EIR will evaluate construction-period and operational emissions of criteria air pollutants. The EIR will estimate operational emissions based on Development Program-related changes in motor vehicle traffic and the introduction of new stationary sources. These emissions will be compared to BAAQMD significance thresholds for regional impacts. Although at this time neither the BAAQMD or any other agency has adopted significance criteria for a project’s estimated contribution of greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs), the EIR will discuss emissions of greenhouse gases from construction and operation of the Development Program. The EIR will also discuss proposed features of the Proposed Project that would help reduce GHG emissions.

**Wind**

Treasure Island’s location in the center of San Francisco Bay exposes it to a unique microclimate due to a lack of natural windbreaks. The low-lying, relatively flat island experiences strong winds coming from the west through the Golden Gate. The Development Program includes proposals for a number of devices to offer wind protection, including angling the street grid and developing a system of planted windrows. The EIR will discuss pedestrian-level wind hazards that could result from the Proposed Project. Many of the proposed structures in the Development Program are low-rise and it is typically not necessary to consider the wind effects of such development. The EIR will identify performance standards appropriate for mid- and high-rise buildings.

**Shadow**

The Development Program would add a number of new buildings, some of substantial height. In order to consider the overall effects of the development, including the proposed windrows, modeling and analysis of shadowing will be performed. The EIR will examine the occurrence of shadows on recreational and other outdoor spaces.

**Community Services and Utilities**

The Development Program would involve replacement or repair of the Islands’ existing facilities for water supply, wastewater collection and treatment, stormwater collection and treatment, power, and communications, and addition of a recycled water system. Wastewater and stormwater treatment would be managed in on-site facilities. Water would continue to be
delivered from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission system with a backup supply from the East Bay Municipal Utilities District. Natural gas would continue to be delivered from the PG&E system. Some electricity could be generated on site, with the remainder provided via two existing submarine cables. Communications would be provided by off-site service providers.

These infrastructure improvements would be put into place while some of the current population is in residence and it would be necessary to continue to provide services without interruption during the upgrading and installation of new facilities. Potential impacts to existing residents will be discussed.

The Development Program would also include facilities for police, fire/emergency medical services, schools, and parks and recreation. The EIR will assess what additional services and facilities are needed to serve the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island populations and analyze the impacts of providing these services and facilities. The EIR will also discuss emergency access to the Islands and potential issues related to emergency evacuation, as part of the analysis of police and fire services.

**Biology**

Treasure Island is a man-made island with a long history of intensive military use. Nevertheless, Treasure Island—and Yerba Buena Island, which is a natural island and heavily vegetated—have become habitat for wildlife such as shorebirds, bats, and marine species. The California Natural Diversity Database reports that several species listed under the California and/or federal endangered species acts, or otherwise considered as having “special status” under CEQA, are present at one or more locations in the Oakland East USGS quadrangle. Eelgrass beds, an important nursery area for many marine species, are present in the shallow waters near Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. The Islands’ physical location in the center of San Francisco Bay puts them in proximity to spawning herring, migratory anadromous fish, marine mammals, and migratory waterfowl. The EIR will describe the existing terrestrial and marine biota living on and in the vicinity of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. The EIR will evaluate the impacts of proposed development on plants, animals, and natural communities on the Islands. In addition, the EIR will evaluate the impact of shoreline stabilization and increasing the height of the Treasure Island perimeter berm, construction of the ferry terminal, and pile driving on marine species. The EIR will also evaluate the impact of the installation of storm water treatment wetlands on wildlife including migratory birds.

**Geology/Topography**

The San Francisco Bay Area is located within one of the most seismically active regions of the United States. Significant earthquakes have occurred in the Bay Area. Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island are located roughly halfway between two notable faults—the San Andreas and Hayward Fault zones. The Project site has a high risk of being subjected to another moderate to
severe earthquake, involving significant ground shaking that could cause foundation and structural damage to buildings and secondary ground failure. Potential seismic-related hazards include liquefaction, earthquake-induced settlement, tsunami, and lateral spreading. The Development Program includes proposed geotechnical stabilization strategies, including stabilization of the viaduct and causeway, seismic reinforcement of the perimeter berm forming Treasure Island, stabilization of utilities, and use of appropriate building foundations.

Because the engineering standards for placement of fill were not as stringent in 1936-1939 as they are today, Treasure Island is underlain by poorly engineered (by today’s standards) artificial fill that varies in depth and thickness. Beneath the fill are varying thicknesses of compressible Bay Muds. Because of the age of the fill, settlement has already occurred. Placement of new loads, however, could begin a new cycle of settlement. Proposed construction would proceed on the basis of site-specific geotechnical studies and geotechnical and structural engineering standards.

The EIR will describe the geologic, seismic and soils hazards of the Redevelopment Plan Area and analyze impacts of the Development Program. The evaluation will address whether implementation of the Redevelopment Plan would result in significant risk to the people or structures on site. Project-specific geotechnical information and recommendations will be provided.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

The Development Program would create the potential for water quality impacts during and after construction. Seismic reinforcement of the perimeter berm and dredging of the ferry terminal may temporarily increase the release of particulates and contaminants from bottom sediments. The Development Program would result in an increase in pervious surfaces compared to existing conditions, and would thus reduce stormwater runoff flows. In addition, the Development Program would replace the existing storm drain system, which does not meet current standards and may be contributing to the release of pollutants from on-site contamination sources. The Redevelopment Plan proposes to treat most stormwater flows on site using methods such as bio-swales, bio-retention areas, flow-through planters, mechanical filters and wetland areas.

Treasure Island is protected by a perimeter berm that surrounds the island. The perimeter berm is currently considered adequate protection from wind-generated and wake-generated waves. However, sea level changes over time could reduce the ability of the perimeter berm to protect the island. The Development Program includes raising the perimeter berm and site grades in developed areas to provide adequate drainage and future protection against waves, tides, and storm-induced flooding.

The residential, retail, and commercial land uses that are proposed would substantially increase the volume of wastewater generated. This wastewater would be treated on site by the existing
and new wastewater treatment plant. In addition, the existing wastewater collection system would be completely replaced.

The EIR will identify the potential change in wastewater and storm water flows and quality. Proposed measures and their effectiveness for reducing storm water quality impacts will be evaluated. The EIR will also evaluate potential flooding hazards, including those exacerbated by potential climate change-induced sea level rise.

**Hazards**

There are several hazardous waste sites, created during the Navy’s use of Treasure Island, within the Redevelopment Plan Area. Some sites have already been remediated; others are still under investigation or currently undergoing remediation by the Navy. Depending on the prior use of the site, the contaminants that may be present include petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), poly-aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), dioxins, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), lead, and asbestos. The Development Program and any development alternatives proposed are located within property contained on the lists compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the government Code (commonly referenced as the “Cortese List” of hazardous waste sites.) The Redevelopment Plan Area is located within the area referenced on the Cortese List as Naval Station Treasure Island, County of San Francisco, Site Code No. 201210. The Navy is investigating, evaluating, and remediating contaminated sites on Treasure Island under the Department of Defense Installation Restoration Program (IRP) prior to the transfer of the property to TIDA. The IRP follows the Comprehensive Environmental Restoration Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) process. The goal of the remedial actions is to eliminate the contamination, or if residual contamination is left in place, to limit exposure pathways that may pose a risk to human health and the environment. Under federal regulations, the remediation efforts must reach a level of cleanup that is sufficient to support a “Finding of Suitability to Transfer” or a “Finding of Suitability of Early Transfer” prior to redevelopment. The Development Program includes remediation beyond that which will be required of the Navy as necessary to support the proposed development program.

The Development Program would involve the use, transport and disposal of hazardous materials for maintenance and cleaning of residences and businesses (paints, solvents, adhesives, and pesticides) on the site.

The EIR will summarize the U.S. Navy activities to investigate and remediate hazards, describe additional remediation beyond the activities planned by the Navy that may be necessary to support proposed development and the commitments included as part of the Proposed Project, and identify impacts related to the additional remediation.
Energy

At buildout, the Development Program would result in a substantial increase in building square footage. According to the Treasure Island Sustainability Plan, the new buildings would be built using green building specifications and employ energy conservation measures that may include use of Energy Star heating and cooling equipment, appropriate building orientation, natural ventilation, optimized building shading, high performance glazing, and solar water heating, and would be constructed to accommodate rooftop photovoltaic installations. The Development Program includes proposals to incorporate facilities that would make it feasible to increase the production of renewable energy by making the use of photovoltaic technology possible and installing demonstration-scale wind turbines. The EIR will describe current energy demand and estimate the net change in electricity use and natural gas consumption from the Development Program. The EIR will assess whether anticipated increases in energy use would be large or wasteful.

Consistency with Plans and Policies

This section of the EIR will summarize project consistency with applicable land use plans and policies, including the San Francisco General Plan (“General Plan”) and Priority Policies, the Tidelands Trust, the policies of the San Francisco Bay Plan, and other City policies that are designed to avoid or mitigate environmental effects. The EIR will discuss proposed amendments to the General Plan and Planning Code. The EIR will discuss the key strategies of the Redevelopment Plan in relationship to General Plan policies regarding housing, commercial uses, transportation, and open space and recreational uses, and will discuss the Proposed Project’s Sustainability Plan in relation to the City’s Sustainability Plan. City and regional plans and policies related to energy, air quality, and natural resources will be discussed in their respective technical sections of the EIR.

Cumulative and Growth Inducing Impacts

CEQA requires a discussion of the ways in which a project could induce economic or population growth, directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. The principal way that the Development Program could induce growth is through the construction of up to approximately 6,000 new residential units and the net direct and secondary population growth that the proposed residential development would stimulate. The Development Program would also result in new office, retail, entertainment, and community services uses that could directly and indirectly contribute to economic growth. The EIR will discuss the potential for direct and secondary impacts from population and employment resulting from development on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. The EIR will address the potentially significant cumulative impacts of the Proposed Project when considered with other planned development in San Francisco and the East Bay. This analysis will be done for all environmental topics discussed in the EIR and will specify
which areas are expected to result in significant cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts will be discussed qualitatively, except where quantitative data on other planned development projects are available.

Mitigation Measures

The EIR will identify feasible mitigation measures to reduce or avoid potentially significant impacts identified in the EIR, as well as improvement measures to reduce impacts that are found to be less than significant.
APPENDIX B

LEGAL NOTICE
NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF EIR AND NOTICE OF PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

Notice is hereby given to the general public of the following actions under the Environmental Review Process. Review of the documents concerning these projects can be arranged by calling (415) 755-9025 and asking for the staff person indicated. The initial evaluation conducted by the Planning Department determined that the following project(s) may have significant effects on the environment and that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared. 2007.0903E - Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan. The proposed Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan area includes all of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island (collectively, "the Islands") in San Francisco Bay (Assessor’s Block 1939, Lots 001 and 002). The Islands are the site of the former Naval Station Treasure Island (NSTI), which was owned and operated by the United States Navy until its closure in 1997 as part of the Base Realignment and Closure process. The Navy is in the process of conveying most of these areas, which currently include a variety of residential, institutional, institutional and recreational land uses, to the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA). The Redevelopment Plan includes the following: stabilization of Treasure Island and the causeway connecting it to Yerba Buena Island; up to approximately 6,000 residential units; up to approximately 270,000 square feet of new commercial and retail space; adaptive reuse of the historic Buildings 1, 2, and 3 with up to 325,000 square feet of commercial space; up to approximately 500 hotel rooms; new and/or upgraded public services and utilities; approximately 300 acres of public open space; bicycle, transit, and pedestrian facilities, and; an intermodal ferry quay/transit hub. (COO-PER) Notice is hereby given to the general public as follows: The Planning Department will hold two PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS on the EIR, the first on Monday, February 11, 2008, at the Bayside Conference Room, Port of San Francisco, Pier 1, The Embarcadero, San Francisco, CA 94111 from 6:00 to 8:00pm, and the second on Wednesday, February 13, 2008, at the Ship Shape Building, Building 497, Avenue M and 11th Avenue, Treasure Island, San Francisco, CA 94130 from 6:00 to 8:00pm. Written comments will also be accepted until the close of business on February 26, 2008, and should be sent to Bill Wycko, Acting Environmental Review Officer, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103. The NOP/Notice of Public Scoping Meetings will be available on-line at www.sfgov.org/site/planning.
The Alameda Times-Star

I am a citizen of the United States; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above-entitled matter. I am the Legal Advertising Clerk of the printer and publisher of The Alameda Times-Star, a newspaper published in the English language in the City of Alameda, County of Alameda, State of California.

I declare that The Alameda Times-Star is a newspaper of general circulation as defined by the laws of the State of California as determined by this court's order, dated September 17, 1951, in the action entitled In the Matter of the Ascertainment and Establishment of the Standing of The Alameda Times-Star as a Newspaper of General Circulation, Case Number 236092. Said order states that "The Alameda Times-Star is a newspaper of general circulation within the City of Alameda, and the County of Alameda, and the State of California, within the meaning and intent of Chapter 7, Title 1 [§§ 6000 et seq.] of the Government Code of the State of California. "Said order has not been revoked, vacated or set aside.

I declare that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

1/26/2008

I certify (or declare) under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Public Notice Advertising Clerk
PROOF OF PUBLICATION

FILE NO. TI-YBI 2007.0903E

In the matter of

PUBLIC NOTICE

The Oakland Tribune

I am a citizen of the United States; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above-entitled matter. I am the Legal Advertising Clerk of the printer and publisher of The Oakland Tribune, a newspaper published in the English language in the City of Oakland, County of Alameda, State of California.

I declare that The Oakland Tribune is a newspaper of general circulation as defined by the laws of the State of California as determined by this court's order, dated December 6, 1951, in the action entitled in the Matter of the Ascertainment and Establishment of the Standing of The Oakland Tribune as a Newspaper of General Circulation, Case Number 237798. Said order states that "The Oakland Tribune is a newspaper of general circulation within the City of Oakland, and the County of Alameda, and the State of California, within the meaning and intent of Chapter 1, Division 7, Title 1 [§§ 6000 et seq.], of the Government Code of the State of California." Said order has not been revoked, vacated, or set aside.

I declare that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

1/26/2008

I certify (or declare) under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Public Notice Advertising Clerk
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SCOPING MEETING MATERIALS
## PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
**TREASURE ISLAND/YERBA BUENA ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN EIR**
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KEY POINT(S) TO BE DISCUSSED (BRIEFLY DESCRIBE IN ONE SENTENCE OR LESS)
APPENDIX D

SCOPING COMMENT LETTERS
Mr. Bill Wycko  
Acting Environmental Review Officer  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA  94103-2479

Subject: Case No. 2007.0903E—Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan  
Notice of Preparation of EIR

Dear Mr. Wycko:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these (late) comments regarding the above-referenced project. The Bay Trail Project is a nonprofit organization administered by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) that plans, promotes and advocates for the implementation of a continuous 500-mile bicycling and hiking path around San Francisco Bay. When complete, the trail will pass through 47 cities, all nine Bay Area counties, and cross seven toll bridges. To date, slightly more than half the length of the Bay Trail alignment has been developed.

For the past 3+ years, the Bay Trail Project has been coordinating with the Mayor’s Office of Redevelopment and Kenwood Investments regarding the potential for the planned multi-use trail around the perimeter of Treasure Island and the network of trails on Yerba Buena Island to be incorporated into the regional Bay Trail system upon completion. All parties are in agreement that the new trail around the island would be a spectacular addition to the Bay Trail system.

In the DEIR, please discuss ABAG’s Bay Trail Plan and its policies as they relate to the proposed trails on Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands. While plans for the perimeter path around Treasure Island are relatively clear, connections from the new east span of the San Francisco/Oakland Bay Bridge are less so. Please provide detailed descriptions and drawings regarding how connections will be made from the new bridge onto and off of both islands for bicyclists and pedestrians. It will be important to remember that in the absence of a pathway on the west span of the bridge connecting the islands to San Francisco, cyclists and pedestrians coming to the Islands will be largely recreational users as opposed to commuters. Tourists, families with children, wheelchair users and skaters are likely to be the prime user group until such time as the west span path is built. As such, please give careful consideration to the width and slope of the pathways leading from the bridge to the respective Islands.

We look forward to working with the Mayor’s Office, the Treasure Island Redevelopment Authority, and the developer to ensure a world-class Bay Trail on and around Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (510) 464-7909, or by e-mail at maureeng@abag.ca.gov if you have any questions regarding the Bay Trail.

Sincerely,

Maureen Gaffney  
Bay Trail Planner
February 26, 2008
Mr. Bill Wycko
Acting Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission St, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

By Fax: 415 558 6409
By e-mail: bill.wycko@sfgov.org
          rick.cooper@sfgov.org

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON NOTICE OF PREPARATION
2007.0903E – Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan

Dear Mr. Wycko:

Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation for this ambitious Project. We appreciate that you have arranged for two scoping meetings and have in addition discussed environmental review of the Project with the Citizens Advisory Board.

As you may know, Arc Ecology has actively participated in the planning process for the reuse and redevelopment of Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands (TI). We have supported efforts by the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) and Treasure Island Community Development (TICD) to create a project that exemplifies environmental sustainability by responding creatively to both the requirements and opportunities that this challenging site presents. Environmental sustainability is a necessity in part because TI depends for land access on the bridge that is a main source of traffic congestion extending for 7-8 mile along the regional highway system and beyond to feeder streets in San Francisco and Oakland. TI also presents unique opportunities for sustainable development because the site is publicly owned land (much of it in the Public Trust) and will be almost completely rebuilt at a time, and in a political setting, where environmental values are high priority.

