| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Kate Aufhauser |
| **To:** | Paul Mitchell; Kern, Chris (CPC); Bollinger, Brett (CPC); Joyce; lubaw@lcwconsulting.com |
| **Cc:** | Van de Water, Adam (ECN); Clarke Miller |
| **Subject:** | RE: Preliminary Data Request for GSW Final SEIR |
| **Date:** | Thursday, August 20, 2015 6:00:48 PM |
| **Attachments:** | image004.png<br>image003.png<br>2015.08.20_Ramboll Environ Report - MB Arena - AttachmentA - Technical Approach.pdf<br>2015.08.20_Ramboll Environ Report - MB Arena - Table.pdf<br>2015.08.20_Ramboll Environ Report - MB Arena.pdf<br>2015.08.20_Revised_SouthSt_Striping_Proposal.pdf<br>D-415-A15 Model (1) (1).pdf |

---

Further additions:

Info Needs Task No. C, On-Site Treatment of Soils

- Please confirm if on-site treatment is proposed.
  - *Yes, it is proposed.*
- Please provide description of type of on-site treatment plant proposed, and proposed location of treatment plant within the site.
  - *The Rapidmix 400 (pug mill) treatment system consists of 75Kw motor, a screen unit (to remove cobbles and rocks), a conveyor belt, mixing tower, and bins to hold the treated soil. Class I California hazardous soil is mixed with lime or cement material to stabilize soluble lead concentrations in soil.*
  - *The CDSM (perimeter shoring wall) installation and the on-site soil treatment will begin at the same time. The CDSM operation will be set up around the perimeter of the site, while the on-site treatment will be begin in the middle of the site while the CDSM work is occurring. The pug mill would need to be moved as required as the soil is removed from site after treatment (i.e., the underground parking areas are deeper than the arena event level).*
- Please describe the specific proposed design features proposed to control emissions, dust and noise.
  - *The pug mill is a Tier 4 emission unit therefore no design feature is needed to control emissions. Treatment unit is permitted to operate under a Temporary Treatment Unit permit approved by DTSC and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The unit will be inside of canvas tent therefore no emissions will result from the treatment.*
  - *Dust will be controlled per the SFDPH approved Dust Control Plan such as stockpile wetting, stop work during high winds, and covering stockpiles.*
  - *With a canvas tent in place the noise generated from the treatment unit will be less than 75DB.*
- Please provide source of power to operate on-site treatment plant.
  - *The pug mill operation has a gen set power plant attached to the equipment for power. (MCJV was not able to get a response of the size of the gen set on the pug mill. The gen set can be seen in the attached sketch of the pug mill.)*
- Please estimate maximum amount of soil (CY) to be treated, and anticipated maximum length of duration of use of on-site treatment plant.
  - *The estimated CY of soil to be treated is 156,056 tons (97,535 cy) to be treated. The*

*large pug mill can treat 5,000 tons (3,100 cy) per day and the treatment plant will be on site approximately 3 months.*

- Please indicate plan/location of potential stockpiling of soil on-site, and duration that stockpiles would be uncovered.
    - *There will be multiple stock piles required for soil treatment. There will be a stock pile of contaminated soils for treatment, and then multiple stockpiles for the treated. The pug mill can treat the contaminated soil faster than trucks will be able to haul the soil and cycle back to the site. There will also be on-going testing of the treated soil prior to hauling off site. This will require multiple treated soil stock piles. Stockpiles would be uncovered for 8-10 hrs during the workday. At the end of the day stockpiles will be covered per the DMP.*

<u>Related</u>

- Based on anticipated comments regarding potential Air Quality impacts, GSW asked Liz Meisner and Anne Gates of Ramboll Environ to perform a Human Health Screening Evaluation for demolition/excavation activities. The draft results of that evaluation are now available and are attached (in 3 separate pdfs) for your review.

<u>Info Needs Task No. G, Transportation</u>

- UCSF Comment on Access Blockage:
    - GSW understands the project description and mitigations currently outlined in the DSEIR are designed to encourage drivers to follow traffic law (including avoiding blocking crosswalks, blocking the box, etc.). If there are areas in practice where access blockage sometimes occurs, the roving PCO provided for in the DSEIR would be able to assist with congestion management in that location.
- Other Misc. Project Access Changes:
    - Trucks exiting the on-site loading dock via the garage driveway at 16th St. will not be permitted to turn left onto 16th St.
    - The sidewalk width along the project frontage at Terry Francois Blvd. has grown to 22'.
    - South St. is being re-striped to maintain the two eastbound lanes currently there today between Bridgeview Way and TFB. We will keep one westbound lane in the same section by removing the previously-proposed parking lane, and associated metered parking spaces, at the northern side of the street. Please see attached for graphic of the proposed changes, which will be incorporated into the graphics of GSW's revised TMP.

GSW believes this fulfills ESA's full information request as provided last week. Please confirm. We will continue to follow up on action items generated during meetings between GSW and the City CEQA team as necessary.

Thanks,
Kate

**Kate Aufhauser**
Project Analyst

510.986.5419 (office) | 202.230.2642 (cell)
KAufhauser@warriors.com

website | tickets | app | social | find us

**Note: I will be traveling without access to phone or email from Friday, 8/21 to Sunday, 8/30.**

---

**From:** Clarke Miller [mailto:CMiller@stradasf.com]
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 19, 2015 1:42 PM
**To:** Kate Aufhauser; Paul Mitchell; Kern, Chris (CPC)
**Cc:** Bollinger, Brett (CPC); Joyce; Adam Van de Water (adam.vandewater@sfgov.org); lubaw@lcwconsulting.com
**Subject:** RE: Preliminary Data Request for GSW Final SEIR

Paul,

Info Needs Task No. A, Helipad:

- See attached for the final crane plan for the project. The crawlers required for the arena construction are included in this plan and details on their size, radius, etc. can be found on the right side of the page. You'll note that the dimensions of the other cranes has not changed since the June submission.

