From:	Dennis Hong
To:	Jones, Sarah (CPC); sarah.jones@sfgov.org
Cc:	Bollinger, Brett (CPC); warriors@afgov.org
Subject:	Case 2014.1441E - Event Center Mixed use DEIR
Date:	Monday, July 27, 2015 1:06:23 PM

San Francisco Planning Department
Atten: Miss. Sarah B. Jones, Environmental Review Officer
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA. 94103

July 20, 2015

Subject: Comments on the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR) Case Number: 2014.1441E – Event Center and Mixed Use Development Mission Bay Blocks 29-32

Good morning Miss. Sarah Jones,

My name is Dennis Hong, I have been a resident and a private citizen residing in San Francisco all my life – Sixty five plus years and currently retired. Thank you the opportunity to review and comment on this exciting Project. I appreciate all the professional work/efforts made by both the OCII and the Planning Department made on this document. I realize that the original scope of work done on this project had changed several times including; a different site, including a number of positive community meetings with the Planning Department, the City, the sponsor (GSW), UCSF and many other stakeholders. In addition, a number of changes have been made (tweaked out) since the publication of the current Draft SEIR – June 5, 2015. To me this shows that progress is being made. As always; communication, collaboration works.

Below you will find my response and comments to this Draft SEIR - as requested by the Planning Department for consideration by the San Francisco Planning Commission, these comments are my personal views. These comments are based on the above Draft SEIR June 5, 2015 – Comment Period – June 5, 2015 to July 20, 2015 (July 27, 2015 @5pm-recently revised).

1. TRAFFIC- I am writing to express my sincere and significant concern with the impact of the additional traffic to this area; both pedestrians and vehicles; both during and after construction. Especially when the project is completed. I have been tracking this project as best as I could. Both the sponsor (GSW) and UCSF have been doing the best possible and with other involved stake holders to resolve some of these issues. This Draft SEIR captures some of that. However, it did not include some of the recent comments and or concessions that came up since it's publication. The recent concerns are mainly with traffic; during and after the games. The possibilities of these issues seem endless. But it looks like all stakeholders are on the same page and are closer than ever to resolving these issues. Most of these issues have been vented, but a compromised plan still needs to be made, the best part is, we are getting there.

2. My main concern is making sure that the traffic issues with pedestrian, vehicle, public transit (Muni, Cal Trains), are worked out with UCSF's master Plan. If the removal of the 280 freeway happens as proposed, it needs to be part of the EIR/plan. Removing this major link and rerouting it under ground as proposed may have a major impact to the project and this area. As I understand it a tunnel would be under Third street which happens to be land fill.

3. Under Cumulative Projects 5.1.5.2, were the following projects considered? HOPE, possible removal of the 280 freeway, Giants Project-Pier 70, 590 Minnesota-UCSF proposed Student Housing and 600 Minnesota-UCSF proposed Student Housing? Several of these Projects may be identified as another name – specifically the HOPE Project. For clarity purposes, could all of these cumulative projects be shown on a map, similar to fig 5-2-12?

4. I realize that the control of Fugitive Dust and construction work is hard to handle. All to often the "best practices" does not work. But with all this work going on how will it affect/impact the ongoing adjacent projects, UCSF's adjacent facilities and their daily operations? The current project at Union Square, Central Subway Station is doing a better than usual job in controlling the dust from entering these high-end retail shops. This includes the California Pacific Medical Center along the Van Ness Corridor. (Use of semi- closed barriers with mesh screens). This may be an better option than some of the best practices.

5. The Draft SEIR does a good job trying to identify the Traffic issues. However, as I mentioned above, since it's publication additional thoughts from the community, MTA, UCSF and others came up are good, these comments should be part of the RTC / Final EIR. All stakeholders have done a relatively good job here. Most importantly the new Arena Facility needs to work with UCSF's Master Plan.

6. More on traffic:

a. During the Events at the arena, add a MUNI shuttle/service to and from the two BART stations 16th and 24th Mission Street to the arena.
b. Provide additional traffic control officers before and after the events.
c. Possibly use other near by garages for additional parking.
d. Restrict traffic along some of the main streets during the events for a smother flow of traffic.
e. During game/event time, work with Caltrans and the city to use a electronic freeway/street type of sign to help direct the traffic before they get in to the Mission Bay area,
these events. They are doing this now when freeway sections and the bridge/s close and it works fine.
f. Consider closing off some of the streets for emergency only access to the hospitals.

7. Aesthetics of the project, both the sponsor and the architects have done an wonderful job. However, I do disagree with some of the comments made on the describing the Area. The use of color Photo-simulations has done an excellent job in showing what this arena may look like. As the design, color and material could have an impact on the visual skyline. I also realize CEQA does not require this step.

8. The new Arena will be an economic boom to both the city and local business, including UCSF, the Dogpatch area and others in the South Eastern part of town.

9.The proposed location is in an ideal part of town. The Sponsor has already done a diligent job in selecting this new site from the original Pier 30-32 which was voted down.

10. Include any other comments made to the (RTC) Response to Comments made during any of the public Planning Commission meetings, i.e., Planning Commission hearing
held on June 30, 2015.

11. Construction Phase, request that the Final EIR provide time lines of this Project.

a. A construction time line showing all ongoing/current, cumulatively or upcoming projects in the vicinity of this project must be considered.
b. Provide the following for controls, signs and etc., for pedestrians and traffic during the construction; traffic control officers, signs, control barriers, etc.
c.Communicate with the local merchants, residences in the area of the dates, construction schedules. Especially if certain streets will be closed. A contact
i.e., Project Manager to call if needed.
d. Provide provisions for dust controls, safety barriers and control signs.
e.Can the use of dust barriers be used to control the dust from getting in to the restaurants, business and residences and the hospital?
f.Can any of the recent/current legislation under consideration (regarding construction dust) be used here? I believe there was something the Board of Supervisors were looking
at on this matter.

12. Will this plan include some of Muni's "Traffic Calming" measures such as some of the intersections along Market Street? This might be a great project to include some of these concept along Market and the Van Ness Corridor.

13. It would be a true shame if the sponsor should abandon this Project. Lets not loose this opportunity of a life time.

In Conclusion: Based on my comments and evaluation of this Draft SEIR, case 2014.1441E of June 5, 2015; I have concluded there is sufficient information and I fully support this Project and this Draft SEIR. With all that said; a little more work needs to be done with communicating and working on the traffic issues, especially how this will or will not impact the Hospitals operations.

If any additional information could be provided in the final Report (RTC), it would be appreciated by the many stakeholders who are personally interested in this project.

Thanks to you, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII), the Planning Department, the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission and the Mayors Office for working so hard on this project. I would like to see the process expedited so that construction can start.

Incidentally, I have also been working, I believe with UCSF's most recent Final-UCSF's Long range plan of – November 2014-State Clearing House Number 2013092047, chapter 5.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments as part of the DEIRIS and the process.
Should you have any questions regarding this email/letter, please do not hesitate to contact me at dennisj.gov88@yahoo.com.

Please: If there are any compelling reasons why you think this project should not continue or be delayed, I would be interested to understand why.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dennis Hong

Cc: B. Bollinger
T. Bohee