As active participants in TI planning, we have observed the many ways that environmental sensibilities have informed design of the Proposed Project. We look forward to an EIR that tests and improves upon environmentally sensitive features of the Project. In particular, we want to ensure that the many innovative programmatic responses to TI challenges will operate over the life of the Project as its sponsors hope.

1 OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT’S ISLAND CONTEXT

Before providing page by page comments on the NOP text, we would like to address important environmental implications of TI’s special geographic context. The location of this Project on a very small island with land access that depends on the Bay Bridge presents unusual considerations that must inform its environmental review:

- Traffic impacts are not proportional to Project size;
• Adequate funding of the Development Plan and Term Sheet\textsuperscript{1}, including exhibits must be ensured to reach the outcomes projected over the life of the Proposed Project;
• Traffic impacts do not diminish over distance from the Project.

These issues will be addressed specifically in the discussion of relevant impacts, but a short discussion of the general implications follows.

1.1 Traffic impacts are not proportional to Project size.
Since the version of TI redevelopment described in the 2004 EIR, we have witnessed the evolution of a project that has grown substantially in order to become financially feasible; in the process its potential to be a model of environmental sustainability has grown. The 6,000 housing units currently proposed would utilize less acreage than the 3,800 previously proposed. The number and density of the additional units can enable residents to meet their needs for many goods and services without leaving the island. Most importantly, a densely populated neighborhood can support frequent, convenient, and inexpensive transit service that fosters accessibility independent of the private automobile.

The same logic dictates that reducing development intensity would not necessarily mitigate environmental impacts. Nor would a less intensively developed project be a suitable EIR alternative, which must feasibly achieve Project objectives with reduced environmental impacts.\textsuperscript{2} For example, moderate reductions in Project size would probably create a project below thresholds needed to support neighborhood retail services, public services, and public transportation, potentially increasing rather than decreasing off-island (primarily auto) trips. An alternative small enough to significantly reduce less off-island traffic would be financially infeasible due to the high fixed infrastructure costs at Treasure Island. A project limited to existing units at Treasure Island and a few hundred residential units at Yerba Buena Island would abandon Project objectives “to provide extensive public benefits to the City such as significant amounts of new affordable housing, increased public access and open space, transportation improvements and recreational and entertainment opportunities, while creating jobs and a vibrant, sustainable community.”\textsuperscript{3}

The need for threshold population levels to support transit and other services also suggests that failure to achieve full buildout could generate unanticipated environmental impacts. EIRs typically treat the “project” as an envelope of impacts, such that partial implementation, like a smaller project, is assumed to generate less impact. The TI Project description appears to share this assumption since it states that the Project will have “up to 3800 units,” even though the impacts of a smaller project might be greater.

\textsuperscript{1} TICD, LLC. \textit{Treasure Island Development Plan and Term Sheet}, September 2006, as adopted by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, file number 06498 12/12/06
\textsuperscript{2} PRCS 21002. Approval of projects; feasible alternative or mitigation measures. The Legislature finds and declares that it is the policy of the state that public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects, and that the procedures required by this division are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects.
\textsuperscript{3} TICD \textit{op cit} page 7
Partial implementation would also be problematic since the Proposed Project is intended to be self-mitigating. Partial implementation of the sustainability plan, the transportation plan, or the infrastructure plan, for examples, would unleash a wide spectrum of environmental impacts that full realization of those plans would be more likely to avoid.

1.2 Adequate funding of the Development Plan and Term Sheet including exhibits must be ensured to reach the outcomes projected over the life of the Proposed Project;

The Proposed Project includes a rich array of services (e.g., transit, public safety, schools, shopping) intended to support a pedestrian- and transit-oriented community life style intended to reduce traffic that the Project would otherwise generate. However, the never-ending expense of operating these services at the levels required by a small island community will be higher than elsewhere in the city. TI’s small size (even as enlarged) and geographic isolation imposes diseconomies of scale and precludes sharing service areas with other neighborhoods for the provision of public safety, schools, health, library and other public services, as well as limiting the variety of neighborhood commercial enterprises. The ferry slip cut into the Treasure Island landfill will require periodic dredging and disposal of the spoils. The Project’s lack of dedicated sources of funding to fully cover such operating expenses and its reliance on public and private agencies that are beyond the City’s control foreshadows ongoing risk of funding shortfalls, with the threat that projected levels of service will not be sustained over the life of the Project.

1.3 Traffic impacts do not dissipate over distance.

Although traffic congestion resulting may occur on the TI site itself (particularly backup at bridge on-ramps) and the bridge, more serious disruptions will occur on the regional highway system (US 101 and I-80, 580, and 880), on and off-ramps, and the city streets that in effect function together to meter traffic on the bridge itself. Under most traffic conditions, traffic on the bridge itself ordinarily flows freely where there are no merging lanes. Currently traffic merging onto the bridge from TI does not usually interrupt the free flow since the short merging lane regulates the volume of traffic joining traffic on the bridge. However even when traffic during the p.m. peak is flowing, there are typically backups five to ten miles to the south and the east.

Therefore the EIR must analyze a region of impact (ROI) for the Project’s traffic effects that captures the far flung effects of adding Project traffic volumes, both the metered traffic adding to the a.m. peak and unmetered traffic to the p.m. peak.

2 PAGE-BY-PAGE REVIEW AND COMMENTS OF THE NOP

The comments that follow trace the general issues above as they inform specific potential impacts, mitigations, and alternative projects.

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 “The EIR will be a project-level EIR on the Redevelopment Plan and the Development Program” [page 1]

Given the wide scope of this Project, the long build-out period, possibilities for incorporating portions of the Job Corps site into the Project, explorations currently under way for ramp redesign, and market and other uncertainties, a Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) would

---

4 CEQA Guidelines: PRC §15175 - §15179.5
be more appropriate than a project level document. The current intention to prepare an independent EIR for bridge ramp improvements once agreement is reached on their configuration segments what is essentially a single project since there would be no compelling reason to rebuild the ramps absent redevelopment of TI. Substantial changes to the ramps will create changes to this Project’s environmental impacts even absent pursuit of modifications of and additions to the Proposed Project. The MEIR provides a streamlined way to track these interdependent changes but provides the City and developer with flexibility.

2.1.2 “An Initial Study will not be prepared as part of the environmental review process for the Proposed Project, instead all topics will be addressed in the EIR.”

At a meeting of the TI Citizens Advisory Board, I requested that the NOP include an Initial Study, not because it was required but because it would provide early information about the Project’s sponsors’ thinking about environmental issues. Although we appreciate the discussion of potential impacts included in this NOP, it lacks the comprehensiveness of an Initial Study; in particular it lacks a summary of mitigations that San Francisco requires an Initial Study to include. In addition the specific question posed by the Initial Study Checklist is a very useful tool to prevent inadvertently overlooking potential impacts.

2.2 Project Location – Access and Transit

2.2.1 “Improvement and/or replacement of the other ramps is currently under study by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority and the California Department of Transportation (‘Calftrans’); improvement or replacement of these ramps, if undertaken, would be a separate project from both the Bay Bridge eastern span currently under construction and the Proposed Project. Impact analysis in the EIR on the Proposed Project will take into account conditions resulting from both the existing ramps and the potential improved or replaced ramps.”

As mentioned above, future ramp improvements could be a critical feature of the final design of the Proposed Project, since the outcome of current negotiations could lead to major modifications. A MEIR would avoid segmenting environmental analysis of these strongly linked approvals while still providing flexibility in dealing with the present level of uncertainty

2.3 Project Description – Conceptual Land Use Plan

2.3.1 “The Proposed Project includes...up to approximately 6,000 residential units...up to approximately 270,000 square feet (sq ft.) of new commercial and retail space;”

This appears to reflect the invalid assumption that a smaller project will have less impact on the environment. “The Redevelopment Plan includes exhibits that address project design concepts (Exhibit E), transportation (Exhibits J and L), infrastructure (Exhibit I), community services (Exhibit Q), affordable housing (Exhibits L and O), jobs (Exhibit M), sustainability (Exhibit K), and other aspect of the development.” These studies, plus the Financing Plan and Transaction Structure (Exhibit R) and the Fiscal Impacts Analysis (Exhibit S) are based on the

---

5 “Mitigation measures and improvement measures identified in the discussion for the applicable topic areas will be summarized here.” [Page 13, “San Francisco Initial Study Form, Annotated Final Version” (July 26, 2006)]
6 San Francisco Planning Department, NOP cover sheet, January 26, 2008
assumption that the full 3800 units would be developed. It is not clear whether these plans could be implemented at an equivalent level for a smaller plan. Concerns that the developer may want to reduce the size of the Project are highlighted by the current crisis and long term uncertainties of the real estate market.

2.3.2 “The Proposed Project includes bicycle, transit, and pedestrian facilities; and An Intermodal Ferry Quay/Transit Hub.”

This description, plus the description on page 9 of the Transportation Plan’s encouragement of transit suggests that the Project does not include the levels of transit service that are included in the Transportation Plan. Which features of the Development Plan are included and which are excluded from the Proposed Project?

Failure of the project to commit to providing transit services at least at the level projected in the Transportation Plan raises concerns about the relevance of the trip analysis in the Transportation Plan. The EIR must base its independent trip analysis on levels of transit service that the City can rely upon the Redevelopment Plan to deliver.

2.3.3 “Approximately 50 percent of all housing units would be in low-rise buildings (building height 65 feet and lower)”

In specifying a maximum, this characterization of the height of half the housing units assumes that a shorter building will have less impact than a taller one. Like the assumption that less development equals less impact, categorizing multi-family housing in six-storey buildings (with off-site parking) together with single family housing that will be furthest from the transit hub obscures the greater traffic impact of the single family units. The EIR needs to make a clear distinction between multi-family units with shared parking and single family units with attached or specifically designated parking in order to capture the much higher rates of automobile trips by residents in the latter.

2.3.4 “Approximately thirty percent of all units would be affordably priced at a range of below-market rates, including an expansion from 250 to 435 residential units for the existing Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative (TIHDI) program.”

The plans presented to the public have consistently spoken of 30% affordable housing as a minimum. There are traffic implications to the mix of affordable and market rate units since car ownership rates – hence trip rates – are lower for the affordable units

2.3.5 “The recreational and open space uses would include … a stormwater treatment wetland…”

We are pleased that the stormwater treatment wetland is now included in the Redevelopment Project Area Plan.
2.3.6 “The Development Program would provide space for...community programs... [and] child care. The existing, closed public grammar school on Treasure Island would be improved and reopened for use by the San Francisco Unified School District.”

Ensuring that an improved school and space for community programs will be available is a necessary first step in providing TI with a school and operating programs at TI. However, for a school to materialize, the San Francisco Unified School District will have to reopen a school that they closed along with others as a cost-saving measure. The economic inefficiency of operating an elementary school on an island with 3,800 dwelling units – many of which will not house families with children – raises questions whether there will actually be a school and what grades it will include. The answer to those questions has obvious implications for the projection of off-island automobile trips and car ownership rates.

To some extent, the same questions arise concerning community programs and child care. The variety of community programs that will be available on-island will depend on the prices charged for the space and, in many cases, the availability of public funding. The necessity to travel off the island for services ranging from religious worship to health care to library will generate automobile trips.

The likelihood that a school, child care facility, community programs, and services required by residents will be financially feasible on TI over the long term will depend to some extent on TI population size.

2.4 Project Description – Proposed Transportation Plan

2.4.1 “The roadway system would consist of three levels of public roadways: arterial streets, collector streets, and neighborhood streets.”

Except to link the multi-modal transportation node to the bridge, arterial streets should not be needed since TI is essentially a single neighborhood. The EIR should analyze the proposed street hierarchy at TI to prevent the construction of excess capacity, which would encourage vehicular traffic and reduce pedestrian and bicycle safety.

2.4.2 “All of the proposed residential units on Treasure Island would be within a 15-minute walk of the proposed Intermodal Transit Hub.”

Walking time should be calculated for housing on Yerba Buena Island and measures proposed to ensure safe walking and bicycle connections.

2.4.3 “The Development Program would include the construction of a new ferry quay and terminal...”

Since the new quay will require excavating landfill that created Treasure Island, the spoils will need to be tested for contaminants prior to disposal. In addition the design of the ferry landing will require on-going dredging of the excavated channel branching off of the Bay. The Project needs to ensure that adequate funding will be available on a continuing basis for proper upland disposal of the dredge spoils.
2.4.4  “Proposed funding for ferry vessels would provide the opportunity for an operator to initiate ferry service to the Islands between San Francisco and Treasure Island, and the proposed bus transit facility would provide stops for Muni service to San Francisco and East Bay transit service.”

[Transit Facilities and Service – page 8]

Since the Proposed Project includes only an “opportunity” for ferry service, and bus stops rather than bus service, the modal split used to calculate auto trips must not assume that ferry service will be available or that bus service will be at the levels projected in the Transportation Plan. This statement is confusing since all presentations to the public of this Project have stressed transit linkages.

2.4.5  “Should funding be identified to replace or improve the existing ramps, Caltrans and the City would conduct a separate environment analysis of the selected design(s).”

[Bay Bridge Access – page 9]

As mentioned above, ramp improvements necessitated (and probably paid for in part) by TI redevelopment should be considered part of the Proposed Project and analyzed in a MEIR.

2.4.6  “The Development Program includes the provision of approximately 8,250 parking spaces…”

[Parking – page 9]

Since parking is an important determinant of modal choice, the EIR needs to analyze whether supplying the 8,250 parking spaces negotiated as part of the Term Sheet would exceed parking demand. The EIR must not assume that ITE or San Francisco neighborhood parking standards are relevant since both the need and demand for parking will be reduced by features of the Proposed Project that do not rely on non-City funding and that would reduce rates of car ownership and use by residents, and car travel by employees and visitors:

- **Land use plan** – a high level of on-island trips by residents will be made on foot or by bicycle compared to a typical San Francisco residential neighborhood, and the concentration of employment and visitor attractions at the transit node will reduce the need for parking through Treasure Island;
- **Transportation Demand Management Program** - the shuttle service and bicycle library will further reduce on-island car trips by residents and also visitors;
- **Parking fees** – plans to charge for parking will reduce demand, depending on charges;
- **Shared parking** – allows a smaller supply of parking spaces to serve a given level of demand by means of a higher average occupancy rate;
- **Mandatory transit passes** – depending on the level of pre-paid service, increases the likelihood of transit use for off-island travel;
- **Car share program** – will reduce car ownership, with corresponding reduction in need for parking;

Since parking supply, location, and price are factors that strongly influence modal choice, calculations that assume generous parking ratios (based on occupancy rates lower than 85%, for example), have the potential to generate significant environmental impacts. The demand for parking is elastic, enabling parking management tools for the design of traffic mitigations. (See Attachment 1 for additional references on this subject.)

---

2.4.7 “Automobile use would be discouraged through parking pricing, parking management, and congestion pricing. The mechanisms proposed include implementation of a congestion pricing program. The congestion pricing fees could be set and adjusted to reflect traffic patterns, congestion levels, time of day, and other conditions that affect the roadway system.”

[Encouraging Use of Transit and Discouraging Automobile Use – page 9]

Given the Governor’s unfortunate veto of enabling legislation for the congestion pricing program, alternative mitigations to accomplish these ends should be proposed in the EIR. Features included in the “car independence mobility alternative” (described below) are examples of such measures.

2.5 Project Description – Wastewater

2.5.1 “In addition, a new wastewater treatment facility would be constructed…

[page 10]

The Financing Plan and the Fiscal Analysis in the TI Term Sheet do not provide for funds to construct the wastewater treatment facility. Construction of the Proposed Project must not begin until full funding for the new system is secure, even though replacement of the existing system will be phased in.

2.5.2 “The replacement wastewater treatment facility…would be designed to handle projected wastewater flows at buildout of the Proposed Project.”

[page 10]

Since there is a possibility that the site of the Job Corps may become available in the future, design of wastewater system should anticipate expansion.

3 PROJECT PHASING AND CONSTRUCTION

3.1.1 “However, the actual timing of construction would depend on market conditions and other factors.”

[page 12]

Since the timing of full buildout of the Proposed Project is uncertain, the EIR must analyze the potential for impacts to be generated ahead of mitigations, and to propose measures to ensure that mitigations (including self-mitigating features of the Project) are synchronized to potential impacts.

4 REQUIRED APPROVALS

4.1.1 Additional approval will be necessary to fully implement the Proposed Project. The list of required approvals omits those by public agencies that the Proposed Project relies upon to implement some of its most important features: San Francisco Unified School District, Alameda Contra Costa Transit District, San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority, and the California Legislature and Governor (enabling legislation for congestion management fees). Approvals of an early transfer will require approval by the Governor and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control in addition to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Approval of the TI Redevelopment Plan will need approval from taxing agencies that share San Francisco property tax receipts.
5 POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

5.1 Alternatives

5.1.1 “The EIR will identify and evaluate alternatives to the Proposed Project. It will analyze a No Project alternative, as well as a plan for a less-intensive development program.”

