

---

**From:** Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 25, 2018 5:46 PM  
**To:** Shaw, Jeremy (CPC)  
**Cc:** Brian Schuster  
**Subject:** RE: updated construction phasing Balboa Res  
**Attachments:** diagram markup\_sy both options.pdf

Jeremy,

Let's plan to use my conference call in number:

**Dial In: 1-844-621-3956 ; Access Code: 805 988 530**

I'll send over an appointment as a placeholder. Also attached are marked up diagrams to accompany the spreadsheet. Note that the EIR diagrams will not include shapes of buildings (this was one of the only drawings available to markup). We will keep it at a higher level of detail and only show the general block outline as in the NOP.

---

**From:** Shaw, Jeremy (CPC) <jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 25, 2018 5:25 PM  
**To:** Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>; Brian Schuster <BSchuster@esassoc.com>  
**Cc:** Joe Kirchofer <Joe\_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com>  
**Subject:** RE: updated construction phasing Balboa Res

Hi Susan,

I am out of the office tomorrow and may be beyond cell range. If my phone works, I will confirm via email in the morning and would ask that you pencil in a call at 2:15. What number should I call?

Thanks,  
Jeremy

**JEREMY SHAW** | *Senior Planner* | SF PLANNING | 415.575.9135

---

**From:** Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 25, 2018 5:21 PM  
**To:** Shaw, Jeremy (CPC) <jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org>; Brian Schuster <BSchuster@esassoc.com>  
**Cc:** Joe Kirchofer <Joe\_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com>  
**Subject:** RE: updated construction phasing Balboa Res

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Jeremy,

How about you, me, and Brian get on the phone tomorrow? It looks like Brian and I are open tomorrow during these times: 11-noon, 2-3 p.m., and 4-5 p.m. Let me know if you're free during those times. I think we'll just need 15-20 min to discuss and resolve remaining questions to keep things moving.

---

**From:** Shaw, Jeremy (CPC) <jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 25, 2018 4:35 PM

**To:** Brian Schuster <[BSchuster@esassoc.com](mailto:BSchuster@esassoc.com)>  
**Cc:** Susan Yogi <[SYogi@esassoc.com](mailto:SYogi@esassoc.com)>; Joe Kirchofer <[Joe\\_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com](mailto:Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com)>  
**Subject:** FW: updated construction phasing Balboa Res

Brian and Susan,

Did you ever connect with Joel on the previous assumptions? It may make sense for the 3 of us to get on a brief phone call.

With respect to the new options, the ultimate designs are still being worked out, as the team is still in discussion with our urban design team. But I think there are ways to keep the environmental analysis moving. I would like to discuss on the phone what we must know now to keep the process moving. In the meantime, below are some preliminary answers to your questions, if the block layout stays similar to the most recent design updates.

Thanks  
Jeremy

---

**From:** Brian Schuster <[BSchuster@esassoc.com](mailto:BSchuster@esassoc.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 23, 2018 3:16 PM  
**To:** Susan Yogi <[SYogi@esassoc.com](mailto:SYogi@esassoc.com)>; Joe Kirchofer <[Joe\\_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com](mailto:Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com)>; Shaw, Jeremy (CPC) <[jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: updated construction phasing Balboa Res

Jeremy,

I'm hoping we can figure out some reasonable assumptions for construction activity for the City's 1,550 project option. Here is what Susan and I had in mind.

- Move blocks K, L, M, and N (developer block TH) to Phase 1 so that the geographic areas of phasing are the same for both options (is there a reason why these blocks were put in phase 2?) AGREED
- Keep block J (developer block H) in Phase 2; same rationale as above. AGREED
- Assume same amount of export (56,000 CY) and truck trips (2,820) as developer's option, unless there is reason to believe there would be less excavation and soil export (e.g. for a smaller parking garage) AGREED. I do not know the rationale behind the assumption that soil excavation is equal in the options with or without the garage. Did you connect with Joel about this?
- Assume the same construction schedule If the last schedules were conservative enough for both options, as we discussed with Joel, then I feel comfortable saying the same again. Otherwise, I would leave that to Joel or ESA's opinion, using the method applied previously.
- Scale the number of equipment pieces (or hours/day) by the number of units / square feet for each building.
  - For example, Building C in phase 1 has 1.6x more units and 1.3x more square footage, so we would scale up the number (or hours) of construction equipment by 1.3-1.6.
  - As another example, Building B in phase 2 has 2.1x more units and 1.9x more square footage, so we would scale up the number (or hours) of construction equipment by 1.9-2.1.

This is not my expertise. Considering the level of precision at play, please hold off on making assumptions about building size until further discussion with the urban design team have taken place. Otherwise, I would leave the method to Joel or ESA's opinion.

