

300 Channel Street, #10
San Francisco, CA 94158-1520
Email: corinnewoods@cs.com

July 27, 2015

Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director, OCII tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org
C/o Brett Bollinger, SF Planning Dept. warriors@sfgov.org
Via e-mail

Re: GSW Event Center DSEIR OCII Case No. ER2014-919-97
Planning Department Case No. 2014.1441E

Dear Tiffany,

I have questions about the adequacy and accuracy of the DSEIR for the Golden State Warriors Arena project in Mission Bay South Blocks 29-32.

Transportation and Circulation, SEIR Section 5.2

Impact TR-1. While the SEIR states that the project would not result in construction-related ground transportation impacts because of their temporary and limited duration, the use of Terry Francois Boulevard for construction staging will have a significant impact on traffic flow to and from AT&T ballpark parking lots. Improvement Measure 1-TR-1 needs to be stronger. Where suggested mitigations “could” be required, the word should be changed to “shall”, and enforcement must be incorporated in the plans. When there are events at AT&T Park, Terry Francois Boulevard needs to be vacated by construction staging and equipment to allow clear traffic flow, as is done by Mission Bay infrastructure developers to clear roads on event days to allow free traffic flow.

Impact TR-2 and TR-3. While parking in and of itself is not considered a significant environmental impact (based on SB743), the traffic caused by searching for (acknowledged inadequate) parking, or drop-off/pick-ups around the Arena, will create a significant and unavoidable impact, even with mitigation. If this neighborhood is to survive the impact of the arena in addition to the already unacceptable conditions that result from ballpark events, there needs to be effective mitigation of the unavoidable impacts. The SEIR suggests mitigation strategies that “could” be implemented “if feasible”, but there are no teeth in the recommendations. Mitigation measures must be specific and enforceable through permits, conditions, agreements or other measures. Mitigations contingent upon further (required) discretionary approvals may not be enforceable, and cannot be deferred. The SEIR mitigation strategies need to be tightened up so that “could” becomes “shall”, and the necessary mitigations are stated as conditions of project approval.

Creation of a Transportation Management Plan and coordination and implementation of the TMP demand oversight and authority to enforce and if necessary, amend the plans to respond to “lessons learned”, conflicts and changing conditions. While the Ballpark/Mission Bay Transportation Coordinating Committee (see Mitigation Measure M-TR-11b) has been helpful in both interagency coordination of traffic and transportation impacts of the ballpark and expression of neighborhood issues, the BMBTCC has no official authority or standing to enforce or amend plans, or ensure adequate funding for required mitigations. The OCII is in no position to become an enforcing agency, and leaving

implementation to “the City” is too vague – there’s no authority or accountability. The SEIR should clearly designate a responsible authority to enforce, amend and access funding for mitigations.

It has been our experience that adequate funding and oversight of mitigations, and flexibility to amend the plan, is the key to success. While the project sponsors are supposed to be drafting a Special Reserve Account to set aside the operational costs of the impacts of the arena, there needs to be a specific and enforceable reference in the SEIR that funding of mitigations will be dedicated for the life of the plan and not subject to the vagaries of City General Fund budget cycles.

Impact TR-6, TR-21, TR-22 While the SEIR addresses active management of pedestrian flows, it needs to be tied to priority for transit. Pedestrians need to be controlled so that transit vehicles have priority over vehicles exiting garages and pedestrian movement.

The most important mitigation for traffic congestion is to reduce the number of private passenger vehicles attempting to access the arena through Mission Bay’s limited and congested street network. It is important that the SEIR require off-site parking, shuttle access to off-site parking, link ticket sales to off-site parking or transportation alternatives, create smart phone or other electronic links to available parking (including reactivation of SFPark), and actively discourage private passenger vehicle access to the Mission Bay neighborhood by providing better transit service. The assumption that UCSF or Alexandria (ARE) parking garages or private parking lots in Mission Bay will be available for Arena patrons is faulty. This incorrect assumption, which inaccurately overstates available parking in the neighborhood, makes it even more critical to discourage “at will” attempts by arena patrons to drive and hope to find parking or the congestion caused by ride-hailing services (TNC’s).

As an active participant in the development of Mission Bay, Chair of the Mission Bay Citizens Advisory Committee, 30 year resident of the neighborhood, and MBCAC representative to the B/MBTCC, I am very concerned that resources for mitigations are overestimated, enforcement and funding are underestimated, and authority and responsibility for implementation of mitigations is vague and unenforceable as expressed in the SEIR. Some of the proposed mitigations in the Mission Bay SEIR still haven’t been implemented, and without specific designated authority and responsibility for implementation, there is no assurance that important mitigations for the impacts of the GSW Arena will actually occur or be maintained.

Sincerely yours,

Corinne W. Woods