As we have discussed earlier in these comments, unlike the typical project, a “less-intensive development program” cannot be assumed to meet the requirements that an EIR alternative generate less environmental impact.

“Alternatives to the Proposed Project. An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. ...The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives.”

We request a “car independence mobility alternative.” It would include the same or greater intensity of development as the Proposed Project plus additional features to enable most residents, employees, and visitors to forego routine private automobile travel without sacrificing mobility. Features of this alternative would include all of the following:

- Time limits for all on-street parking ranging from 30 minutes to 2 hours;
- Parking fees that fully amortize construction and land costs (including pro-rated infrastructure costs, such as Treasure Island stabilization, based on square footage) and full operating costs, including enforcement;
- Leasing (rather than sale) of all residential off-street parking, with a system prioritizing need based on factors such as disability and employment location;
- Mandatory transit passes for residents, employees, and hotel guests covering the full cost of all bus and ferry travel;
- TIDA contracts with San Francisco and East Bay bus and ferry service providers specifying 24-hour, 7-day service with short daytime headways;
- Community-wide membership in a car share organization;
- Establishment of an island-focused taxi or jitney service;
- Dedicated or queue-jumping access to the bridge for buses, taxis; van pools, emergency vehicles;
- Maximum 15 mph speed limit for all TI roads;
- TDM services that include car pool and van pool match making;
- Purchases delivery;
- Supervised pathways enabling children living on Treasure Island to walk or bicycle to school without crossing major roadways.

---

9 PRC 15126.6 ((a)
5.1.2 “An alternative that does not include an exchange of Tidelands Trust properties between Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island will also be described and analyzed.”

Such an alternative that presumably would limit all new residential and most commercial construction to Yerba Buena Island could avoid the high fixed costs of soil stabilization that make a smaller project infeasible on Treasure Island. However, such an alternative would sacrifice the nine objectives of the Proposed Project that are bulleted on pages 7 and 8 of the Development Plan. Unless such an alternative is being seriously entertained by the City and the developer, it would not contribute insights to a public dialog about ways that environmental impacts of the Proposed Project could be mitigated. If such an alternative is under consideration, there needs to be an extensive public discussion since it is in conflict with all previous concepts.

5.2 Employment, Population and Housing

5.2.1 “The EIR will describe existing conditions related to employment, population, housing, and business activity…"

The baseline for the evaluation of these and all potential impacts by this EIR should be conditions on the date of this NOP (January 26, 2008), and not “the physical conditions which were present at the time that the federal decision for the closure or realignment of the base or reservation became final.”

5.3 Transportation

5.3.1 “In a transportation report for the Proposed Project, the travel demand will be estimated by using population, square footage, and other relevant information.”

As we have discussed earlier in these comments, additional critical variables include features of the Proposed Project that are designed to shift travel mode choices to transit to the extent that implementation of projected services and programs will occur. In the design of mitigations, emphasis should be placed on factors such as parking that affect the competitive attractiveness of transit.

The scoping for the Transportation Report should be available for public review prior to its finalization.

5.3.2 “Traffic impacts will be analyzed for the AM and PM peak periods.”

Daily and weekend traffic impacts should also be analyzed. Since a possible result of the congestion management program would be to shift trips to off-peak hours, it will be important to track the ripple effects and to understand how much roadway capacity is available at other times of the day to absorb the spillover. Bridge-related traffic congestion extends from early morning until late evening on both weekdays and weekends.

---
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5.3.3 "Traffic impacts will be analyzed in relation to existing conditions and in a future context that accounts for cumulative growth in volume of traffic on the Bay Bridge." [page 17]

The concern is not traffic volume on the Bay Bridge; it is congestion on the roads and highways that serve the bridge. The issue is delay rather than volume since a congested typically serves a smaller number of vehicles than one with flowing traffic.

5.3.4 Truck traffic
The EIR needs to analyze truck traffic impacts, including those related to demolition, construction, and on-going deliveries.

5.4 Air Quality
5.4.1 "Increased traffic could lead to local 'hot spots' with higher concentrations of carbon monoxide." [page 17]

As for transportation impacts, the Region of Influence for air quality needs to extend to the full area (both highways and city streets) that will be impacted by additional bridge traffic.

5.5 Community Services and Utilities
5.5.1 "The EIR will also discuss emergency access to the Islands and potential issues related to emergency evacuation, as part of the analysis of police and fire services." [page 19]

Dedicated access to the bridge is needed to ensure that ambulances can get to a hospital quickly when there is a backup due to metering.

5.6 Cumulative Impacts
5.6.1 "The EIR will address the potentially significant cumulative impacts of the Proposed Project when considered with other planned development in San Francisco and the East Bay." [page 22]

The discussion of cumulative traffic impacts must include all projects that will contribute to the congestion of city streets and highway sections that are impacted by bridge traffic.

[Eve Back]
REFERENCES ON PARKING MANAGEMENT AS A FACTOR IN MODAL CHOICE


Hess, Daniel B. (2001), The Effects of Free Parking on Commuter Mode Choice: Evidence from Travel Diary Data, Lewis Center for Public Policy Studies, UCLA


March 4, 2008

Bill Wycko
Acting Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Subject: Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan NOP

Dear Mr. Wycko:

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (District) staff reviewed your agency’s Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan (Project). We understand that the Project would provide the basis for redevelopment from a primarily low-density residential area with vacant and underutilized structures to a mixed use community with public and community services. The Project would consist of approximately 6,000 residential units, 235,000 square feet of commercial and retail space, 400-500 hotel rooms, 300 acres of open space, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transportation and transit infrastructure, community services, and utilities.

The District has the following specific comments on the environmental analysis that should be included in the EIR.

1. The EIR should provide background information regarding the District’s attainment status for all criteria pollutants and the implications for the region if these standards are not attained by statutory deadlines. A discussion of the health effects of air pollution, especially on sensitive receptors, should be provided. In addition, a discussion of the implications resulting from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) current proposal to lower the national ozone standards to be more health protective should be provided.

2. The BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines: Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans (1999) provide guidance on how to evaluate a project’s construction, operational and cumulative impacts. You may download a copy from the District’s web site at: http://www.baaqmd.gov/plnlceqa/index.htm. The EIR should provide a detailed analysis of the Project’s potential effects on local and regional air quality from construction, operations and cumulative impacts for each of the project alternatives being considered. The EIR should estimate daily and annual volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen oxides (NOx), and particulate matter (PM2.5) emissions from stationary, area and mobile sources resulting from long-term project operation and compare them to the significance
criteria in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. We recommend utilizing URBEMIS 2007, version 9.2.4, for estimating emissions.

3. The EIR should estimate and evaluate the potential impacts of toxic air contaminants (TACs) on sensitive receptors as a result of project implementation. We suggest utilizing ARB’s Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective, (http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm) for guidelines on siting sensitive land uses. We recommend that the EIR evaluate any risks with siting land uses near major transportation corridors and other emission sources.

4. We recommend that the EIR include a quantitative analysis of the criteria pollutant emissions that would be generated from construction equipment exhaust during project construction for each of the project alternatives being considered. Construction equipment generates fugitive dust emissions, exhaust emissions of criteria pollutants, and TACs, specifically diesel particulate matter, a known carcinogen. The EIR should require that all associated construction activities comply with the dust mitigation measures in the District’s CEQA guidelines. We encourage that the EIR include all feasible mitigation measures to reduce construction equipment exhaust emissions. Such measures could include but are not limited to: maintaining properly tuned engines; minimizing the idling time of diesel powered construction equipment to two minutes; using alternative powered construction equipment (i.e., CNG, biodiesel, electric); using add-on control devices such as diesel oxidation catalysts or particulate filters; using equipment that meets California Air Resources Board’s (ARB) most recent certification standard for off-road heavy duty diesel engines; phasing project construction; and limiting the operating hours of heavy duty equipment.

5. We understand that the Project would result in a substantial increase of energy use. The EIR should evaluate the Project’s potential to increase the demand for energy from utilities. Increasing the demand for electricity, natural gas, and gasoline may result in an increase of criteria air pollutant emissions from combustion, as well as an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, which can impact regional air quality. We recommend that the EIR discuss energy demand of the Project at build-out, including any cumulative impacts, such as the need to build peaker power plants to provide power during peak demand. When identifying strategies to minimize the Project’s impact on energy and air quality, the EIR should include feasible mitigation measures that require a minimum level of green building measures for new development.

6. We recommend that the EIR analyze GHG emissions. The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) recently released a resource document addressing GHG emissions from projects subject to CEQA. The resource document, CEQA and Climate Change, contains an overview of available tools and models for evaluating GHG emissions and strategies for mitigating potentially significant GHG emissions from projects. The report may be downloaded from http://www.capcoa.org. The Project should seek to minimize its contribution to climate change by implementing all feasible mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions, especially those measures targeting the Project’s vehicle miles traveled, as transportation represents approximately 50 percent of the Bay Area’s GHG emissions.
If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Sigalle Michael, Environmental Planner, at (415) 749-4683.

Sincerely,

Jean Roggenkamp
Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer

cc: BAAQMD Director Gavin Newsom
    BAAQMD Director Jake McGoldrick
    BAAQMD Director Chris Daly
February 26, 2008

Bill Wycko, Acting Environmental Review Officer  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479  

Re: Case No.2007.0903E -- Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island  
Redevelopment Plan  

Dear Mr. Wycko,

Allow me to introduce myself. My name is Ilana Bar-David and I serve on the Fort Mason Center board. I attended the SPUR Sustainability Committee meeting this month and was updated on the status of the Treasure Island Redevelopment Plan. Ruth Gravis encouraged me to send you my thoughts regarding the inclusion of an artist colony on Treasure Island. I am delighted to fax this to you to be considered as the vision for Treasure Island evolves.

An artisan crafts colony would offer a very unique destination in the Bay Area as a center for traditional crafts. This live/work artist colony, focusing on pre-Industrial technological crafts such as printing, ceramics, glass blowing, musical instrument making, wrought iron and paper making, would complement the "green" emphasis in the development of Treasure Island. Such a colony would provide an anchor and centralization of various dying artistic traditions. Cobble streets, store fronts and open studios for interacting with the public for purposes of education and sale, would offer a special and memorable experience for the visitor/passersby. The revival, restoration and preservation of such crafts, many of which have a strong historical presence in the Bay Area, would further enhance the pioneering sustainable vision of Treasure Island, entice visitors, and reduce commute congestion.

We also discussed the possibility of establishing a green business center on the island that would attract non-industrial enterprises that focus on sustainability. People who work in such environments might also be attracted to living on the island and thus "walking their talk" to work and thereby also reducing commute congestion.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about these ideas.

Ilana Bar-David
February 27, 2008

Bill Wycko, Acting Environmental Review Office
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, California 94103-2479

SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan; Case No. 2007.0903E; BCDC Inquiry File No. MC.MC.0703.1

Dear Mr. Wycko:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan. The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC or Commission) has not reviewed the NOP, but the following staff comments are based on the San Francisco Bay Plan (Bay Plan) as amended through November 2007, the McAteer-Petris Act, and staff review of the NOP.

Jurisdiction. BCDC jurisdiction includes Bay waters up to the shoreline, and the land area between the shoreline and the line 100 feet upland and parallel to the shoreline, which is defined as the Commission’s 100-foot “shoreline band” jurisdiction. The shoreline is located at the mean high tide line, except in marsh areas, where the shoreline is located at five feet above mean sea level. An essential part of BCDC’s regulatory framework is the Commission’s Bay Plan. The Bay Plan includes findings and policies that direct the Commission’s review of proposed projects and priority land use designations for certain areas around the Bay to ensure that sufficient areas around the Bay are reserved for important water-oriented uses such as ports, water-related industry, parks, and wildlife areas. The Bay Plan also includes Map Policies that are geographically specific. There are several Map Policies that are relevant to Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island.

BCDC’s jurisdiction in the project area includes Bay jurisdiction and shoreline band jurisdiction. The Yerba Buena Island portion of the project is also designated in the Bay Plan as a waterfront park priority use area.

Fill and Public Access. For the portions of the project that would include placing fill in the Bay, the project would be reviewed to ensure that there was no alternative, upland location for the fill; that the fill proposed was the minimum necessary for the project; and that the fill was sited and designed to have the minimum impact on Bay resources.

With respect to public access, the Commission can only approve a project within its jurisdiction if it provides maximum feasible public access, consistent with the project. The Bay Plan policies on public access state, in part that, “[i]n addition to the public access to the Bay provided by waterfront parks, beaches, marinas, and fishing piers, maximum feasible access to and along the waterfront and on any permitted fills should be provided in and through every new development in the Bay or on the shoreline.” Public access improvements provided as a condition of any approval should be consistent with the project and the physical environment, including
protection of natural resources, and provide for the public's safety and convenience. The improvements should be designed and built to encourage diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline, should permit barrier-free access for the physically handicapped to the maximum feasible extent, should include an ongoing maintenance program, and should be identified with appropriate signs. The policies also direct that "[a]ccess to the waterfront should be provided by walkways, trails, or other appropriate means and connect to the nearest public thoroughfare where convenient parking or public transportation may be available." The public access policies also state that the access should be permanently guaranteed, include an ongoing maintenance program and identified with signage.

In addition to the general public access policies, the Bay Plan Map policies contain public access direction specific to Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. Bay Plan Map 4, Policy 19 states for Treasure Island, "[i]f and when not needed by the Navy, redevelop for public use. Provide continuous public access to the Bay in a manner protective to sensitive wildlife. Provide parking and water access for users of small craft at the north end of Treasure Island." Bay Plan Map 4, Policy 22 for Yerba Buena Island also contains specific direction for public access and recreation that should be incorporated into the design for projects on Yerba Buena Island, including "[a] large public open space at the center of Yerba Buena Island" and "[a] linked system of trails near the shoreline and at the upper elevations that connect vista points and open spaces."

The EIR should evaluate whether projects detailed in this plan, including the new ferry terminal, commercial complexes, and proposed pedestrian and bicycle paths provide maximum feasible public access and are consistent with BCDC's public access policies and the Bay Plan Map Policies.

Recreation. The Bay Plan Policies on Recreation state, in part, "[a]ny concentrations of facilities should generally be as close to major population centers as is feasible" and that "[d]ifferent types of compatible public and commercial recreational facilities should be clustered to the extent feasible to permit joint use of ancillary facilities and provide greater range of choice for users." Specific recreation policies on marinas state, in part, "[f]ill should be permitted for marina facilities that must be in or over the Bay, such as breakwaters, shoreline protection, berths, ramps, launching facilities, pump-out and fuel docks, and short-term unloading areas. Fill for marina support facilities may be permitted at sites with difficult land configurations provided that the fill in the Bay is the minimum necessary and any unavoidable loss of Bay habitat, surface area, or volume is offset to the maximum extent feasible, preferably at or near the site." The policies also state that, "[n]o new marina or expansion of any existing marina should be approved unless water quality and circulation will be adequately protected and, if possible, improved" and that, "[a]ll projects approved should provide public amenities such as viewing areas, restrooms and public parking; substantial physical and visual access; and maintenance for all facilities. Frequent dredging should be avoided."

The EIR should examine the effects that this development will have on recreation on Treasure Island, particularly in the shoreline band and in the public's access to the shoreline. Potential negative effects on public marina and boat launching facilities from increased intensity of use should be evaluated. Additionally, Yerba Buena Island is designated in the Bay Plan (Map 4) as a waterfront park priority use area. Bay Plan Map 4, Policies 20 and 21 are relevant to both Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island and should be included in the design of any projects proposed for the islands.

Transportation. Bay Plan Policies on Transportation state, in part, "[t]ransportation projects on the Bay shoreline...should include pedestrian and bicycle paths that will either be part of the Bay trail or connect the Bay Trail with other regional and community trails. Transportation projects should be designed to maintain and enhance visual and physical access to the Bay and along the
Bay shoreline.” Bay Plan transportation policies on ferries state, in part, “[f]erry terminals should be sited at locations that are near navigable channels, would not rapidly fill with sediment and would not significantly impact tidal marshes, tidal flats or other valuable wildlife habitat. Wherever possible, terminals should be located near higher density, mixed-use development served by public transit. Terminal parking facilities should be set back from the shoreline to allow for public access and enjoyment of the Bay.”

Development of more extensive public transportation and bicycle transportation systems are consistent with the Bay Plan as long as these are developed in accordance with Bay Plan policies. The EIR should examine the effects increased transportation usage of all modes will have on public access to the shoreline, wildlife, and recreation. The EIR should also examine whether new bay fill will be needed for the construction of new transportation facilities.

**Appearance, Design and Scenic Views.** The Bay Plan Policies on Appearance Design and Scenic Views state, in part, “[a]ll 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. Shoreline developments should be built in clusters, leaving open area around them to permit more frequent views of the Bay. Views of the Bay from roads should be maintained by appropriate arrangements and heights of all developments and landscaping between the view areas and the water.”

The NOP proposes a large increase in the amount of development on Treasure Island and the intensity of use of the waterfront. This development should be consistent with Bay Plan policies on Design and Scenic Views.