Thanks,
Clarke

---

**From:** Kate Aufhauser [mailto:KAufhauser@warriors.com]
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 18, 2015 7:26 PM
**To:** Clarke Miller; Paul Mitchell; Kern, Chris (CPC)
**Cc:** Bollinger, Brett (CPC); Joyce; Adam Van de Water (adam.vandewater@sfgov.org); lubaw@lcwconsulting.com
**Subject:** RE: Preliminary Data Request for GSW Final SEIR

Paul et. al. –

A follow-on to Clarke's email:

Info Needs Task No. B, WIND:

- GSW confirms that the previously provided RWDI wind mitigation analysis results are applicable for our selected mitigation design. We selected Mitigation Option #4 (Solid Canopy with Porous Vertical Standoff).

Info Needs Task No. E, HAZARDS:

- SFDPH did respond to Langan's submission of the Phase II ESA, Site Mitigation Plan, and Dust Monitoring Plan. Per the attached responses:
    - The Site Mitigation Plan has been approved (see letter).
    - The Dust Monitoring Plan is being revised to address comments from SFDPH (see

letter). However, the DMP will be re-submitted prior to completion of the Final EIR, and SFDPH has conferred conditional approval based on the intended incorporation of said comments (see email).

- Langan is also current drafting a Dust Mitigation Plan for naturally-occurring asbestos. Based on anticipated review time from BAAQMD, the plan should be available in time for consideration in the Final EIR (targeting early September).

Info Needs Task No. G, TRANSPORTATION:

- Adam provided figures associated with the Local/Hospital Access Plan yesterday via email. We presume no further GSW submission is required.
- GSW agrees to the items contained in the SFBC comment letter.
- GSW suggests responses to comments reiterate that the TMP is a living document, intended for repeated editing over time as needed. In addition, GSW will agree to revise the TMP in the near-term to reflect a new chapter on the Local Access Plan, and to incorporate UCSF's suggestion (comment letter, page 4) that surveys' scope may be expanded from emergency access to general patient and staff access. No other edits to the GSW TMP are anticipated at this time.

Other items:

- The GSW project involves no plans for an NHL tenant in SF.
- GSW has received confirmation that the California Building Code Appendix M, which outlines regulations for building in Tsunami Hazard Zones, has not been adopted by the City of San Francisco. Compliance is not required for the GSW project.

Thank you,
Kate

**Kate Aufhauser**
Project Analyst
510.986.5419 (office) | 202.230.2642 (cell)
KAufhauser@warriors.com

website | tickets | app | social | find us

**Note: I will be traveling without access to phone or email from Friday, 8/21 to Sunday, 8/30.**

---

**From:** Clarke Miller [mailto:CMiller@stradasf.com]
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 18, 2015 6:54 PM
**To:** Paul Mitchell; Kate Aufhauser; Kern, Chris (CPC)
**Cc:** Bollinger, Brett (CPC); Joyce; Adam Van de Water (adam.vandewater@sfgov.org)
**Subject:** RE: Preliminary Data Request for GSW Final SEIR

Paul,

An update on a number of Info Needs Tasks.

Regarding Info Needs Task No. D, since discussions are still underway with the Port regarding GSW's ability to use the Port's outfall for discharging its treated dewatering flows, it's best to leave the language in the DSEIR unchanged (which provides some flexibility for other outfalls, if necessary).

Please see the attached pdf for truck turning movements in the loading dock (Info Needs Task No. M).

Regarding Info Needs Task No. N, Adam is checking with the Port regarding usage of the Western Pacific site for truck layover. Apparently trucks needed for events at Moscone currently use the Western Pacific site, so it's unlikely to be a problem.

A question regarding Info Needs Task No. A. Can you confirm that the format we produced in June (see attached; this is **NOT** the 'new final') is sufficient for your purposes here? If not, please clarify what additional information is required.

One item I did not see on the Info Task Request List is confirmation of the wastewater flows to the MBSPS vs. Mariposa PS. I should have those numbers by the end of the week.

Thanks,
Clarke

---

**From:** Paul Mitchell [mailto:PMitchell@esassoc.com]
**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2015 5:04 PM
**To:** Clarke Miller; Kate Aufhauser; Kern, Chris (CPC)
**Cc:** Bollinger, Brett (CPC); Joyce
**Subject:** RE: Preliminary Data Request for GSW Final SEIR

All:

Attached is a revised data request, which reassigns Item E to the sponsor to respond to. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions. Thanks.

Paul Mitchell
ESA | Community Development
550 Kearny Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94108
415.896-5900 | 415.896-0332 fax
pmitchell@esassoc.com

---

**From:** Paul Mitchell
**Sent:** Friday, August 14, 2015 6:38 PM
**To:** Clarke Miller; 'Kate Aufhauser'; 'Kern, Chris (CPC)'
**Cc:** 'Bollinger, Brett (CPC)'; Joyce
**Subject:** Preliminary Data Request for GSW Final SEIR

All:

As a followup to our 8/12/15 CEQA meeting, attached is a preliminary data request to help facilitate preparation of the FSEIR. All data request items are assigned to the project sponsor to respond to, with the exception of the row in blue text which is assigned to EP to respond to. As shown, we have identified aggressive due dates. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions. Thanks.

Paul Mitchell
ESA | Community Development
550 Kearny Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94108
415.896-5900 | 415.896-0332 fax
pmitchell@esassoc.com