

**From:** Springer, Matt <[Matt.Springer@ucsf.edu](mailto:Matt.Springer@ucsf.edu)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 16, 2015 6:54 PM  
**To:** Warriors, PLN (CPC)  
**Subject:** comments on Warriors arena draft SEIR

Dear Ms. Bohee,

I would like to submit the following comments regarding the DSEIR for the Warriors arena in Mission Bay. For disclosure, I am a Mission Bay resident, I am on the Board of the South Beach / Rincon / Mission Bay Neighborhood Association, and I am a UCSF professor. My comments do not necessarily reflect the views of the Neighborhood Association nor UCSF; they are my own.

1) Use of third-party parking structures: In Figure 5-2 in the Transportation Management Plan, it appears that several UCSF or residential parking structures are being provided as examples of where fans might park. A note in accompanying text states that the figure does not reflect actual third-party agreements, but residential parking garages should not be used for fan parking, and while perhaps the UCSF parking garage closest to the arena could potentially be incorporated into a deal of some sort with the university, the parking structure on the other side of campus in the Rutter Center should not be used as a preferred fan parking structure because that would result in a horde of fans, sometimes drunken fans, pouring through the campus. This is not acceptable at any time of day, as the research mission of the university is not confined to business hours.

2) Page 5.2-68 states that preferred performance standards include that "event traffic does not block access to the UCSF emergency room entrance for emergency vehicles or patients on Mariposa Street between I-280 and Third Street" and says "In the event that ongoing monitoring shows at any time that the performance standards outlines above are not being met,..." It is crucial that lack of blocking of patient access to the UCSF hospital will never be a performance standard that isn't being met. That is, monitoring of the blocking of access to the hospital to identify a problem is not sufficient; rather, monitoring should be in place to prevent that from ever occurring and to actively control event traffic to allow patient access at all times.

3) The funding must be guaranteed for the mitigations outlined in the SEIR. Whether it comes from the City or the Warriors, the mitigations must not be reliant on there being sufficient funds; those funds should be identified and secured before the project is approved, or else the EIR is irrelevant.

4) Egress from Mission Bay South to the west occurs via the traffic circle and via 16th/Mariposa corridors. The arena attendees will be encouraged to use the 16th and Mariposa corridors or to exit to the north, but I suggest that they be actively diverted away from Mission Bay Blvd. MB Blvd doesn't show up as a preferred route but it is hard to interpret from the maps whether the traffic will be kept away from it. The residents of Mission Bay South, and those of Mission Bay North via the west end of Berry St, will rely on the traffic circle to be able to get in and out of their homes during pre- and post-event times. If arena traffic is pouring westward through the

traffic circle, the residents will be trapped in Mission Bay or prevented from reaching it, especially as the Caltrains come through. The traffic circle should be reserved for non-event traffic. Please note that from my experience on Berry St before the west end was completed through Mission Bay Drive to 7th St, we were trapped on Berry whenever there was pre- or post-AT&T Park traffic, and we had to plan to not leave home or come home during those times via car or transit. If the traffic circle becomes held hostage to event traffic as well, then everyone in Mission Bay will experience unacceptable access limitations to their homes.

Respectfully submitted,

~~~~~  
Matthew L. Springer  
[matt.springer@ucsf.edu](mailto:matt.springer@ucsf.edu)  
(415) 369-9295 (Home)  
(415) 502-8404 (Work)  
(415) 218-5155 (Cell)  
<http://www.matthewlspringer.com>