**Sea Level Rise and Safety of Fills.** Bay Plan findings and policies anticipate the need for planning associated with safety of fills and sea level rise. The safety of fills findings state, in part, “[s]tructures on fill or near the shoreline should be above the highest expected water level during the expected life of the project. Bay water levels are likely to increase in the future because of a relative rise in sea level. Relative rise in sea level is the sum of: (1) a rise in global sea level and (2) land elevation change (lifting and subsidence) around the Bay.” Bay Plan policies on safety of fills state, in part, “[l]ocal governments and special districts with responsibilities for flood protection should assure that their requirements and criteria reflect future relative sea level rise and should assure that new structures and uses attracting people are not approved in flood prone areas or in areas that will become flood prone in the future, and that structures and uses that are approvable will be built at stable elevations to assure long-term protection from flood hazards.”

In addition to consistency with other BCDC policies new fill needed for construction and geotechnical stabilization projects in BCDC jurisdiction that involve bay fill must be consistent with the Bay Plan policies on the safety of fill and sea level rise.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, or any other matter, please contact me by phone at 415-352-3649 or email sahrye@bcdc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

SAHRYE COHEN
Coastal Planning Analyst

SC/gg

cc: Andrea Contreras, Planning Staff San Francisco Planning Department
Dear Mr. Wycko:

Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan – Notice of Preparation (NOP) and the Transportation Impact Study Draft Final Scope of Work (TISSOW)

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Department) in the early stages of the environmental review process for the proposed project. The comments presented below are based on the NOP of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the TISSOW for the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan. As lead agency, the San Francisco Planning Department is responsible for all project mitigation, including improvements to state highways. The project’s fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures in the EIR. Any required roadway improvements should be completed prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. While an encroachment permit is only required when the project involves work in the State Right of Way (ROW), the Department will not issue an encroachment permit until our concerns are adequately addressed. Therefore, we strongly recommend that the lead agency ensures resolution of the Department’s concerns prior to submittal of an encroachment permit application. Further comments will be provided during the encroachment permit process; see the end of this letter for more information regarding encroachment permits.

Forecasting

On page 2 of the TISSOW, it states that traffic counts will be taken from 1:00 to 3:00 PM on a single Saturday. Presumably, this time period is thought to be the peak period for weekend traffic, although it should be confirmed that this is the peak period at the particular location. However, since weekend traffic volumes are far more variable than weekday volumes, a number of counts appear justified, including some where special events such as Forty-Niner or Giants games or major events at the Moscone Center are occurring.

On pages 2 and 3 of the TISSOW it states that, "discussion of parking conditions will be based on qualitative information contained in the Transfer and Reuse of Naval Station Treasure Island EIR." Please include the information used in addition to noting the reference. We are not able to comment on whether this is an appropriate basis.

“Caltrans improves mobility across California”
On page 3 of the TISSOW, a statement is made that the document will include "justification for why East Bay freeway interchanges and local streets are not included as part of the impact analysis." The Department recommends consideration and analysis before this decision is made.

The "Treasure Island Transportation Plan" is referenced throughout the Scope of Work as a source of information to be used in the study. Since we are not familiar with this plan we can't comment if this is appropriate. Please provide this document for our reference. If this plan uses trip generation rates lower than those in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation, 7th Edition, these rates will need to be justified.

The "San Francisco Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review" is cited as providing the analysis methodology for this project. When analyzing the impacts to state highways, the methods used should be compatible with the Caltrans' “Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies” located at the following website:


In any case, the methods used should always be evaluated to ensure they are appropriate for this project.

On page 4 of the TISSOW, reference is made to the "Land Transfer and Reuse Plan Environmental Impact Report." Any material used from this document should be discussed and justified in the Treasure Island Development Plan environmental documents.

On page 5 of the TISSOW, it states that Fehr & Peers will use "methods developed for the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)" to measure the effects of transit oriented development on trip generation. These methods need to be thoroughly discussed and justified to ensure they are appropriate in this case.

Similarly, the "trip generation elasticities" referenced on page 5 of the TISSOW need to be thoroughly discussed and justified.

Please provide a definition for the "cumulatively considerable" used in the second line on page 8 of the TISSOW.

On page 17 of the TISSOW, the document states that “traffic impacts will be analyzed for the AM and PM peak periods….in relation to existing conditions and in a future context that accounts for cumulative growth in volume of traffic on the Bay Bridge.” This suggests that the focus will be on a more or less symmetrical daily commute. A critical consideration is potential additional traffic due to the anticipated presence of retail to serve Island residents as well as traffic generated by other land uses on Treasure Island including a hotel (500 hotel rooms) and 325,000 square feet of commercial uses in renovated historic buildings and “retail uses concentrated and organized as a main street.” Assuming that traffic generated by these land use activities is significant, it is suggested that the documents be more specific with respect to sources of all traffic accessing Yerba Buena Island and Treasure Island.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
It is not stated which, if any, travel demand model will be used to analyze this project. For a project of this scope, a travel demand model would be an appropriate analysis tool. Will one be used, and if so, which one?

**Community Planning**

The Department encourages EIR development coordination, to the extent practicable, with the "Walkable-Bikeable Treasure Island" study being led by the San Francisco Department of Public Health. We assume that you will model transit, pedestrian and bicycle trips as well as motorized vehicle traffic, and that multimodal level of service (LOS) or performance measures will be employed in your analysis of impacts. In addition, please analyze secondary impacts on pedestrians and bicyclists that may result from any mitigation measures for traffic impacts and describe any pedestrian and bicycle mitigation measures that would in turn be needed as a means of maintaining and improving access to mass transit facilities and reducing traffic impacts on state highways.

**Highway Operations**

Under the section, “Project Description/Proposed Transportation Plan/Bay Bridge Access” on page 8 of the NOP, the second paragraph makes reference to an approved Project Study Report (PSR) to improve the freeway ramps. However, it should be noted that the approved document was a Project Study Report-Project Development Support (PSR-PDS), which only defines support costs for project development. Therefore, the cost, scope, and schedule associated with the project are not covered in the PSR-PDS.

Under the section, “Potential Environmental Issues/Transportation” on page 17 of the NOP, the study area is not defined for the analysis of AM and PM peak periods. The Department recommends that the analysis cover the ramps in both directions of the bridge, the westbound approach east of the site (i.e., the Bay Bridge toll plaza), and the eastbound approach west of the project site (i.e., the freeways in San Francisco).

Please assess in greater detail intersections 2, 3, 8, and 10 under Task 2 on page 1 of the TISSOW. While we agree that the remaining nine intersections would provide a more thorough traffic study, the traffic impacts from the proposed project would likely have a relatively small impact at many of these intersections because the number of possible destinations would dilute traffic volumes from Treasure Island to any particular intersection. However, the Department recommends three additional intersections be included in the study:

- Bryant Street/Sterling Street
- Bryant Street/5th Street/I-80 EB on-ramp
- Harrison Street/5th Street/I-80 WB off-ramp

Under Task 2 on page 2 of the TISSOW, the second paragraph states that count data will be collected at up to three locations on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. The Department recommends that all ramps be incorporated into these counts. Please be aware of ramp and road closures due to on-going construction on the Bay Bridge east span before data collection occurs.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
We concur with the discussion concerning peak period queuing; however, while queuing is an important performance measure, we recommend that travel time data also be collected and documented as part of the existing conditions.

On page 2 of the TISSOW, it states that the average and 85th percentile speed on the bridge will be measured. However, this does not seem practical assuming traditional methods of measuring 85th percentile speeds. A more practical and probably more appropriate method to collect speed data on the bridge would be to use probe vehicles or "floating cars" performing a series of runs across the bridge.

Under Task 3 on page 3 of the TISSOW, the last bullet indicates that intersection LOS will be reported. Note that, in general, since measures of effectiveness (MOE) for the overall intersection typically do not adequately describe the operation and may actually mask a deficient condition on one or more approaches, MOEs for intersections need to be determined and reported for each approach leg. In addition, we consider LOS by itself to be an inadequate MOE for describing traffic operational conditions. LOS may be used as a secondary MOE. For intersections, however, acceptable MOEs include flow (output), average control delay, queue (length or number of vehicles), and number of vehicles/capacity (V/C) ratio. For freeway and ramp operations, flow (output), speed, and travel time/delay are acceptable MOEs.

Under Task 3 on page 4 of the TISSOW, the first bullet indicates that the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology will be used for analysis of ramp operations. Note that HCM methodology is not applicable for congested conditions, which may be the case for some, or all, of the ramps.

The analysis of Bay Bridge existing operation, under the second bullet on page 4 of the TISSOW, seems to focus only on the queuing on the approaches, but not on the operation of the bridge itself. The operation of the bridge as well as its approaches should be covered in terms of queuing (extent and duration), flow rates, travel times, speeds, and bottleneck locations.

Under Task 5 on page 7 of the TISSOW, the comment above for Task 3 regarding intersection LOS applies to this task.

The fourth and fifth bullets and the second paragraph under Task 5 on page 7 of the TISSOW indicate that 2030 will be the future year analyzed. We recommend that the future year for this analysis be consistent with the future year that will be used for the project studies for the proposed new ramps.

**Proposed Utilities**

Water – The plan assumes that a secondary water supply will use a pipe being constructed on the new east span of the Bay Bridge. This project will need to cover the Department’s construction and support costs for placing this pipe on the new east span. Connection to the pipe termination points will need to be designed and constructed – these are not part of the Department’s project.
Wastewater – The NOP states that a new wastewater treatment facility would be constructed on Treasure Island. Does this mean that the City will not use the sewer line constructed on the new east span of the Bay Bridge?

Recycled Water – The NOP states that piping for recycled water would be provided only on Treasure Island. Does this mean that the City will not use the reclaimed water line constructed on the new east span of the Bay Bridge?

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please call Lisa Carboni of my staff at (510) 622-5491.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY C. SABLE
District Branch Chief
IGR/CEQA

c: State Clearinghouse

*Caltrans improves mobility across California*
Mr. Rick Cooper  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479  

Subject: Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Notice of Public of Scoping Meetings – Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan  

Dear Mr. Cooper:  

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Notice of Preparation (NoP) for the Treasure Island (TI) and Yerba Buena Island (YBI) Redevelopment Plan EIR. The Coast Guard reviewed the notice and has the following concerns:  

First and foremost, the Coast Guard runs an essential “24/7” mission at its facility on YBI. Our facilities there require uninterrupted utility service from the City of San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. With the City’s plan to replace and upgrade public services and utilities on the islands, the Coast Guard is concerned that utility services to our facilities might be interrupted during construction activities.  

Next, some of the proposed utility replacements and upgrades that concern the Coast Guard most include: 1) Replacement of water tanks on YBI; 2) Replacement of the waste water treatment plant (WWTP) on TI; 3) Installation of new electrical substations; and 4) Replacement of the telecommunication system. It is important that the City works closely with the Coast Guard to assure that none of the above actions would interrupt utility services to any Coast Guard facility on YBI.  

Also, the increased traffic volume and changes in their patterns, both during and after construction, may limit the ability of Coast Guard personnel to access their facilities quickly, and at all hours. Even with mitigation, the additional traffic might still be a cause for concern to the Coast Guard because of potential noise and air pollution. This is the case, since the YBI roadway network connecting the eastbound bridge on-ramp, passes through Coast Guard property. The proposed plan may also impact the public transit service to and from the islands during and after construction.  

Furthermore, Coast Guard missions at YBI have increased and intensified in recent years. This has resulted in increased personnel, as well as a need for additional parking spaces. To meet this requirement we have identified a need for approximately 52,000 square feet of additional
parking. The most viable option to solve this parking deficit would be to lease parking spaces on TI. As such, the Coast Guard requests the City consider this request in its Plan. Additionally, the Coast Guard is concerned about the impacts the Plan might have on our limited parking spaces near Hilltop Park on YBI.

Finally, the Coast Guard is concerned about security for its residents, personnel, as well as its facility during and after construction. This concern stems from the proposed increase of up to 6,000 residential units and 2,000 employees on TI and YBI, as well as other proposed recreational activities such as bike trails on the islands.

In closing, the Coast Guard is fully supportive of the City’s Redevelopment Plan as long as the Coast Guard’s essential missions on YBI are not negatively affected during and after construction.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at (510) 637-5505.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

PATRICK WALLIS
Chief, Shore Team South
U. S. Coast Guard
Civil Engineering Division
By direction
February 21, 2008

Bill Wycko, Acting Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Re: Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report – Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan (Case No 2007.0903E)

Dear Mr. Wycko:

East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island (TII/YBI) Redevelopment Plan. EBMUD has the following comments.

EBMUD currently provides emergency water supply to TI/YBI through a special agreement with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Navy and Islands. The emergency water from EBMUD should not exceed the capacities originally designed and planned for TI/YBI. EBMUD researched the demands on the existing service and there has been a general upward trend since 2004 in water usage. The demand is well within the amount estimated in the original service agreement; however, please be aware that this service must continue to be a back-up service and used only in case of emergency when full water supply is not readily available from San Francisco. Minimum flows to maintain water quality in the pipeline from Emeryville are acceptable.

On page 13, the last bullet under Required Approvals states that “Approval of new service connection and water meter in Oakland (EBMUD)” is required. The project is outside of the EBMUD’s Ultimate Service Boundary, thus an additional service connection and meter will not be granted.

On page 9, Proposed Utilities, Water, and on page 19, Community Services and Utilities, top paragraph, the text should be changed from “East Bay Municipal Utilities District” to “East Bay Municipal Utility District.”
If you have any questions concerning this response, please contact David J. Rehnstrom, Senior Civil Engineer, Water Service Planning at (510) 287-1365.

Sincerely,

William R. Kirkpatrick
Manager of Water Distribution Planning
February 26, 2008

Mr. Bill Wycko, Acting Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103-2479

Re: Case 2007.0903E – TI/YBI EIR Scoping Comments

Dear Mr. Wycko:

I have a number of comments on the NOP for the TI/YBI Redevelopment Plan EIR.

Defining the alternatives

Of special concern is the selection of the alternatives to be assessed. I do not see the purpose in studying an alternative that assumes that there will be no Public Trust exchange. The project objectives could not possibly be met this way, and if they could (if anywhere near 6,000 dwelling units could be placed on YBI), the automobile-related impacts would be at least as harmful as in the Proposed Project alternative, and the development would present additional negative impacts including major destruction of wildlife habitat. Also, this level of development on YBI would be in violation of BCDC’s Bay Plan. The Public Trust trade has already been authorized by the legislature and there is no reason to believe that it would not be implemented by the State Lands Commission. Comparing a no-trust-trade alternative to the Proposed Project alternative would not give decision makers and the public any useful information, and I see no point in spending valuable time and resources on it.

An alternative that would give us useful information is one that uses the same development intensity as the Proposed Project alternative while minimizing or avoiding the potential negative impacts. Such an alternative would maximize the sustainability of the project by setting targets for the lowest possible environmental harm and by identifying the means to achieve these targets. For example, to eliminate car-related impacts, the elements of a maximum sustainability alternative would include only one-quarter of the parking spaces in the Proposed Project alternative and would increase the desirability of car independence through a variety of means including grocery delivery service and take-home grocery carts for residents and visitor-serving uses that lend themselves to ferry or bus travel (experiences to enjoy rather than things to buy). In addition to the measures to discourage driving mentioned in the NOP, there would be specific efforts to reduce car ownership (not just car use), and a marketing program for the sale and rental of the new residential units that targets those who are ready to enjoy a car-free lifestyle.
Where the Proposed Project alternative calls for a developable pad for a recycled water plant, the maximum sustainability alternative would assume that all sewage will be treated to the tertiary level. The stormwater management program would be designed to treat flows from events larger than the five-year storm, through additional LID measures such as cisterns for roof runoff storage. The erosion problems on YBI, especially in Clipper Cove, caused by stormwater discharges would be eliminated.

On-island energy production would exceed the 5% of peak demand referenced in the NOP. The distributed energy system concept would extend beyond the urban core area. The green building standard would be increased to some equivalent of LEED platinum.

The land use program would include a variant in which the Job Corps Center is relocated off-island or reconfigured to allow for more compact development. A program to encourage TI/YBI residents to work on the islands and island employees to reside on the islands would reduce the “citywide job generation or housing demand” or both.

The maximum sustainability alternative would set targets for minimizing automobile ownership, because people who own cars are more likely to use them, and parking spaces are never a highest and best land use. Providing space for people to store their cars increases the cost of housing and decreases the value of public space. Ample carsharing pods would be made available. A fee for private auto use on and off the island would be collected all day; cars have impacts on the environment regardless of the time of day, even those with zero tail pipe emissions. Congestion-based pricing could be on top of the 24-hour fee. Instead of aiming for no more than a 5% increase in Bay Bridge traffic, the cap would be 1%.

The word “demolition” would be replaced with “deconstruction” throughout.

Comparison of alternatives

In comparing visual impacts, please include renderings, photomontages or computerized simulations that include various views of the islands, along with reference points such as the top of YBI and the Bay Bridge towers, taken from sea-level vantage points.

Please compare the alternatives for their level of compliance with SF’s Transit First Policy

It would be useful to know the total annual carbon emissions projected for each alternative after build-out.

The alternatives comparison would assess the ecosystem damage that would result from various levels of management of invasive exotic plants and animals.
Additional scenarios to be analyzed:

- What if the project fails to receive state approval for the proposed Congestion Management Pricing program? (Studying such an alternative would make more sense than studying a non-Trust-trade alternative.)

