From:	Paul Mitchell
To:	Kern, Christopher (CPC); Bollinger, Brett (CPC)
Subject:	FW: GSW - UCSF Comments - Helicopter
Date:	Monday, March 23, 2015 3:50:16 PM
Attachments:	GSW Helicopter Flight Path with Crane radius.pdf GSW Helicopter Flight Path with Crane radius - overall.pdf 3rd and 16th view with Heli flightpath.pdf TFB view with Heli flightpath.pdf Mission Bay Helicopter Flight Paths 2014_rev 5-13-14.pdf Map of Flight Paths.pdf UCSF Heliport Layout Plan 2013-09-09.pdf

---

Chris and Brett: As a followup to my last email, below and attached are what Clarke sent us last Wednesday. The first three pdfs are the results of their analysis.

-Paul

From: Clarke Miller
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2015 5:20 PM
To: Paul Mitchell; lubaw@lcwconsulting.com
Cc: Jose Farran; Joyce; Kate Aufhauser; Mary Murphy (MGMurphy@gibsondunn.com); 'Sekhri, Neil (NSekhri@gibsondunn.com)'
Subject: RE: GSW - UCSF Comments - Helicopter

All,

Here are the diagrams that our general contractor produced which illustrate that neither the building heights (with penthouse mechanical areas) nor the cranes interfere with the flight path info that was provided to us by UCSF. As you can tell, the analysis is not well polished, but it does illustrate there's sufficient buffer in all cases. Given that the project will need to comply with FAA regulations and therefore have appropriate building-top and crane-top hazard lighting, do we need to otherwise submit an official analysis for CEQA? We could share these results directly with UCSF and engage them in a conversation on how the project will not create an interference issue as an alternate route.

I've copied Mary and Neil in the event they want to chime in on the appropriate approach here.

I've also attached three pdfs that UCSF initially gave to us on flight paths and trajectories.

Clarke

From: Paul Mitchell [mailto:PMitchell@esassoc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2015 5:09 PM
To: lubaw@lcwconsulting.com
Cc: Jose Farran; Joyce; Kate Aufhauser; Clarke Miller
Subject: RE: GSW - UCSF Comments - Helicopter

Luba:

One of the items the sponsor will be providing us will be the results of a preliminary review they conducted of applicable regs (e.g., FAA) when considering compatibility of the proposed use of

tower cranes at the project site with the UCSF helipad. Perhaps we can discuss what if any additional discussion may be needed after we receive that information.

Thanks.

-Paul

From: lubaw@lcwconsulting.com [mailto:lubaw@lcwconsulting.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2015 5:03 PM
To: Kate Aufhauser; Clarke Miller
Cc: Jose Farran; Joyce; Paul Mitchell
Subject: GSW - UCSF Comments - Helicopter

HI Kate and Clarke
We have initiated review of the UCSF comments on the transportation section. Comment #47 - attached - requires information from the project sponsor regarding how the construction of the project (i.e., cranes and boons), as well as the operation of the three buildings would not conflict with the approved flight paths for the UCSF helicopter service. We do not have the expertise to conduct this analysis, nor the background on how the project was designed to take the flight paths into account. Hopefully the architects have already worked this out.
Thank you,
Luba