From:	Kate Aufhauser
To:	Paul Mitchell
Cc:	Reilly, Catherine (CII); Clarke Miller; Bollinger, Brett (CPC); Joyce; Clarke Miller
Subject:	RE: Information Request for SEIR Project Description
Date:	Tuesday, January 13, 2015 5:29:42 PM
Attachments:	image003.png

Paul –
Please find answers below in **bold.**
Thanks,
Kate

Kate Aufhauser
Project Analyst
510.986.5419 (office) | 202.230.2642 (cell)
kaufhauser@warriors.com
WARRIORS
website | tickets | app | social | find us
SBJ's 2014 Sports Team of the Year

From: Paul Mitchell [mailto:PMitchell@esassoc.com]
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 5:44 PM
To: Kate Aufhauser
Cc: Reilly, Catherine (CII; Clarke Miller; Bollinger, Brett (CPC); Joyce; Clarke Miller
Subject: Information Request for SEIR Project Description

Kate:

Below are comments received from OCII/Planning staff on the administrative draft Project Description that will require a response/information from the sponsor. Since we are submitting the revised Project Description as part of the administrative draft SEIR, responses you provide by January 20, 2014 can be included in the revised Project Description we will submit to the City.

- **Building Heights:** Catherine Reilly commented on the administrative draft SEIR Project Description questioning how building heights should be presented in the SEIR, and indicated that OCII usually measures heights of buildings from the sidewalk. Currently, it is stated in the Initial Study and administrative draft SEIR Project Description that building heights are measured from the San Francisco datum. I think we can continue to use reference to the SF datum when discussing the existing site elevation. However, Catherine's recommendation of measuring proposed building heights from the sidewalk may be appropriate as you wouldn't need to account for the incremental distance between curb and the SF datum when measuring the building heights. Catherine's recommendation raises a new issue however, of needing to accurately calculate building heights from a sloped site (I believe Blocks 29-32 varies by about 2 feet between the east and west sides). The *Mission Bay South D for D* document defines building heights as being measured from finished grade, with stipulations for accounting for slope, as follows:.

*"**Building Height:** Building height is the vertical distance between finished grade and the top of a building. The allowable height of a building is specified by the Height Zone in which the building is located. Building top is defined as the top of the finished roof in the case of a flat roof, and the average height of the rise in the case of a pitched or stepped roof (See Figs. 7 & 8 on p.21). On a sloping site, this measurement is taken at the median grade height for each building face. Total building height is calculated by determining the average height of all individual building faces. Exemptions to building height include:*

- *Mechanical equipment and appurtenances necessary to the operation or maintenance of the building.*
- *Enclosed space related to the recreational and/or community use of the roof, not to exceed 20 feet in height above the roof level.*
- *Ornamental and symbolic features of buildings, including towers, spires, cupolas, domes, where such features are not used for human occupancy"*

ESA is requesting that the sponsor to please coordinate with OCII to reach consensus for how all Warriors site/elevation plans that identify building heights will be presented in the SEIR (including accounting for slope), after which you can provide all future graphics for inclusion in the SEIR in accordance with that direction, and we can revise the administrative draft SEIR Project Description accordingly (tables, figures, text). Please let me know if this approach is agreeable to you.

We have been using SF City Datum for three primary reasons:

1) **It matches the proposed future elevation of TFB**
2) **Its neat relationship to the Mission Bay datum has been helpful to our Civil and Geotech engineers.**
3) **Determining elevation values at the Piers, which was also a sloped site, proved complex and confusing for the CEQA and design teams (I recall we required several meetings, and a few weeks, to resolve). We'd prefer to avoid a switch now that could produce the same issues.**

If Catherine does not object, it is our preference to stick with measurements from the SF Datum. If that suits, it would require no changes to tables/figures/text/graphics.

- **Bird Safe Design Measures:** Chris Kern has requested the sponsor describe specific bird-safe design elements proposed to reduce the potential effects of the proposed buildings, signage and lighting on birds.

  FYI, in reviewing the prior Project Description for Piers 30-32, the discussion of bird safe design measures was limited to an acknowledgement of the proposed use of fritted glass to reduce the potential risk of bird strikes – we assume this is also applicable to the Mission Bay site **[yes, correct]**.

  If available, are there any other specific measures your engineer/architects may be able to identify to reduce the potential effects of the proposed buildings, signage and lighting on birds? **I conferred with our design team on this. GSW and OCII have not yet begun discussions about building façade materials, signage, or lighting, so we have no further detail to provide at this time.**

- **<u>Soil-Cement Cut off Wall</u>.** In the administrative draft Project Description, under Construction, we make reference to the a soil-cement cut off wall (based on information from your engineer). Can you please explain what this feature consists of (dimensions, materials, etc.) and its proposed use**. I have reached out to our engineers for detail and will forward the reply when available.**

Thanks, and please call with any questions.

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