- What opportunities will materialize when (if!) Caltrans finishes its work on the East Span of the Bay Bridge? For example, what might be the impacts of public reuse of the restored Torpedo Factory?

Additional concerns

Because many San Franciscans use the term “wastewater” to mean both sewage and stormwater, please help avoid confusion by saying “sewage” when you mean sewage.

Mitigation measures must be implementable. In the Programmatic EIR, the mitigation measure listed for the potential removal of roosting habitat for the black-crowned night heron was consultation with CA Department of Fish and Game. Subsequent talks with DFG staff revealed that the resources did not exist for such a consultation.

With regard to the sensitive habitat within Clipper Cove, please note the following quote from the Draft DEIR, page 4-133: “While the potential for spills cannot be eliminated entirely, existing regulatory requirements minimize the potential for spills to occur, require timely response to accidental spills, and reduce the potential for nonpoint sources to cause significant adverse impacts on surface water quality. The Coast Guard would have a quick response time, given its proximity to the site, and spills would be contained and would have less-than-significant impacts on biological resources.” Perhaps we shouldn’t be so optimistic.

The inventory of biological resources must not rely on data gathered for the EIS and used in TI/YBI Sustainability Plan. If California quail or Lewis’ woodpecker have been sighted on YBI, please document carefully. ☺

It may be useful to coordinate with the Board of Supervisors-mandated Habitat Management Plan for YBI.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment. Please contact me if I can make any of these suggestions more understandable.

Yours truly,

Ruth Gravanis
February 26, 2008

Bill Wycko
Acting Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission St., Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Wycko,

On behalf of the 8,500-member San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, I would like to submit the following comments concerning the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Case no. 2007.0903E.

The EIR should contain any required analysis of the following items:

- The current plan calls for approximately 6,000 parking spaces for approximately 6,000 residential units. The EIR should investigate the environmental impact of limiting this number to 3,000 parking spaces.

- A Pedestrian/Bicycle/Maintenance Pathway on the West Span of the Bay Bridge and the impacts on regional traffic flows, air quality, congestion, and transit. As you know, such a pathway is currently being constructed on the East Span of the Bay Bridge, and a pathway on the West Span would help alleviate the traffic issues predicted after Treasure Island is developed and more trips on and off the island are generated.

- The EIR should look at the design strategies set forth by the Treasure Island Community Development, LLC for bicycle and pedestrian connections from Treasure Island to the East Span of the Bay Bridge.

- If required, analysis of a Bicycle Shuttle as a transit option for bicycle commuters traveling from Treasure Island to San Francisco and the East Bay, and its effects on congestion, air quality, and traffic.

- The impact of limiting automobiles on "neighborhood streets," as described in the Transportation Plan.

- If required, analysis of different types of bicycle facilities on "arterial streets" and "collector streets," as described in the Transportation Plan. Kinds of bicycle facilities that may be implemented include, but are not limited to: bicycle lanes

Continued on next page.
Continued from previous page

separated by raised medians or other barriers, "bike boxes" at intersections, and bicycle boulevards.

- Utilization of numerous traffic calming features and policies on all of Treasure Island streets and impacts on traffic, air quality, and congestion.

- If required, analysis of a robust bicycle parking program, including, but not limited to, designated bicycle parking rooms at clusters of residential units, at retail and commercial places (both on-sidewalk or on-street), and excellent facilities at the Island's multi-modal central transportation hub.

- If required, analysis of the impact of a bicycle-sharing program.

- If required, analysis of a clear and separate bicycle and pedestrian pathways around the central terminal near Building One.

Thank you and please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Neal Patel
Community Planner
Treasure Island Community Transportation Planning Project
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition
neal@sfbike.org
February 25, 2008

Mr. Bill Wycko, Acting Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103-2479

Re: Case 2007.0903E – TINBI EIR Scoping Comments

Dear Mr. Wycko:

On behalf of the Department of the Environment, I am pleased to be able to submit comments to you relating to Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Scoping for the redevelopment of Treasure Island and Yuerba Beuna Island (TINBI). This is a critical project that will advance the sustainability of the Islands and has the potential to establish an international model for ecological urban development. This Department has been involved in the planning of this project for more than five years.

The TINBI Notice of Preparation (NOP) states that the Planning Department will prepare four alternatives, one of which would be an analysis of a "less intensive development program." However, less intensive development does not necessarily mean a reduction in environmental impacts. "Less intensive" could mean that there are not enough residents to support neighborhood-serving commercial uses, necessitating more trips off-island; and without the patronage needed to support frequent and reasonably priced transit, the impacts related to private automobile use could be worse. If the intent is to create an alternative that reduces or avoids the significant impacts of the Proposed Project, then we would recommend that the EIR include a "Minimum-Impact Alternative" instead of or in addition to a "less intensive development" alternative.

The Minimum-Impact Alternative would call for less use of the private automobile and higher goals for energy efficiency, carbon neutrality and water-quality. It should also measure the total quantity of greenhouse gases and other criteria pollutants generated each year. This alternative may include the following characteristics:
Transportation

- A reduction in the number of parking spaces, including reducing retail and commercial parking;
- Lower targets for vehicle miles traveled;
- Additional incentives for minimizing automobile ownership, not just car use;
- Lockers at the transit hub so that visitors would be able to leave packages, extra shoes etc., there instead of in the trunks of cars – allowing fuller enjoyment of the variety of activities that the islands have to offer;
- Weather-protected space for bikes on the ferries;
- Bus service to, from and on the islands that minimizes the number of transfers required;
- Higher green building standards – higher LEED and Green Point Rated levels; and

Water Conservation and Water Quality

- Higher standards for storm water discharges: higher level of treatment, greater detention times; more storage and reuse of roof runoff;
- Maximum use of recycled water;
- Minimum use of domestic water;
- Accommodation of flows greater than the 5-year storm event;
- Gray water systems in residential buildings and hotels; and
- Climate-appropriate landscaping, requiring minimal supplemental water.

Resource Conservation

Energy Conservation and Carbon Neutrality (non-transportation)

- Remediation process to be as carbon neutral as possible,
- Higher renewable energy generation targets, including on-island generation and use of distributed energy systems

Biology

- Biodiversity targets that protect and restore ecosystems, not just sensitive species; and
- Highest Green Point Rated points (or equivalent) for Bay-Friendly landscaping – for water conservation, Bay water quality, and habitat value.

The Department of the Environment recognizes that the EIR is an informational document prepared in accordance with the terms of CEQA and provides decision makers with an analytical tool to make decisions about the project. Our Department looks forward to working with TIDA and the Planning Department on many of these programs in an effort to enhance this project's environmental benefits and hold it up as a model for other development not only in San Francisco but in the Bay region.

Thank you for consideration of these comments. Please feel free to contact Jennifer Kass at 415-355-3762 for clarification of any of these suggestions.

Sincerely,

Jared Blumenfeld
February 25, 2008

Mr. Bill Wycko, Acting Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103-2479
FAX 558-6409

Re: Case 2007.0903E -- Treasure Island – EIR Scoping Comments

Dear Mr. Wycko:

The Sierra Club requests that the following be included in the subject EIR:

1) Description and assessment of an alternative or alternatives and variants that reduce the impacts related to the private automobile, and
2) A comparative analysis of all alternatives with respect to carbon emissions and other impacts.

We attach a draft table to show the alternatives and variants to be studied and compared.

For 1) The Developers Base Alternative to be described and studied should include the following elements:

a) Basic bus fares and fast pass rates the same as on the SF mainland and East Bay at the time of the study

b) Buses given absolute priority on TI and YBI roadways.
   The purpose of this and the element c) below is: Improved priorities are a low cost method to make buses more attractive to riders and encourage people to drive less in order to reduce carbon emissions.

c) Priority for buses to flow onto the bridge

d) Basic ferry fares to be twice the Muni adult fare, per previous project studies

e) Peak-hour access fees set to limit bridge travel congestion impacts (a project requirement).

f) Some of the bridge access fees to fund a portion of the proposed West span bikeway.
g) Garage parking fees – hourly, daily and monthly – at a minimum, to be the same as the lowest priced City-owned garage within the central business district.

h) Curb-side and open space meter rates to be the same as Zone Three neighborhood commercial except that meters within 1,000 feet of a garage shall be $0.50 per hour higher than the garage.

For 1) The Off-peak Access Fee Alternative to be described and studied should include a, b, c, d, e, f, g and h) above and the following elements:

i) All of the revenue from parking meters on TI and 25% of commercial garage fees (the same as SF mainland) flow to the SFMTA to provide essential transit services to TI residents and visitors, as a way to meet the requirement that revenue from Trust Lands are to be used on the Land.

j) Off-peak access fees set to provide any necessary additional subsidies to ferry travel, bus transit to Oakland, on-island shuttle buses, and all other TI/YBI alternative mobility modes.

The purposes of this element are: 1) High tolls, all day every day of the week, on the Golden Gate Bridge, set to fund maintenance and ferries and buses as alternate modes, to limit bridge congestion, work reasonably well. 2) The developer’s Base Alternative uses revenues, from sources which in mainland San Francisco are used to fund Muni transit. This element replaces any funds diverted by i) above. In addition, if the study shows that off-peak access fees from SF to TI, necessary to replace funds from parking used in the Base Alternative for other uses, are greater than the Bay Bridge tolls, then access fees should also be collected from Oakland to TI traffic.

For 1) The Reduced Parking and Commercial and No Ferry Service Alternative to be described and studied should include a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i and j) above and the following elements:

k) Reduced Parking: For this alternative, the supply of parking would be limited as follows: Residential 0.75 off-street parking spaces per unit maximum; Hotels 0.1 parking spaces per room; Retail and “Flex” (commercial) Space 0.2 spaces per 1,000 square feet; Marina 0.3 parking spaces per berth, and reduced curbside and open space parking based on maximum mobility and pedestrian ambiance alternatives.

The purpose of this element is to determine the impacts of a reduced supply of parking, the same similar uses in mainland SF.

l) Reduced Retail and Commercial Uses. Retail space would be limited to only provide all (if practical) residential and short-term visitor needs. “Flex” (commercial) space would be limited such that at least fifty percent of workers will be TI/YBI residents. This should not affect Trust permitted hotels. This alternative shall include increased residential supply to replace at least the reduced square footage of retail and commercial uses, from the Base Alternative. All of the retail and commercial would be located at ground and lower stories of residential buildings, so that most TI residents can shop and get to their on-island work sites on foot.

m) No ferry service. Peak and Off-peak Access fees set per e and j) above, but with all of the net funds (not used for j) above uses, except ferries) us as additional subsidies to reduce the cost of SF fast passes and an East Bay bus equivalent, for TI/YBI residents. Reduced parking and commercial, even with greater residential may result in less driving and
therefore less total revenues, than the sum of e) and j) above, to be divided among a greater numbers of residents.

The purposes of this element are: 1) Show the impacts of the high energy consumption of ferries. 2) Show of the impacts of using ferry subsidy funds to further reduce the cost of transit and thereby reduce driving. 3) Consider alternate uses of the ferry dock area.

For 2) Comparative analysis: A thorough comparison of the alternatives should be made, using a table or matrix such as the one attached, to allow for evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives. Evaluation criteria should be included that will produce the following information for each alternative and variant:

a) The total quantity of green house gases and pollutants released per passenger carried from TI/YBI to their respective terminals in San Francisco or East Bay bus stop by buses, ferries and automobiles (to a nearby downtown parking garage), based on the average passenger load for each trip for a typical week day.

b) Total greenhouse gases emitted per year. The Club believes that for a project on an island barely above sea level, it is especially critical to compare the production of global warming gases.

c) Total daily passenger volumes from TI/YBI to the SF mainland and East Bay for each mode, at project completion,

d) Daily, discount and monthly bus and ferry fares.

e) Travel times at peak and off-peak for each mode, showing time for: walking; waiting, boarding, unboarding and riding.

3) The study should also discuss the possible alternative uses and impacts of using some or all of the Job Corp site for residential development to bring more TI residents closer to retail and transit.

Please feel free to contact me for any clarification.

Very truly yours,

Howard Strassner, Chair Transportation Committee
419 Vicente, San Francisco CA 94116, 661-8786, (h,w)
email: ruthow@dslextreme.com

Attachment: Draft Table
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developer's Base Choice.</th>
<th>Off-peak Access Fee</th>
<th>Reduced Parking &amp; Retail, No Ferry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Feet Comm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni Fare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily/Monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Fare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily/Monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Access Fee</td>
<td>$/access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Peak Fee Access Fee</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$/access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily 108 Riders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily AC Riders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Ferry Riders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Autos to SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Autos to EB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Autos to SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Autos to EB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Parking Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hourly/daily/mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter rates hourly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Bus to SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Ferry to SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Auto to SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2 Ferry to SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2 Auto to SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2 Auto to EB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2 Bus to SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2 Bus to EB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual CO2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 25, 2008

Bill Wycko  
Acting Environmental Review Officer  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Ste 4000  
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Dear Mr. Wycko:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings.

For background, the SLC has jurisdiction and authority over all ungranted tidelands, submerged lands, and the beds of navigable rivers, sloughs, lakes, etc. All tide and submerged lands, granted or ungranted, as well as navigable rivers, sloughs, etc., are impressed with the common law public trust. The public trust is a sovereign public property right held by the State or its delegated trustee for the benefit of all the people. This right limits the uses of these lands to waterborne commerce, navigation, fisheries, open space, recreation, or other recognized public trust purposes.

In the case of Treasure Island, the California Legislature has granted all tide and submerged lands, whether filled or still existing, to the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) (Chapter 898, Statutes of 1997). As stated in Chapter 898 as amended (by Chapter 542, Statutes of 2004 and Chapter 660, Statutes of 2007), all former and exiting tide and submerged lands on Naval Station Treasure Island will be subject to the public trust upon their release from federal ownership (Section 3 (b) (2)). Chapter 898, as amended, further recognizes that public trust lands at Treasure Island are to be used for public trust purposes. However, there are two exceptions, first short term leases may be issued for property for which there is no immediate trust-related need (Section 8 (b)); and buildings which were built for a non-trust use and which are now incapable of being put to a public trust use may be used for non-trust purposes consistent with the reuse plan for their remaining useful lives, to be set by agreement at between 25 and 40 years (Section 9). Reference should be made to Chapter 898 itself for further requirements related to these non-trust uses.
In its statutory role as administrator of the public trust, the State Lands Commission must protect the public's interests in trust lands and ascertain that the property is used for purposes consistent with the public trust. The State Lands Commission may allow an exchange if it finds that the property to be freed of the trust is not necessary or useful for public trust purposes. In a land exchange, these findings are made in the context of an exchange of equally valuable lands to be impressed with the public trust. The configuration and potential utility of lands for public trust purposes is to be improved through an exchange.

We support that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) recognizes, for informational purposes, that discussions are ongoing regarding a land exchange involving parts of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. Representatives of TIDA, the developer, staff of the State Lands Commission, and the Office of the Attorney General have met to discuss the parameters of a land exchange. Also, meetings have occurred with public interest groups and individuals regarding an exchange. Through an exchange, the public trust could be terminated on lands at Treasure Island that are located away from the shoreline and no longer useful for public trust purposes. At the same time, the public trust would be imposed upon land at Yerba Buena Island which is useful for public trust purposes. Chapter 898, as amended, authorizes land exchanges (Section 11), provided all required findings can properly be made.

Based on the information provided on the competitive transportation management plan, it is important to note that any charges must be non-discriminatory for all users of Treasure Island. Care must be taken not to authorize preferential treatment of the residents of Treasure Island.

On a separate point, the EIR should recognize that the tide and submerged lands granted to the United States by Chapter 81, Statutes of 1897 are reversionary lands. Title to these properties should pass to the State of California, which will then deed them to TIDA to hold in trust through Chapter 898, Statutes of 1997, as amended.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. As requested in the notice, please note that I will be the contact person for the State Lands Commission and may be reached at (916) 574-1227 or via email at katog@slc.ca.gov should you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Grace Kato
Public Land Management Specialist
SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT
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[The proceeding began at 6:19 p.m.]

MR. COOPER: Welcome, everyone, to tonight's public scoping meeting for Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR. Let's open the meeting, the purpose of which is to obtain public comment regarding the scope of the issues to be addressed in the draft environmental impact report for the project.

My name is Rick Cooper; and I am an environmental planner in the San Francisco Planning Department. With me today are -- outside the door is Andrea Contreras. We and one more Planning Staff, Patrice Siefers, are the coordinators of the environmental impact report, or EIR, for this project. My function this evening is to moderate the scoping meeting.

Seated in the room tonight are some people I'd like to introduce. To my right here is Michael Tymoff as well as Jack Sylvan, representing the Treasure Island Development Authority, cosponsor of the redevelopment plan, as well as coleads on the EIR. Also seated here this evening are representatives of Treasure Island Community Development LLC, the private cosponsor of the redevelopment plan. As well as, also, we have members of the Turnstone Consulting, EIR consultants on this
project.

As you came in, hopefully you have signed in our sign-up sheet. Otherwise, please make sure to do so before you leave tonight. Andrea is outside to assist you. Also, if you'd like to speak, please do fill out a speaker card, which we'll be collecting. So far no one has signed those. So later on you'll have an opportunity to, if you wish to.

