



**PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
AND OTHER PUBLIC PLANNING PROCESSES**

**REGARDING THE  
BRISBANE BAYLANDS  
AND RELATED PROJECTS**

Candlestick Preservation Association  
December 2013

## Preface

This document contains public Comments for the Baylands area Draft Environmental Impact Report and subsequent planning processes. These Comments apply to the Baylands Project, the Recology expansion, as well as successor and related projects in Brisbane and San Francisco.

We are excited by the potential of the Baylands developments. The Baylands is one of the largest undeveloped urban waterfront sites presently available in the Country. This site could become a paragon of universally beneficial public and private waterfront cooperation. It could create a new standard for development on the Peninsula, embrace and foster the natural resources and recreational activities in the vicinity, and provide a multitude of lifestyle and income benefits for the surrounding communities.

This development could break the trend of “suburban blight” and sterile business park ghost towns that predominate the Peninsula waterfront. To accomplish this, it will not be enough to simply intersperse token green spaces and mixed-use elements as an after-thought. The Project should place public waterfront enjoyment, preservation, and amenities at the core of the development.

Countless examples show that real public lifestyle benefits improve real estate values, city revenues, business incomes, and the quality of life for residents and visitors alike.

These Comments generally refer to any Project in and around the Baylands and vicinity of Candlestick Point State Recreation Area. The intent is that they will be applied where appropriate for specific projects and process stage. It is prohibitively costly to produce separate sets of comments for each stage of each project, especially when the comments will be substantially the same.

These Comments are separated into three parts:

- Part I explores Baylands development alternatives and benefits of general waterfront preservation relative to the status quo of waterfront development on the Peninsula and San Francisco
- Part II examines potential impact of the proposed Project on the recreational windsurfing Resource at Candlestick Point State Recreation Area as well as ways in which the Resource can be preserved
- Part III distinguishes these Comments from those for which the Master Response for the 300 Airport Boulevard project was prepared, a project that underwent a similar wind impact analysis

The general public who participate in planning and entitlement processes often do not have access to funding or resources available to public agencies and private project sponsors. Public participation in these processes is long, complicated, expensive, and usually entirely volunteer-based.

We have faith that the various agencies, officers, representatives, and the general public will receive these Comments with deference to these challenges to public involvement. It is our hope that the spirit and intent of these Comments will prevail over any discrepant details or technical omissions.

We urge all who read these Comments to consider the seriousness of underestimating risks to surrounding natural resources. A margin-of-error in favor of preservation at this stage has been shown time and time again to be one of the best investments a community can make for both public and private long-term interests.

It is always possible to loosen preservation restrictions later but practically impossible to reclaim natural resources once lost.

Capitalized words and phrases are defined in Appendix A. All geographic measurements herein are as accurate as possible but are approximate.

# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Part I: A Call for Real Leadership in Waterfront Development</b>	
<b>1 A Broad View of Peninsula Waterfront Development</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Sterile Business Park Ghost Towns . . . . .	5
1.2 Overdeveloped Commodity . . . . .	6
1.3 Drawbacks of Dependence on Income Benefits . . . . .	7
1.4 Effect on Downtown . . . . .	7
1.5 Effect on Sierra Point . . . . .	8
1.6 Other Options . . . . .	8
<b>2 Lessons from the Past</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Preventing “Manhattanization” . . . . .	9
2.2 Preservation Key to Thriving Success . . . . .	10
<b>3 New Waterfront Development Competitive Pressure</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4 Imagining the Possibilities</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1 Immediate Benefits to All . . . . .	14
4.2 Real Economic Benefits . . . . .	14
<b>5 Alternatives for the Brisbane Baylands</b>	<b>17</b>
5.1 Available Area . . . . .	17
5.2 The Only Realistic Option . . . . .	17
5.3 Phasing Public Space Development . . . . .	17
5.4 Consider the Alternative . . . . .	18
<b>Part II: Windsurfing Importance, Impact, and Preservation</b>	
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>21</b>
1.1 Embrace Natural Resources . . . . .	21
1.2 Unique, Valuable, and Scarce Resource . . . . .	21
1.3 Unrealistic and Incomplete Thresholds, Assumptions, and Methods . . . . .	22
1.4 Goal of Comments . . . . .	23
<b>2 Methodology and Assumption Deficiencies</b>	<b>25</b>
2.1 Comparing the Project to 300 Airport Boulevard . . . . .	25
2.2 Inaccurate Impact Area . . . . .	27
2.3 Sparse and Incomplete Measurement of Potential Project Impacts . . . . .	30
2.4 Vague and Arbitrary Modeling Assumptions . . . . .	33
<b>3 Improper Determination of Potential Impact Significance</b>	<b>43</b>
3.1 Arbitrary and Inappropriate Threshold of Significance . . . . .	43
3.2 Impacts Projected Using an Appropriate Measure . . . . .	46
3.3 Significance of Resource Availability Impact . . . . .	51
<b>4 Windsurfing Sensitivity to Development</b>	<b>53</b>
4.1 Special Risk to Off-Shore Wind Sites . . . . .	53
4.2 Importance of the Bay Area to Windsurfing in the United States . . . . .	54
4.3 Importance of CPSRA to Windsurfing in the Bay Area . . . . .	54

<b>5</b>	<b>Recommended Mitigation for Potential Project Impacts</b>	<b>57</b>
5.1	Site-Specific Final Wind Analysis Studies . . . . .	57
5.2	Alemany Gap Wind Flow . . . . .	57
5.3	Architectural Requirements . . . . .	59
5.4	Use Limitations . . . . .	61
5.5	Funding for Monitoring, Testing, and Enforcement . . . . .	63
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Part III: Addressing Master Response of 300 Airport Boulevard Project Final EIR</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>Adequacy of the Significance Threshold</b>	<b>76</b>
1.1	Threshold Did Not Follow CEQA Adoption Process or Meet Requirements . . . . .	76
1.2	Wind Turbulence Component Arbitrarily Dismissed . . . . .	76
1.3	Absolute Required Operating Conditions Not Identified . . . . .	76
1.4	Evidence of “No Impact” Does Not Consider Substantial Resource Area . . . . .	77
<b>2</b>	<b>Adequacy of the Wind Study and Evaluation of Turbulence</b>	<b>78</b>
2.1	Baseline Wind Data . . . . .	78
2.2	Applicability of Wind Study Results to Range of Wind Speeds . . . . .	78
2.3	Measurements of Wind Direction and Turbulence . . . . .	79
2.4	Gusts or Gustiness . . . . .	79
	<b>References</b>	<b>80</b>
	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>82</b>
A	Definitions of capitalized words and phrases . . . . .	82
B	Lull, mean, and gust wind speed reduction impact analysis . . . . .	83
C	Mean wind speed reduction impact analysis . . . . .	85
D	Wind turbulence intensity increase impact analysis . . . . .	87
E	Predicted wind lulls and gusts due to wind turbulence intensity . . . . .	89
F	Background on the DEIR Process . . . . .	92
G	Definitions of technical symbols and terms . . . . .	93
H	Selected formulas . . . . .	94
I	Miscellaneous . . . . .	95