

To: John Swiecki, AICP, Community Development Director  
City of Brisbane  
50 Park Place, Brisbane, CA. 94005  
Email: eir@ci.brisbane.ca.us

From Cris Hart 223 Mariposa Street Brisbane CA 94005

January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2014

RE: My Comments of the Bayshore Draft EIR of 2014

Dear Mr. Swiecke,

Please accept my comments on the Baylands Draft EIR

### Regarding Section 4 Cultural:

#### **Lazzari Building Eligibility:**

Where is a report that says the tank and boiler shop is not considered eligible for historic listing under HRHP or CRHR criteria? How was this statement arrived at?

Re: page 4-D-7 *"The Lazzari Charcoal Building has not been previously identified on any federal, state, or local registers of historical resources. This warehouse building, while historically associated with the SPRR, does not have sufficient historical or architectural significance to be considered individually eligible for listing under NRHP/CRHR criteria"*

Also see conclusion on 4-D-28 *Conclusion: The Lazzari Charcoal Building is not considered a "historical resource"*

#### **Landscape**

Is the cultural landscape of the Roundhouse and Tank & Boiler Shop(Lazzari) examined as unique landscape examined on own?

Are the roundhouse and Tank and Boiler shop not a cultural landscape on their own?

Why does the Roundhouse not have its own cultural landscape when it has proven cultural and architectural significance?

What exact proof is there that Caltrain alignment is 'substantially modified' (Given existence of historic maps).

RE: 4.D-18 *The double-track rail line now used by Caltrain was also substantially modified from the railroad's original alignment. The removal of the railroad tracks in the late 1980s, as well as the destruction of a definitive majority of the historical structures associated with the railyard following its closure in the 1960s, has eliminated the physical, visual, and spatial features that contributed to and defined the character of the space during its use by the SPRR. The remaining buildings and associated altered landscape are not sufficient to qualify as a potential cultural landscape. Therefore, the Project Site does not appear to constitute a cultural landscape as defined by the National Park Service.*

## **“Roundhouse Circle” Road**

Does the proposed “Roundhouse Circle” road surrounding the roundhouse detract from the cultural significance, sensory experience ? If the roundhouse is a traffic circle without railroad presence how can its designed purpose be shown?

RE: 4-D-27 *Encircling the outside of the existing Roundhouse and the proposed Roundhouse Green would be “Roundhouse Circle,” a new two-lane road.*

## **Landscape Summary**

Does the conclusion that no cultural landscape exists exclude the ability to use development funds from restoring part of a railroad landscape?

RE: 4.D-29 *Conclusion: No cultural landscape exists on the Project Site, and therefore Project Site development would not cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5*

## **Archaeological Resources as yet unfound**

Not listed among archaeological resources are artifacts from the railroad and railroad craftsman including tools, train or locomotive parts that may be uncovered. What provision is there for exploring the site or building interior, buried in pits and reclaiming those artifacts by an appropriate cultural institution for preservation?

RE 4.D-33-34 *Historic-era materials subject to this measure might include in-situ (in place) stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and in-situ deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse.*

Other:

## **Elevation and Sea Level**

Potential sea level rise and the 100 year floods is discussed in several places but I’m not clear if any elevation changes are proposed at the Roundhouse. If there are, has an exemption as a historic structure been investigated to exclude it from any such modification?

*Sorry I do not have a section to reference for this*

## **Water Supply**

Is desalinization plant considered as option to bringing in water from other districts?

*Sorry I do not have a section to reference for this*

End of my comments on the draft EIR. Thank you for your attention.

/s/ Cris Hart January 23, 2014