Another item that you can pick up if you wish is a comment form; and you can fill that out this evening. We'll be collecting them before we break tonight.

A couple of housekeeping items: Restrooms are located out the door and to the left and to the left one more time. We request that you kindly turn off the ringers on your cellphones and pagers and step outside the room, if you need to talk on your phone.

The purpose of the meeting tonight is to assist us in the EIR for the proposed project to comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA. It's a very public process, so the main reason for this meeting is to solicit both written and oral comments or suggestions concerning the scope and focus of the EIR. This is your opportunity to assist the department by sharing any information you may
have that will be useful in the preparation of the EIR regarding potential physical and environmental effects of the proposed plan. Your comments could help to identify significant environmental issues that determine the depth of analysis, identify resource issues not requiring detailed analysis, or identify reasonable project alternatives.

This is not a meeting about the merits of the proposed project or about whether to approve or disapprove the proposed project. We are here tonight to listen to your comments and information and not here to discuss or debate your views.

Your participation in this matter is both a statement of this evening's meeting's importance and an opportunity to collect information for use by the EIR team that will develop the CEQA documents.

In just a moment you will see a brief presentation from Michael regarding the proposed plan. And after that I'll speak to you just briefly about the process from here. Then we'll open up the meeting for public comments.

We have a court reporter here with us tonight to make a verbatim transcript of the proceedings, so I request that you speak slowly and clearly -- probably slower than I have so far -- so the reporter can make an
accurate transcript, which will become part of the
public record for the process.

After all the speakers have commented, we'll
wrap up the meeting.

Now I'll hand things over to Michael Tymoff,
who will speak to you about the proposed plan.

MR. TYMOFF: Good evening. I'm Michael
Tymoff. I work in the Mayor's office on behalf of the
Treasure Island Development Authority. Thank you for
joining us tonight.

I'm going to give a brief overview of the
redevelopment project, starting off just briefly with
the overview; talk a little bit about the planned
process to date and timeline; and then go over kind of
the four main areas of the plan -- the land-use plan;
sustainability; transportation plan; and infrastructure.
And then talk a little bit about the implementing steps
as we're moving forward in the project phasing.

I'll try to be brief, because I think I can
safely say more people in the room know more about this
project than the people who know little about this
project, because most of the people in this project --
who work on the project -- are here in this room.

So the timeline: In 1993 the base was
selected for closure. And then in '94 a reuse committee
was formed, which resulted in a draft reuse plan being published in 1996. This was really a policy document that continues to guide the planning process. It's really a general-plan level that looked at proposed uses for the Islands.

In '97 the base closed and the City took on a lease with the Navy and began interim operations. In 2000 a procurement process was started to select a prospective master developer, which resulted in Treasure Island Community Development being selected in 2003 and the current development planning process being initiated.

In 2005 TIDA and the Planning Commission certified a programmatic EIR, which will be the basis for the transfer of the land; and that was done on the draft reuse plan. That's in contrast to this current EIR, which is a project-level EIR on the redevelopment plan and the projects and activities which will be carried out pursuant to that redevelopment plan.

And then in December of 2006, TICD and TIDA's development plan and term sheet was endorsed by the Board of Supervisors after 200-some meetings, so a very extensive public process -- the most extensive publicly vetted project in San Francisco's history.

And then just in January of 2008 we issued the
Notice of Preparation and are anticipating the draft EIR in 2009.

So quickly to go over the land uses, this is an aerial view of the existing conditions out on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island.

Just real quickly, the redevelopment plan captures the entirety of both islands, including the 35-acre Job Corps parcel, which will remain in its current use on Treasure Island; and then the 36-acre Coast Guard parcel, which is on the eastern side of the Bay Bridge that will also remain in this operation.

Currently, there's about 800 residential units -- approximately 700 of them on Treasure Island and approximately a hundred on Yerba Buena Island. There's three main historically significant billings -- Buildings 1, 2, and 3, creatively named. There's also a district which has been listed on the National Register, which is the Great Whites. There's nine structures in this area. There's also a torpedo building, which is out on the end as well. FHWA/Caltrans owns in fee about 10 acres and then have about 20 acres of aerial easements.

And this is the plan for tomorrow. We think it will be an example of sustainable master-planning community, bar none. Quickly, the development program
about 6,000 residential units, 30 percent of which will be affordable -- up to 500 hotel rooms. That's split between three different hotel types, which I'll talk about a little bit later. Approximately 300 acres of open space. And up to 325,000 square feet of commercial space in Buildings 1, 2, and 3.

And then a significant jobs and community-benefits package. Really quickly, one of the aims of the project is to create a new San Francisco neighborhood with a real mixture of incomes and people. And so to do that there is a real diversity of product types, ranging from two- to four-story townhomes through mid-rises. And each of the super blocks has an icon neighborhood tower ranging between 18 to 24 stories. And then there's a number of high-rise towers that you can see right here around the urban core; and those are ranging from 35 to 55 stories.

As I mentioned before, pretty robust affordable housing package -- 1,800 units. Those will be delivered in a variety of ways. TIDA has as one of our partners the Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative, which is a consortium of about ten organizations that will be responsible for having 435 affordable units developed; and those will be for formerly homeless folks. TIDA organizations provide
both housing and services to the formerly homeless. About 750 are inclusionary homes that will be developed by TICD; and then TIDA will cause to be developed about 625.

There's also a transition plan in place to make sure that all the folks that are living out on the island have the opportunity to transition into new units as they're built at their existing rates; and that will be a phased program as the development gets built out over time.

Quickly, some of the other uses that form kind of the retail and commercial urban core of the area. There's about 275,000 square feet of both visitor-serving and resident-serving retail; and that will be organized around this main street very close to the intermodal transit hub. As I mentioned earlier, there's a couple different hotel types. This is a 50-key spa facility. This is a condo hotel.

And similarly, along Clipper Cove, we're looking at a time-share hotel. Also, as I mentioned, commercial uses for Buildings 1, 2, and 3. Again, as I'll talk about a little bit later, in the transportation plan, by clustering the development into a compact footprint, that leaves us with about 200 acres on Treasure Island proper and a hundred acres on YBI for
a very diverse range of open space and parks programs.

And we think that, in addition to creating a new neighborhood for San Francisco, we are also going to be creating a regional open-space system, again with a great variety of programs. So we have an urban farm; what's termed as the Great Park; includes stormwater wetlands, treatment wetlands, some kayak-launch and board-sailing areas, a regional sports facility; largely natural areas on Yerba Buena Island; and then a series of neighborhood parks as well as this Cityside art park with views back to the city.

One of the other mandates for the project is that it be self-sufficient; and so to do that we are providing a series of essential public services and facilities, including a police and fire station located, again, close to the urban core; an elementary school. Other facilities include childcare, which will be located in Building 1, as well as distributed throughout in these neighborhood towers; as well as a mix of community spaces. Also, as I mentioned, the stormwater wetlands and a new wastewater treatment facility will be provided.

Again, one of the mandates for the project is for it to become one of the largest -- or become the most sustainable large development project in the
history of the United States -- make no small plans, right?

So we're doing that in a couple ways. First of all, from kind of a site-planning excercise, so everything outside of the footprint of the building we have committed to achieving a LEED-gold certification as part of the U.S. Greenbuilding Council's LEED for neighborhood-development program. And that really looks at mixing land uses; creating walkable, compact development; providing high-quality transit; looking at best practices in terms of stormwater treatment. We've got about 50 percent of the total land area as open space, most of which will be native landscape.

And then on the building front, all buildings will be required to comply with the greenbuilding specifications that have been tailored specifically to Treasure Island; a number of strategies to reduce -- or to exceed -- Title 24 standards by 20 to 30 percent.

Also, in the central core there will be a central heating and water -- or excuse me -- a central heating and cooling plant to provide heating and cooling to these buildings and to share resources. There will also be a robust system of roof-mounted photovoltaic to provide on-island renewable energy.

Again, on the transportation plan, I think the
single biggest thing we can do is create a dense development around an intermodal transit hub. Again, the mandate is for this transportation package to be self funding, self-sufficient. There's a number of things that we're doing both at the site-design level as well as through some incentives to promote a transit-oriented lifestyle and to minimize the impacts of automobiles onto the Bay Bridge.

This diagram is a nice diagram just to talk about walking radiiuses. We've got about 80 percent of all units within a 10- to 15-minute walk, which is this ring; and then within a 5- to 10-minute walk of the intermodal facility, with about 50 percent of the units. The densities are around 90 to a hundred units per acre. And that, as I mentioned before, gives us the opportunity to create a large open-space system and reduces the need for infrastructure into those outlying areas, providing high-quality frequent transit service, so there's an interconnected system of ferry service connecting the island to San Francisco at 10- to 12-minute headways; buses providing service to Transbay as well as possibly a line to the Civic Center; to Fourth and King for the Caltrain line. Those will be at 5-minute headways and then at 7- to 11-minute headways. And then also an east bus service at 7-minute headways.
There will also be an on-island free shuttle serving transportation throughout the Islands.

As I mentioned before, some of the incentives -- it's a system of carrots and sticks. So prepaid transit passes will be made requisite in the cost of housing out there. There will be a bike library and a car-share program. And then some of the disincentives to minimize impacts on the bridge are congestion pricing, so people that will be getting on at am. and p.m. peak hours will be charged for getting onto the bridge, ramp metering. So, again, a safety valve to allow, as the bridge is at capacity, letting people on and off the bridge with a light. And then there will be a TDM -- a transmit-demand management district -- specifically created to manage -- dynamically manage -- all of these programs to make sure that they are functioning properly and working together synergistically.

Infrastructure: Again, because of the unique nature of this being a man-made island, one of the first phases of construction is to stabilize the entire perimeter of the island as well as the viaducts which connect the ramps to this main corridor down to TI and also Yerba Buena Island, stabilizing the causeway which connects the two islands and then possibly stabilizing
the utility trunk backbone corridor and then cutting the
ferry key for the intermodal hub.

And then all new infrastructure systems -- so
delivering distribution systems -- stormwater,
wastewater, domestic water supply and storage, as well
as backup supply. And then all the dry utilities --
gas, electric, communication -- will be provided new.
They will be phased in so that all the folks living out
here right now will have uninterrupted service. But
when we're all done it's going to be a completely new
infrastructure out there.

So to conclude on project implementation, as I
mentioned before, the development plan and term sheet
was endorsed in December of 2006. We expect the EIR to
be certified and the disposition and development
agreement to be approved in 2009 with transfer of the
land from the Navy to the city and the first phase of
infrastructure in 2010, with the first home sales -- or
pad sales -- in 2012; and then a build-out year of 2018:

So quickly to go through the phases, as I
mentioned, this first phase would consist of geotech
stabilization, the infrastructure backbone, and cutting
the ferry key. The second phase will be cityside and
Clipper Cove neighborhoods; the elementary school;
wastewater treatment plant and stormwater; the first
phase of Yerba Buena Island West; and then open space on
Yerba Buena Island, as well as the urban core and the
intermodal transit hub -- creating it there really early
on in the project.

The third phase will be the eastside
neighborhood -- this recreational facility, regional
sports facility; and then two areas in the Yerba Buena
Island of housing. And then the historic district.

And then the final phase is this remainder of
the open-space system -- the Great Park, the core
towers -- these orange squares; the urban farm, which is
about a 20-acre parcel in here; and then this last edge
of the cityside neighborhood. That's what we think we
might look like.

MR. COOPER: Thank you, Michael.
Now I'd like to briefly explain to you the
CEQA process we'll be following for preparation of the
EIR.

The first step of the process was the issuance
of a Notice of Preparation and the public scoping
meeting. This notice was sent on January 26th to
solicit participation in determining the scope of the
EIR from the agency and the public who are involved. It
provided a description of the proposed redevelopment
plan and indicated where written comment on the scope
may be sent. The notice indicated that written comments
should be submitted by Tuesday, February 26th. Extra
copies of the NOP are available outside the door here
with the other materials.

The next step of the process will be
publication of the EIR, which will be distributed with
public review for a period of about 45 days. Oral
comments will also be accepted at a Planning Commission
hearing on the draft EIR which be held about a month
after publication of the draft. The draft will contain
analysis of the potential physical and environmental
effects of the proposed project, provide feasible
mitigation measures to address any effects found to be
potentially significant, and present potential
alternatives to the proposal that would avoid or reduce
and identify the impacts of the project. The EIR will
be sent to various agencies and interested parties,
including those who signed in tonight. Others will
receive a notice that is available for their review.

The verbal comments we receive tonight
regarding the physical effects of the project and in
writing will be carefully reviewed and taken into
account as applicable to the preparation of the draft
EIR. Please note, however, written response to comments
received during the scoping will not be prepared.
However, the EIR team will read each letter and review the transcript of the comments made to help us focus the EIR analysis as appropriate.

Following the close of the draft EIR comment period, the department will prepare a comments-and-responses document which will contain written responses to all substantive comments received during the EIR review period. The comments-and-response document will be distributed to those who commented on the draft, EIR, various agencies, and other parties.

About two weeks after publication of the comments-and-response document, a hearing will be held before the Planning Commission and Treasure Island Development Authority, where they will be asked to certify the final EIR, which will consist of the draft EIR together with the C&R document.

Please note that certification of the EIR does not indicate that the project will be approved or disapproved. Rather, it would satisfy the CEQA environmental-review requirements for the proposed project. Approval or disapproval is a completely separate consideration from the accuracy of the EIR.

We are ready to open up the hearing now for public comment. You may hear contrasting viewpoints. I would respectfully request that all people respect the
comments of others. When you come up to the microphone, please state your name and address and if you represent an organization; and you may be asked to spell your name for the benefit of the court reporter.

It's now time to open up for any speakers. Do we have any?

Okay. Well, thank you very much for coming this evening. Are you sure? Anybody? Going once. MS. PILRAM: Does that include questions we have?

MR. COOPER: Oh, by all means.

MS. PILRAM: Okay. I have a question.

MR. COOPER: Sure. Please.

MS. PILRAM: My name is Alice Pilram. That's P-i-l-r-a-m. I am a resident on Yerba Buena Island. And I just have a question if the environmental impact report is going to take into account current stories about global warming, because Treasure Island sits right at sea level. And I know right now -- I'm also a member of the RAB -- and they're doing work on the far end of the island where they're trenching out right now. And they have gone down approximately four feet and hit Bay water. So it's a very watery island. And I just wondered if those concerns were going to be addressed in the environmental
MR. COOPER: With due respect, I think we will just take that as a comment.

MS. PILRAM: Okay.

MR. COOPER: I think those issues should be covered in the document.

MS. PILRAM: I believe so.

MR. COOPER: So, again, if you don't mind, please fill out a speaker card for us.

MS. PILRAM: Sure.

MR. COOPER: Thank you.

Any other speakers?

Okay. Well, thank you all very much for your attendance this evening. I'm available for a few more minutes following the conclusion; and feel free to contact me in the Planning Department. My phone number is 575-9027 in the 415 area. Thank you very much.

[The hearing ended at 6:46 p.m.]
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attorney's office, who's representing both Planning and
TIDA, in essence.

And so the purpose of this meeting really is
to solicit your comments on the NOP. And I'd like to
turn it over to Rick so that he can give you an
overview of the process, where we are -- the overall
EIR process -- respective roles of TIDA, TICD, the
Planning Department; and then give a brief overview of
the purpose of the Notice of Preparation and
public-comment period.

MR. COOPER: Good evening, everyone. Again,
I'm Rick Cooper from the Planning Department. And I'm
the coordinator for the EIR for the redevelopment plan.
I have two other staff members in my department working
with me -- Andrea Contreras and Patrice Seifers. And
we are actually a co-lead agency with TIDA on the
environmental impact report. And we also have
Turnstone Consulting on board as our EIR consultant,
who also work with us in the development of the
environmental impact report.

Just to give you a very brief description, the
environmental impact report is a requirement of the
California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA, which
requires an environmental review of projects as defined
under the law. And the purpose of this is to provide
information on the project and to disclose potentially
significant environmental impacts; to provide feasible
mitigation measures for those impacts; and to, also,
disclose impacts that would be significant and
unavoidable. It also is to provide feasible
alternatives to the proposal that would reduce or avoid
those impacts as [inaudible] in that document.

So this Notice of Preparation, which we
published on January 26th, was the first document that
we've issued as part of this process, which is a very
public process. The Notice of Preparation is to
provide the public and interested -- I'm sorry --
responsible agencies with notification that the process
is beginning and to solicit feedback regarding the
scope of the analysis that we should be doing regarding
those physical and environmental effects.

So we're now in the middle of that period. We
have conducted a public scoping meeting last night in
the Port Building down on the waterfront. We'll be
having another meeting tomorrow night on the island.
They are all public-noticed meetings; and we've also
run an ad in the newspaper and are soliciting comments
either orally at those meetings, as well as tonight;
and, also, written comments can be sent to the address
that's found in the Notice of Preparation. The close
-- that's a 30-day comment period. That comment period is closing the 26th of this month. So I would encourage any of you or other interested parties to either attend one of these meetings or write those comments and send them to us at the address provided.