Please let us know what you think.

Thanks,  
Brian

Brian Schuster  
Air Quality and Climate Change Specialist  
ESA | Environmental Science Associates  
550 Kearny Street, Suite 800  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
415.896.5900 main | 415.896.0332 fax  
415.262.2308 direct | 650.868.8913 cell

[bschuster@esassoc.com](mailto:bschuster@esassoc.com) | [www.esassoc.com](http://www.esassoc.com)

Follow us on [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

---

**From:** Susan Yogi  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 23, 2018 12:07 PM  
**To:** Joe Kirchofer <[Joe\\_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com](mailto:Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com)>; Shaw, Jeremy (CPC) <[jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** Brian Schuster <[BSchuster@esassoc.com](mailto:BSchuster@esassoc.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: updated construction phasing Balboa Res

..and here's the spreadsheet referenced in my email.

I'm not available most of this afternoon, but looping in Brian if he can provide any direction or answer questions.

**Brian** – we just had our weekly team call. Jeremy is essentially the project sponsor for the City's 1,550 project option. He is going to look at the 1,550 construction info and help come up with assumptions if possible. I think we'll just need to have a conservative set of assumptions for the 1,550 in order to move forward.

---

**From:** Joe Kirchofer <[Joe\\_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com](mailto:Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 23, 2018 11:37 AM  
**To:** Shaw, Jeremy (CPC) <[jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org)>; Susan Yogi <[SYogi@esassoc.com](mailto:SYogi@esassoc.com)>  
**Subject:** FW: updated construction phasing Balboa Res

---

**From:** Susan Yogi [<mailto:SYogi@esassoc.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 22, 2018 11:50 AM  
**To:** Joel Roos <[joelr@pudco.com](mailto:joelr@pudco.com)>; Brian Schuster <[BSchuster@esassoc.com](mailto:BSchuster@esassoc.com)>  
**Cc:** Joe Kirchofer <[Joe\\_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com](mailto:Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com)>; Nora Collins <[Nora\\_Collins@avalonbay.com](mailto:Nora_Collins@avalonbay.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: updated construction phasing Balboa Res

Thanks Joel!

- The construction equipment quantities look identical between the two options. Wouldn't there need to be an increase in construction equipment quantity and/or longer operational hours for the vertical construction to maintain the same schedule? Our notes show that we will go with the default average of 8 hrs/day for construction equipment operation for the 1,100 unit option. Perhaps your contractor can weigh in on whether

there's an assumption for a % increase in magnitude for the equipment and/or operational hours for the 1,550 option?

- Our understanding is that since the 1,550 option would *not* include a below-grade public parking garage as proposed under the 1,100 option, less excavation would be required. The spreadsheet still shows 57,000 CY of off haul for the 1,550 unit option. Wouldn't there be less off haul under the higher density option?
- The spreadsheet shows that Blocks J, K, L, M, N would be constructed in Phase 2 for the 1,550 option. The geographic areas of Blocks K, L, M, and N areas are part of Phase 1 under the 1,100 option (see attached – it's based on the old block numbering but you'll see what I mean). Is there a reason Blocks K through N can't be assumed as part of Phase 1? If there are differences in the phasing schemes, then our source/receptor modeling for the 1,100 option would not be accurate for the 1,550 option.

The point is to capture differences in the construction schedule and/or intensity for the project options in the analysis. We want to make sure this is all correct before Brian's team gets started.

---

**From:** Joel Roos <[joelr@pudco.com](mailto:joelr@pudco.com)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 21, 2018 1:28 PM  
**To:** Susan Yogi <[SYogi@esassoc.com](mailto:SYogi@esassoc.com)>; Brian Schuster <[BSchuster@esassoc.com](mailto:BSchuster@esassoc.com)>  
**Cc:** 'Joe Kirchofer ([Joe\\_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com](mailto:Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com))' <[Joe\\_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com](mailto:Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com)>; [Nora\\_Collins@avalonbay.com](mailto:Nora_Collins@avalonbay.com)  
**Subject:** updated construction phasing Balboa Res

Susan and Brian,

This construction schedule now includes a tab for 1548 units.

It should be noted that the City Variant does not add up to the 1550...it adds up to 1548.

The paving has now been calculated and the recycling plant has been input. Note, we are showing 3 months of operations on the recycling plant whereas AB believes that it is closer to 7 weeks. We erred on the conservative side.

Please also note, with regard to the 1550 variant, we have not made any adjustments to the parking count, except for the alignment of the Townhouses 1:1.

Best,

Joel  
NOTICE: This message, including any attachments, is proprietary to AvalonBay Communities, Inc., intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information designated as internal use, confidential, and/or attorney-client privileged work product doctrine information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this message are prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please destroy it and notify the sender immediately.