Following that, we'll then dive into working on the EIR itself, taking those comments into account; and we're conducting background studies that will then inform what is written in the document; and we expect that we'll be able to publish what's called the draft EIR, the DEIR, the latter part of this year. And at that point there will be a 45-day public comment period, where people will be able to review the document and provide comments either at a public hearing or, again, in a written format. Following that, we will then take all those comments that are made on the adequacy of the document and respond to them in a comments-to-responses document. And then, finally, that document along with the draft EIR will be taken before the TIDA board and the Planning Commission for certification. The certification would indicate that they believe that we have adequately considered the environmental impacts of the project and a complete and accurate document. And at that point the environmental review will be complete.
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It's important to note that certification of
the EIR does not indicate whether the plan should or
should not be approved. It's an informational
document; and at that point the decision-making bodies
can go ahead and work on their approvals, but this is
the first step in that process.

So that's all I really have to say at this
point. I would remind you that we're really here to
hear your comments to us on what you believe we should
be considering in the scope of work on this EIR. I'm
not really here to conduct a dialogue with you on those
potential impacts, but we will take all of your
comments very seriously. And I may, if I feel the
need, break in to perhaps ask questions for
clarification. But, otherwise, I'm just here to take
notes and we'll listen to all of your comments.

With that, I'll turn it over to Michael.

MR. TYMOFF: Also, I'd just like to add to
that, as we're giving comments, if you can just state
your name before you deliver the comment, because we
are recording this and will have it transcribed.

You've all received a copy of the Notice of
Preparation. And in the interest of time, I'm just
going to go briefly through a summary of what's in the
Notice of Preparation. As Rick mentioned, the purpose
of the NOP is to provide a summary of the project. There will be a much more detailed project description in the draft EIR, so the NOP describes where the project is; what it is; and then addresses the environmental topics and issues that will be analyzed as part of the EIR. Contrasted to the EIR, which was certified in 2005, this is a project-specific EIR on the redevelopment plan area. The previous one was a programmatic, based on the 1996 reuse plan; and this will be a stand-alone document, not tiered off of that.

Also, listed in the NOP, an additional study is not being prepared. We have used the environmental checklist that the City typically uses. And MEA has made the determination that all environmental topics will be contained and analyzed in the EIR. Having said that, the EIR is going to focus on the significant impacts and more briefly described by other impacts may or may not be significant.

So briefly again on the project description summary, the proposed redevelopment plan area captures all of Treasure Island and YBI -- 400 acres on Treasure Island, 150 on YBI -- and includes the formerly accepted residential areas on both Treasure Island and YBI -- about 720 existing occupiable housing units on TI and 80 on YBI. And then the redevelopment plan also
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includes 550 acres of submerged lands. Additionally,
the redevelopment area captures the Job Corps campus on
TI, which is 35 acres; and the U.S. Coast Guard
facility, which is about 35 acres, on YBI. Those will
remain in their current uses.

The proposed project that's being analyzed
does not include the Caltrans ramps, which Jack
described later. They will be analyzed in the EIR as
both in their existing condition and in their new and
improved in-place condition as part of the [inaudible]
conditions. The development plan and term sheet, which
was endorsed in 2006, forms -- is the underlying basis
for the redevelopment plan. And, again, the
project-level EIR is on both the redevelopment plan and
then all the public and private projects and activities
that will be carried out pursuant to that. So that's
termed in the NOP as the development program. And then
the proposed project is the development program and the
redevelopment plan in total.

Quickly, just to review the development
program: 6,000 new homes; 30% affordable, 1,800 units;
approximately 270,000 square feet of resident- and
visitor-serving retail organized around a main street
of the intermodal transit hub; approximately 325,000
square feet of commercial uses in Buildings 1, 2, and 3.
that will be adaptively reused in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s standards; up to 500 hotel rooms; approximately 300 acres of open space with a network of bicycle and pedestrian trails; and then, as we were discussing earlier, all-new facilities infrastructure and a suite of public services; and then, as I mentioned, the intermodal transit hub and [inaudible].

The program’s expected to be built out in four major phases over a ten-year period. We're expecting that will happen in 2010. The EIR will analyze the project at full build-out.

And then, real quickly, just a summary of the environmental effects: Again, the purpose of the meeting tonight is not to have a conversation, dialogue, or debate about the potential impacts. But it's for you guys to provide comments about what we should be analyzing. So the EIR will analyze the potential impacts, identify mitigation measures, and analyze whether those mitigation measures will reduce the impacts to or below a less-than-significant level. And then, as Rick mentioned, the EIR will also ID and analyze alternatives, including a no-project alternative; an alternative which does not include a trust-exchange between Treasure Island and YIB; and
then another possible alternative based on the EIR analysis.

And then, finally, feasible mitigation measures and improvements will be ID'd -- identified -- to reduce or avoid those potentially significant impacts.

So that was about as quickly as I could go through this. We really wanted to reserve the time to you guys to provide us with your comments, recognizing that we've got a couple additional, more exciting agenda items for tonight. So, with that, shall we just turn it over and have you guys start [inaudible] the comments?

MR. SYLVAN: I do just want to reiterate that -- of course, we can answer questions, but unlike the typical CAB meeting, where there's a lot of dialogue back and forth arguing the merits of stuff, the goal is not for us to have that same dialogue about whether the project is the right project in terms of the project or whether we're doing the environmental review in the right way. It's for you to tell us the things that you think we should be looking at in the environmental review process that, as we start that analysis for the draft EIR, we have that guidance from you all.

MR. TYMOFF: So you may see Jack and I [inaudible]
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UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible].

MR. SYLVAN: I was assuming that Karen would handle it the same way that the CAB -- and then at the end there would be public comment.

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Always is.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a process question. Is there a difference between what an individual CAB member might put out as a comment versus something that --

[CROSS-TALK]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- versus something that the whole CAB would vote on and say, Here's a comment. Here it is as a CAB-voted thing. What are we doing here tonight --

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: That's one of our issues. While we did get this document significantly prior to our meeting, which was a nice change, the NOP wasn't published until the end of January. And we held off this meeting until after the NOP was published so we could see what it says. So we have the predicament of not meeting again before public comment has closed.

MR. SYLVAN: So can I just -- I think, for the purposes of what we're trying to accomplish, which is in addition to the public scoping meetings we're having, we wanted to give the CAB an opportunity to
have their -- basically their own scoping meeting. And so, from the standpoint of providing guidance on things that we should be looking at in the EIR, I don't think it actually is that important to distinguish between a personal comment from a CAB member versus something that the entire CAB formally agrees that they -- because the fact is that we have to respond to whatever the issues are. And even if there's not consensus in the CAB on what those issues are, we should just get them all out on the table. And then we'll -- through the process we'll just have to deal with them all.

Okay.

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: And we did do this before, but it was for the other plan, the first plan. And we did submit formal comments in writing.

MR. SYLVAN: I think you did that on the draft EIR, which, again, it's a different step in the process.

[CROSS-TALK]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- likely that comment period within that will [inaudible]

MR. COOPER: I should say that [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's my understanding that the NOP doesn't [inaudible]. We can give comments.
MR. SYLVAN: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The response is only on the comments made on the draft at the other end.

[inaudible]

MR. TYSOFF: But those comments are used as we finalize the scope.

MR. SYLVAN: The purpose of getting comments now is that the NOP -- for you all, it's a different animal, because the NOP, for people who haven't been involved in the project, is to tell them what the project is and give them an opportunity to say, well, you know, we actually think that you should be looking at this in terms of environmental impacts. With you all, you already understand the project, so the bulk of the NOP is telling you stuff that you already know. The purpose of this is we're about to go engage in a massive analytical process with the REI, our consultant, to do the analysis that goes into the draft EIR. And what you all tell us you're interested in being looked at will shape how we do the analysis and actually will be responded to in the draft EIR. It's not an immediate response. It comes when you see the draft, which is after, you know, we do all that work.

MR. BLACK: I was just going to suggest. Can we -- I'd love to start so that we can start seeing how
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it works.

[CROSS-TALK]

MR. BLACK: -- remind people to state your
name before.

MR. SYLVAN: Do we want to move this more into
the middle, so we want to make sure we get people's --
we actually have verbatim what you say, so we're going
to transcribe this.

MR. BLACK: Rob Black. On page 17, you talk
about -- under "Noise," you talk about you'll be
looking at the impact of noise during the construction
time, but under "Transportation," you don't talk about,
it doesn't look like, the impacts of construction
vehicles. And I think that's going to be a significant
impact while construction is taking place on the bridge
on-and-off ramps because of the scope of scale. So I'd
like to make sure that you're looking at the
construction phase under "Transportation" [inaudible]

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: I'd like to make one
other request, too, which you just reminded me. If
you're -- if you're referring to something specific in
this document, will you refer to the page and paragraph
number so we know where to go if you're talking about
that. Okay? Thanks, Rob.

Liz.
Ms. Hirschkorn. And first comment’s a general comment. And that is that the mitigations that might come out of this process, I would suggest also look at beyond the master developer, that this plan also has a future pad individual development; and so those mitigations should extend beyond this planning period in front of us, but also to full build-out of the facilities.

And then the second comment is a little more specific. In the NOP page -- pages -- where you’re talking about the transportation programs and different -- different types of uses -- walking, et cetera. I'm on page -- pages 8 and 9. And it's not specific wording, so I won't point to a paragraph. But my general comment is there’s a lot of discussion in the previous DEIR that compared the impacts to what was preexisting Caltrans data, if you will -- preexisting to any of the current uses of Treasure Island. It was all based on when it was a base -- an active base. And I don’t see anything -- I've just scanned this -- but I don't see anything addressed about what the reference point of what that evaluation of the traffic impacts on the bridge would be. And I'd like to encourage that evaluation, compare this proposed project with the current -- the current existing conditions, not the
previous active base status of the bridge. Thank you.

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Suzanne.

MS. KIM: I'm Suzanne Kim. On page 9 on the parking section, to also look at [inaudible] transportation but also [inaudible]. And then on page [inaudible] talking about the walking and biking, they're talking about the shared paths [inaudible]. Just what [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

MS. KIM: Okay.

MR. COOPER: So, again, [inaudible] previous comment, you're referring to runoff --

MS. KIM: Runoff, pollution from cars, automobiles -- looking at that [inaudible] would you look at that as a [inaudible]

MS. PANG: A while back --

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: State your name, Wilma.

MS. PANG: I'm Wilma Pang. I remember we talked about the parking unit per unit. It goes back and forth whether it's two or one. Is this the figure that we arrived at [inaudible]. You know that parking we talked about [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not making a controversy over the amount of parking. I'm just saying that I would like to study that [inaudible].
MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: I think it was Liz -- I don't think it was you, Suzanne -- on page 17, the second paragraph, it says "Traffic impacts will be analyzed in relation to both existing and future contexts."

Other comments? Michael.

MR. DELANE: Mike DeLane. I just want to reaffirm. I think it's on page 10, the first paragraph [inaudible] San Francisco Fire Department. It's very important to make sure that that does happen and particularly what type of system is used [inaudible]

MR. BLACK: Rob Black. Within this scope of this EIR, going forward, would this also include the marina renovation? Or is that going to be separate?

MR. SYLVAN: The marina renovation was covered in the previous EIR.

MR. BLACK: And that's what we will stay with?

MR. SYLVAN: Right. That's not a part of this plan.

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: And nothing's changed. They haven't done anything in years, because they really -- they're waiting for the Navy. They've presented a plan and they're waiting for land to be transferred.

George.
MR. BROWN: George Brown. On page 15 they're talking about the employment, the population, and housing. I see a lot of numbers [inaudible] other pages in there, you know, they're providing certain numbers [inaudible] but I don't see much about employment here. And I would hope that they would include some type of goal, which I know there are some goals within the City, but this EIR, all I see is it says it will compare the existing number of employees, residents, and visitors [inaudible]. So maybe there could be a little more information [inaudible] San Francisco [inaudible].

MR. KOLL: Kevin Holl. On page 11, you have a heading called "Geotechnical Stabilization." My only comment would be to strictly scrutinize the proposed geotech stabilization [inaudible].

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Gene.

MR. BRODSKY: Geotechnical stabilization.

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: This is Gene Brodsky speaking.

MR. BRODSKY: Gene Brodsky. Failure to review the safety of the former Navy housing at the northern end of TI in regard to liquefaction and the existing building foundations.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: On the storm-water
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[inaudible] of stormwater it talks about the flows
greater than a five-year storm bypassing all treatment
processes. I think there needs to be some -- that
technology has only been around for ten or fifteen
years; and there's not really a lot of data to show
that that's a viable process to [inaudible]. It's on
10.

MR. MOLINARE: Tim Molinare. I want to read
from responses to comments on Treasure Island
development plan, a term sheet that's an exhibit that
was produced about a year and a half ago regarding
wastewater-treatment facility. It's referred to on
page 10 of your document. It says that as part of the
final design options for treatment of secondary
effluent to improve levels via treatment of treatment
wetlands will be explored to determine the cost of
land-use impact. The following language has been added
to the infrastructure plan, working with the builder
and the operator of the new wastewater-treatment
facility: The facility will be the most appropriate
treatment technology available and feasible at the time
with the goal to maximize treatment in wetlands and
minimize direct discharge to the Bay.

So my comment coming off of that is I think
this EIR, as part of its scope, should look at an
alternative to the presently proposed secondary
effluent treatment with outflow to the Bay. That's
what you're planning at this point, but I think that
the EIR should look at the impacts of that and then
look at an alternate system which would treat the
effluent to a higher level, which could be used on-site
and treated thorough the wetlands and ultimately
discharged directly to the Bay without using an outfall
and maintaining an outfall and all of that.

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Suzanne.

MS. KIM: Suzanne Kim. Introduction of
non-native species [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Having lived out there,
there's lots of cats.

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: As an aside, if anyone's
a cat lover, read Jon Carroll today. It's hysterical.
Just an aside.

Yes, Wilma.

MS. PANG: Wilma Pang. On page 7,
"Institutional and Public Services," fifth line. I'm
interested about the school -- existing closed public
grammar school on Treasure Island would be improved and
reopened. What do you mean by "improved"? You mean --
how is the word "improved" -- what does it mean?
Rebuild it or renovate it?
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MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Be more specific about
what they mean. Okay.

Do I see another hand back here?

MS. GALLAGHER: Heather Gallagher. On page
16, talking about transportation and 18 talking about
demolition. And what I’m curious about is what happens
to all that demolished stuff and [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You’re talking about
the existing stuff?

MS. GALLAGHER: Yeah. How can you demolish
something at Treasure Island and not do something with
that stuff that’s on it?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They buried it before.

[CROSS-TALK]

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Wait till the ferry
service is established and then truck it all off back
here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

MR. HOLL: Kevin Holl. On page 16 there’s a
heading called "Archeological Resources." My question
is, Is there -- it states that there’s a high
likelihood for the presence of archeological resources.
My question is, Is there any thought at this time there
would be some type of archeological find that would, in
fact, slow down or prevent the construction of any part
of the project?

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Is it old enough to have archeological [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yerba Buena Island --


UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Are there any other comments right now?

[End of Side B of Audiotape 1/Start of Side A of Audiotape 2]

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: There we go. Okay. Any more CAB comments?

Okay. Public comments. Ruth?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ruth [inaudible] Not a comment but a question. What I'm wondering is if you can tell us a little bit more about the project alternatives [inaudible]. Can you tell us what you're thinking in terms of [inaudible]

MR. COOPER: I really couldn't at this time.

[inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Name, please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible] a major component of the transportation plan was the
congestion-management program. And that is called out
in the Notice of Preparation [inaudible] enabling
legislation for this program [inaudible] by the
Governor, so that I guess what my question is, Is where
is Plan B, the same question I've been asking for a
very long time.

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Any other comments?

Questions? Thank you.

MR. COOPER: Thank you all very much for the
questions and comments.

MR. SYLVAN: It's also possible -- you may hit
me under the table for saying this -- but you also can
submit comments in writing directly to the Planning
Department.

MR. COOPER: As I said in my opening comments.

MR. SYLVAN: Oh, you did. Sorry.

MR. COOPER: Please feel free. And, also,
I'll put my phone number -- 415-575-9027. I'll leave a
few cards tonight as well. Please feel free to contact
me if you have any questions or if you have any further
comments or feedback.

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: E-mail.

MR. COOPER: E-mail?

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Yeah, because I think if
-- you will take comments by e-mail, right?
MR. COOPER: Yes.

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: 'Cause that's an easy way
for people to --

MR. COOPER: It's very simple.

tick.cooper@sfgov.org. And [inaudible]

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Could you repeat that.

MR. COOPER: [inaudible] And here are some
cards as well [inaudible]

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Great. Thank you so
much.

MR. COOPER: Thank you all very much.

MS. KNOWLES-PEARCE: Okay. Good.

Michael, why don't you do the calendar next.

MR. TYMOFF: I think the last time we met we
passed out a forward development planning schedule that
was more robust and included [inaudible]. This is for
this calendar year. So we're obviously in February.

Other agenda items we haven't yet gone over is the
amended and restated bylaws. We talked [inaudible].

Kind of three major efforts that are ongoing throughout
this year. That's the refinement of the land plan and
the design for development process, whereby we'll just
define the three-dimensional form of the island and
then codify that in the design guidelines -- design for
development document; and also set forth the design
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MR. COOPER: Good evening and welcome. Rick Cooper of Planning department staff.

And given the few people that we have tonight -- and I'm pretty sure that most of you of are fairly aware of the CEQA process as well as the plan -- I want to shorten my comments quite a bit so we can move on to the public comments.

Just to reiterate, this public scoping meeting and the one we held on Monday night are kicking off the public portion of the CEQA process and EIR for the redevelopment plan for Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island. We are in the middle of a 30-day comment period that will close on the 26th of this month. We welcome public comment tonight. And you can fill out a form and hand those comments to Andrea Contreras my colleague, who along with Pat Siebers in our office -- the three of us constitute the Planning Department EIR team. Our co-lead agency is TIDA, for purposes of the EIR.

And I would just ask, when you make your comments tonight, to please speak nice and slowly and clearly so the court reporter can make a clear verbatim transcript of tonight's proceeding. Following the comment period, we'll proceed with developing the EIR and we'll publish the draft EIR, hopefully, by the end
of this year/early 2009. There will be a 45-day public comment period on that.

In addition, when we prepare our comments-and-responses document and publish that, there will be a certification that's done by both the TIDA board and the Planning Commission that will be noticed; and you will have an opportunity at that time to comment on the entire document prior to us requesting certification before those two bodies.

So with that, I'll turn this over to Michael Tymoff for a brief presentation on the redevelopment plan.

MR. TYMOFF: Good evening. Welcome.

I think most of us know the plan pretty well, so I don't want to -- so I'll keep to brevity and get to the comment period -- just run through the plan, talk a little bit about the planning process and the timeline up till now and up through publishing of the draft and then get into the meat of the redevelopment plan.

What's called the development program in the NOP is largely comprised of the land uses and the sustainability plan, transportation plan, infrastructure, and improvement. And then, lastly, just talk a little bit about project phasing and implementing the next steps.
I think most of you know that in '93 the base was selected for closure. And in '94 a citizens' reuse committee was formed, which resulted in a reuse plan in '96. So it's really a policy guide and general-plan-level document which continues to guide the process today.

In 1997 the base stopped operating and the City entered into a lease agreement with the Navy for interim operations. In 2000 TIDA began a procurement process to select a master developer, which then resulted in 2003 selecting TICD as the master developer.

In 2005, a programmatic EIR was certified by the TIDA board and the Planning Commission that was based on the draft reuse plan; and that is a standard document. This is project-specific, a project-level EIR, not tiered off of that project. The programmatic EIR also cleared the marina, which is not being analyzed as part of the project EIR.

And then in December of 2006 the development plan was endorsed by the Board of Supervisors. We just published a Notice of Preparation January 26th, with a comment period through February 26th. And as Rick mentioned, we're hoping to have a draft out by end of the year.

So this is Treasure Island today. Existing
uses: About 720 occupable units out on the northwest
dend of Treasure Island; about 80 on Yerba Buena Island.
There's a couple of existing federally owned parcels --
the Job Corps and the Coast Guard -- 35 acres and
36 acres. Those will remain, but are included in the
redevelopment plan area. There's also three
historically significant buildings that will be restored
-- adaptively reused -- per the Secretary of the
interior standards; and then a district -- the Great
Whites -- a collection of nine buildings; then the
torpedo building out on the tip of Yerba Buena Island.
Treasure Island tomorrow: The development
program. And I think that most of us know that 6,000
residential units; up to 500 hotel rooms; 270,000 square
feet of retail organized around the main street, both
visitor-serving and resident-serving retail.
Approximately 300 acres of open space on both islands.
Then, as I mentioned, about 325,000 square feet of
commercial uses in Buildings 1, 2, and 3. Then robust
jobs, economic-development, and community-benefits
package.

So one of the mandates for the project is to
create a family-friendly neighborhood, or a series of
neighborhoods. We are doing that through a diversity of
product types and with the goal of creating an authentic
mixed-income, mixed-age community; and then also a
diversity from an architectural and urban-design
standpoint to create a diversity of building types to
create an interesting skyline and urban form.

So you have townhomes, two to four stories;
five-story mid-rises; eight to twelve neighborhood
towers, 18 to 24 stories; and then high-rises between
400 and 600 feet. Those high-rises are these yellow
guys, so those are clustered around this intermodal
transit facility. And really trying to create -- we
have a diagram later in the presentation -- but creating
the densest population around the transit facility.

Again, robust affordable housing and
transition plan. Thirty percent of the homes will be
affordable at different income ranges -- 1,800 homes.
Those will be delivered in three ways. TIDA will cause
to be developed about 435 -- TIDA is Treasure Island
Homeless Development Initiative. It's a consortium of
ten nonprofits that provides affordable housing and
services to formerly homeless persons. About 750 of
those units will be provided within the market-rate
buildings and the inclusionary homes; and then TIDA will
cause to be developed about 625 homes. Also as part of
the development -- disposition of the development
agreement -- we will get to a transition plan to make
sure that all the folks that are living out on the
island who are in good standing through DDA will have an
opportunity to move into new units as they're coming
along at their existing rents. Then, again, the
development will be phased in such a way that folks will
not be displaced until the adequate units are available
for them to move into.

Quickly, I mentioned the intermodal facility.
And this diagram just talks about the main-street
retail, the commercial uses, and the historical
structures and then the hotels. This is a condo hotel,
a 50-key spa facility. Open-space program -- again, I
think one of the goals of the project is to really
create a regional destination. We think we'll be able
to do that through the creation of a diversity of open
space and park types as well as programs. We've got the
cityside park on the western shoreline, our art and
sculptural park, a series of neighborhood parks within
the block -- 20-acre urban farm, agricultural park.
This area out here is being called the Great Park, not
unlike what you see out at Crissy Field, with a wetland
for stormwater treatment and habitat creation. Out here
you have a board-sailing and kayak-launch facility.
There's opportunities for some camping and activities
out here; and then a regional sports facility.
Public access out on Pier 1, Treasure Island sailing center, the marina -- again, not part of this project, to be analyzed under the EIR, but that will happen in concert roughly on the same timeline as the project. And then a trail system, including providing an access from the east span; a bicycle path that will wind its way through TI and then along the shoreline for continuous pedestrian and bike access. Then a hilltop park at the top of Yerba Buena Island.

Community facilities: Police and fire station, childcare facilities, and TI museum in Building 1. As I mentioned, an urban farm; life-learning academy out here currently; and we anticipate them being in the redevelopment project. New wastewater-treatment plant that we're working with the PUC on developing. As I mentioned, stormwater wetlands. Currently closed elementary school that we will be working with the San Francisco Unified School District to provide -- we're not sure whether that's a renovation. It's a new structure, but in some form it will come back; likely to be K-5; and ultimately maybe K-8.

Then, again, in the neighborhood a series of community rooms to provide residents the central services for daily needs. Then this art park on the eastern shoreline.
Sustainability: At the master-plan level there's commitment to achieving LEED for neighborhood development gold. This is in its pilot phase right now, but we really look at all of the facets of sustainability outside of the footprint of the buildings. You see some of the strategies. A lot of it has to do with compact development -- pedestrian and friendly environments, location, efficiency, transportation programs. So there's a lot of inherent pieces of the project that are really LEED benchmarks. Then at the building level, all buildings will have to comply with the greenbuilding specifications that have been developed with San Francisco Environment.

Transportation: Some of the guiding principals -- as I mentioned, the transit-oriented land-use plan creating the highest density areas around the intermodal transit facility. Transportation system needs to be self-funding and self-sufficient; and then minimizing the impacts of autos on the Bay Bridge.

This is a diagram just showing the walking distances from the intermodal transit facility. So 8 percent of all units are within a 10- to 15-minute walk of that facility; and approximately 50 percent of them are within a 5 to 10-minute walk of the facility.

Transit service: Frequent high-quality
transit service, including a ferry from Treasure Island to San Francisco at 12-minute headways; MUNI service to Transbay and possibly Civic Center and then maybe Fourth and King or a second route yet to be determined. Those are anticipated at 5-minute headways to Transbay and then 7- to 10-minute headways. East Bay service -- approximately 11-minute headways; and then an on-island shuttle. So when the buses come, they'll just circulate around -- drop off and pick up, lay over around the intermodal facilities, and then return to a destination in San Francisco and the East Bay; and then folks will have access to their homes through the shuttle service.

Some of the pieces of the transportation plan, including both incentives and disincentives for folks to use cars: On the incentive side, transit passes will be provided at cost as part of your housing cost. There will be a bike-library program as well as a car-share program.

Then on the disincentive side the congestion-pricing program -- all parking is paid, including residential units, will be unbundled from your unit, both physically and financially. Ramp metering -- as folks get on the bridge, kind of a safety valve, as the bridge gets backed up, it will facilitate people getting on and off the island. And then a
transit-parking district and all these various programs
-- an on-island transit coordinator.

Infrastructure: Because of the unique characteristics of this being a man-made island in the middle of the Bay, the first phase of improvements will include stabilizing the perimeter of the island, cutting a ferry key, and then stabilizing both causeway and the viaduct structures with the bridge and ramps down to Yerba Buena Island.

All-new domestic water supply; wastewater and stormwater facilities. And then all the dry utilities -- gas, electric, communications -- will be entirely replaced again in a phased manner so that utilities and essential services are continuous throughout construction.

Real quickly, just kind of the key milestones to the development schedule: As I mentioned, the term sheet was endorsed in 2006. We expect the EIR to be certified and approval of the disposition and development agreement in 2009, with property transferred from the Navy to the City; and first phase of construction in 2010, with first pad sales in 2012; and about a 10-year buildout. Project completion in 2018.

I talked about this phase earlier -- the geotechnical stabilization of the perimeter of the island;
the ferry key; and then the infrastructure backbone.

The next phase -- these two neighborhoods -- Clipper Cove and cityside park; the core; the wastewater treatment facility; the school; the first Yerba Buena Island neighborhood; and open-space system.

Phase 3 is the eastside neighborhood; the regional rec facility; Yerba Buena Island east; and then the Great White historical district renovation.

And then the fourth phase is this remainder -- the open-space system and the Great Park as well as the agricultural park and the towers in the urban core.

That's it.

MR. COOPER: Thank you, Michael.

So at this point we welcome public comment on this scope and contents of the EIR. As far as I can tell, I think we have one speaker. Please state your name and address for the record and speak clearly for the court reporter.


If this project is implemented the way that the Board of Supervisors endorsed it, it will be a wonderful project. But as many of you know who have followed or listened to my concerns over the years, the big question is will all aspects of it be implemented.

My very first question has to do with what are
the -- what is considered the project? It includes
certain aspects of the plan as it was included in the
item sheet but not all of them. It doesn't include the
sustainability plan, the community-services plan, and so
on.

It seems to me that when the TIDA board
adopted this as the preferred alternative and the Board
of Supervisors adopted it with certain conditions, that
that was the project in its entirety, with all of the
pieces that they were endorsing. And to pick out
certain pieces of it, it's not the same project. It
doesn't have all of the same aspects to it. And that
speaks to a somewhat larger concern that I have about
one of the complications and one of the challenges about
doing an environmental review of this project.

Typically, when a project is subjected to
environmental review, it is the envelope that is -- the
envelope of the project that is evaluated. And when you
have a project like this, that in many ways is supposed
to be a self-mitigating project, it's not absolutely
clear to me how the environmental review process will
deal with the fact that some of it may be implemented
and some of it may not be implemented.

Just in the number of units, for example, the
Notice of Preparation talks about up to 6,000 units.
Well, the integrity of the plan -- this is not a plan where impacts reduce as the project gets smaller. This is a project that had to become large enough to meet certain thresholds for goods and services, for transportation. It had to be large enough. So this environmental-review document has to do some kind of sensitivity analysis or has to account for the fact that simply making it smaller doesn't reduce impacts.

That will be important in talking about an alternative, but it will also be important about talking about the project itself. That we need to know -- we need to know about those thresholds and the ability to meet those thresholds. I understand that that creates challenges of its own for the developer in terms of being able to adjust to the market, but I think that has to be reconciled to the fact that a project we have already seen of 3,000 or 4,000 units -- 3,800, I think, was the previous one -- didn't cut it.

So that -- and I will go on about this at greater length in writing and try to make this comment a little bit more straightforward, but I think you probably understand the gist of that concern.

The other concern has to do with what you were talking about; and it's a related concern, in some ways, of the alternatives. What was mentioned in the Notice
of Preparation was to do a less intensive development. Well, remember that the alternative, if it is to meet the requirements and the spirit of CEQA, which is to use alternatives as a way of understanding what better could happen, what could be imposed as mitigation -- it has to be both feasible -- and we already know that the 3800-unit project was not feasible. So bringing in a project of about that scale, knowing that it's infeasible, would really not be cricket. And it also has to have lesser impacts so that it's going to be important not to do the kind of conventional CEQA thing of cutting the units in half and saying that that's your alternative.

The other alternative that was mentioned was to have one that -- without the public-trust trade. And I can understand any rationale for having such a -- for having such an alternative. There are many uncertainties about this project, but the one near-certainty is you have the enabling legislation to do the trade. You have been working with the State Lands Commission. There is no reason to suppose that you have to have a Plan B for that eventuality, particularly since you are going blithely ahead with the congestion management, where there is indeed real uncertainty.
Arc Ecology will try to propose an alternative -- or at least features of an alternative -- that should be evaluated that will hopefully meet the criteria of lesser impact; and we will try to make it feasible within our limited capacity to evaluate that.

So one of the -- to continue on the track of will this project actually be implemented and all of the features of it, one of the things that we know from the financial plan that was developed is that many of the self-mitigating features of this plan -- the transportation plan, the solid-waste management facility, the affordable housing, the school on site -- all of those are not baked into the financing of the plan. There are -- in some cases, such as transportation and housing, there is some contribution of capital costs; but for the ferry there are some projections for operating costs. But as the Board of Supervisors confirmed, one of the real problems with all of this is that implementing those self-mitigating features requires other agencies to spend money, whether it is the City and County of San Francisco, whether it is AC Transit, whether it is the San Francisco Unified School District, or whether it is TIDA. All of the risks for actually -- not all of the risks -- but a very large proportion of the risks for actually implementing
those features have been spun off of the project.

There has to be some way in evaluating -- if these were proposed as mitigations, they wouldn't qualify, because the full financing of them would not be available -- or even the project's contributions to those costs. I think we need to have the same kinds of standards applied for a self-mitigating project, that there has to be some level of certainty that the project, as it's been proposed -- which is great -- is the project that will actually be built, will actually be operating.

On a different topic, I -- given the large number of approvals that are needed for this project and given the many aspects of the project and the long-term buildout of this project, I would suggest that you do this as a master EIR rather than a -- rather than a project-level EIR. If you did that, you would also be able then to take into account and deal with the ramp improvements that are currently being worked on. The idea of having those as a totally separate EIR, I think, begins to segment the project, because the only reason really for doing those ramp improvements is this project. I think a master EIR would give you some of the flexibility that you need and deal with some of the phasing-in and some of what is currently uncertain and
allow you to deal with it in a more systematic way.

The final thing I think I would like to draw
to your attention that caught my eye in the Notice of
Preparation has to do with the traffic analysis. As you
may remember, in the earlier EIR -- the project-level
EIR -- the region of impact that was looked at was just
the bridge itself. And that was a major flaw in the
EIR. At the time in the comments I wrote -- I compared
it to looking at the impacts of filling up a bathtub and
continuing to add more water. The bathtub doesn't get
any fuller, but the downstairs neighbor has water coming
through the ceiling. Well, that is what the analysis of
traffic was in that earlier EIR. It looked just at the
traffic on the bridge and, lo and behold, they came to
the conclusion that the bridge is already full. So
there are no impacts for adding more traffic, because
you can't have any more.

What is incontrovertible is that the bridge is
the source of congestion on the regional highway system,
probably extending eight miles south and eight miles to
the east; that where the congestion and the decrease in
the level of service takes place is on city streets
leading to the freeway system and further back in the
freeway system where there is merging. The bridge
itself is pretty much -- unless there's an accident --
is a free-flow situation. So to look just at the bridge
really is to avoid and to ignore what are the true
traffic impacts. You have to look at a much larger
region of impact; and the impact to both the regional
system as a -- for a radius that is defined by the
bridge's impact on the system and on the city streets in
San Francisco that feed the bridge.

The metering that is one of the baked-in
mitigations would deal with a.m. traffic, but p.m.
traffic you don't have that -- you don't have that
ability; and it is the p.m. traffic that is even the
more serious congestion problem. So let me just leave
it to say that I hope you won't make that mistake again,
that it was a very serious flaw; that I hope the Navy
made you do it, that you don't really want to do it
yourself.

Anyhow, I will have more to say; but I
appreciate your setting up the two scoping sessions.
And in the past I've appreciated the help I've received
from all of the staff and look forward to working with
you again, not to block the project -- quite the
contrary -- but to make sure that the project that you
have all worked so hard to present to people and to
prepare is actually the project that everybody is going
to have to live with in the future.
MR. COOPER: Thank you very much for your thoughtful comments.

Do we have any other speakers tonight?

Okay. Well, that concludes our meeting. Thank you very much. And I look forward -- well, you will be receiving copies of the draft EIR at a later date. And we look forward to your comments at that time.

That concludes our meeting.

(Meeting ended at 6:48 p.m.)
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