

Mission Bay in the News: Press Releases and Related Coverage

April – November 2015

Table of Contents

Press Releases and Significant Related Coverage

1. Big-time opposition emerges to Warriors' arena plan: *San Francisco Chronicle*, 4/30/15
2. UCSF Stakeholders Mount Opposition to Flawed Warriors Mission Bay Stadium Plan: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 4/29/15
 - a. Group 'comes out of nowhere' to try to block Warriors' Mission Bay arena: *San Francisco Business Times*, 4/29/15
3. Warriors' Claim of No Traffic, Parking Impact "Simply Not Believable," say Foes of Proposed Mission Bay Arena and Event Center: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 4/30/15
 - a. Anonymous alliance is out to kill Warriors arena: *San Francisco Chronicle*, 5/1/15
 - b. Bag arena plan, opposition leader tells Warriors and city, or face long battle: *San Francisco Business Times*, 5/1/15
4. Mission Bay Alliance Demands City Address Environmental Impacts of New Giants' Development in Review of Warriors Arena: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 5/5/15
5. Mission Bay Alliance Files Records Request with SF Over Warriors Arena Plan: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 5/20/15
 - a. Mayor Ed Lee announces new Mission Bay Project to house homeless veterans: *KRON*, 5/22/15
 - b. Opponents of Warriors arena prepare to battle impact findings: *San Francisco Chronicle*, 5/29/15
6. Mission Bay Alliance Hires Top Legal Team to Review Golden State Warriors' Arena Plan: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 6/1/15
 - a. Legal Team Announced to Challenge Golden State Warriors San Francisco Arena, Real Estate Development: *San Francisco Sentinel*, 6/2/15
 - b. Petition by community groups favoring Warriors arena in Mission Bay reaches 3,000 signatures: *The San Francisco Examiner*, 6/2/15
7. Mission Bay Alliance Legal Team Will Review Golden State Warriors' Arena EIR Plan: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 6/5/15
 - a. Opponents of Proposed Golden State Warriors Arena Petition to Halt Project: *NBC Bay Area*, 6/5/15
8. Mission Bay Alliance Launches Petition to Stop the Proposed Warrior's Entertainment Center in Mission Bay: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 6/18/15
9. Oakland Port Commissioner Launches Movement to Keep Warriors in Oakland: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 6/19/15
10. UCSF Nurses Call on City to Reject Mission Bay Arena and Prioritize Health First: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 6/29/15
 - a. UCSF nurses union comes out against S.F. Warriors arena: *San Francisco Chronicle*, 6/29/15
 - b. Proposed Warriors Arena in San Francisco Sees New Opposition: *ABC 7 News*, 6/29/15
 - c. UCSF employees concerned with new Golden State Warriors arena, say congestion will hinder access to emergency care: *KRON*, 6/29/15

11. Proposed Warriors' Entertainment Complex Flunks Environmental Test for Traffic, Congestion, Draft EIR Shows: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 6/30/15
 - a. Opponents: Warriors proposed arena fails environmental test for traffic: *KRON*, 6/30/15
 - b. Warriors SF arena plan: Cash vs. money: *Comcast Sportsnet*, 7/2/15
12. Mayor Lee Misled Public on Warriors Arena Plan, Mission Bay Alliance Claims: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 7/14/15
 - a. Opponents accuse mayor of misleading public on Warriors Arena: *KRON*, 7/14/15
 - b. Warriors Arena at Mission Bay shows power of money over people: *Contra Costa Bee*, 7/14/15
13. Public Receives One-Week Extension to Provide Comments on the Proposed Warriors' Arena Environmental Impact Report: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 7/17/15
 - a. Big players, sharp elbows in fight over Warriors' Mission Bay arena: *San Francisco Business Times*, 7/17/15
 - b. Environmentalists, Transit Enthusiasts Push for Voter-Approved Downtown CalTrain Extension: *The San Francisco Appeal*, 7/24/15
 - c. Warriors proposed arena could clog downtown S.F.: *The San Francisco Chronicle*, 7/26/15
14. Massive Traffic Jams, Life-Threatening Congestion, Degradation of Life Quality Result From Proposed Warriors' Arena, Opponents' EIR Filing Shows: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 7/27/15
 - a. San Francisco Mayor threatens UCSF Hospital at Mission Bay — play ball for Warriors or else!: *Contra Costa Bee*, 7/27/15
 - b. A Basketball Arena Battles for San Francisco's Heart: *The New York Times*, 9/5/15
 - c. If the Warriors build it, will the fans, the victories, and the passion come too?: *KALW Radio*, 9/17/15
15. Proposed Warriors' Arena in Mission Bay Spells 'Disaster,' say Top Ranked UCSF Scientists: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 9/24/15
 - a. Group of Prestigious UCSF Scientists Says Warriors Arena Could Be 'Disaster' for Mission Bay: *SFist*, 9/24/15
 - b. Warriors Arena at Mission Bay endangers biotech boom in SF: *Contra Costa Bee*, 9/24/15
16. New Site Proposed for Golden State Warriors Arena in San Francisco Near Pier 80: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 9/28/15
 - a. Bay Bridge builder in black despite penalties: *The San Francisco Chronicle*, 9/25/15
 - b. Golden State Warriors must address traffic issues to win key San Francisco arena ally: *San Jose Mercury News*, 9/28/15
 - c. Opponents of Warriors arena in Mission Bay want project moved south: *The San Francisco Examiner*, 9/28/15
17. Mission Bay Alliance Requests Formal City Review of Alternative Golden State Warriors' Arena Site Near Pier 80: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 10/13/15
 - a. San Francisco Chronicle suspends reporter for press release copy-and-paste: *Columbia Journalism Review*, 10/13/15
18. Mission Bay Alliance Demands Release of Emergency Access Deal Struck Between UCSF and Warriors after City, UCSF Stonewall Public Access: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 10/14/15
 - a. An alternative – albeit wacky – site for the new Warriors arena: *The San Francisco Chronicle*, 10/16/15
 - b. The Warriors Face Backlash In Their Move to San Francisco: *Golden Gate Express*, 10/19/15
 - c. Blood on the Hardwood: *San Francisco Magazine*, 10/23/15
 - d. \$60 million for transportation in latest Warriors arena plan: *SF Gate*, 10/23/15

- e. Should S.F. pay Oakland for stealing away the Warriors?: *San Francisco Business Times*, 10/28/5
- 19. S.F., Warriors Proposed Arena Final SEIR Released Just Now: Only Gives Public One Week to Comment: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 11/2/5
 - a. Warriors arena opponents take more shots at the plan: *The San Francisco Chronicle*, 11/2/15
 - b. Warriors New Arena Still Getting Push Back: *KGO 810*, 11/2/15
- 20. UCSF Parents, Economic Expert Raise Concerns about Warriors' Arena on Eve of City Vote: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 11/3/15
 - a. Warriors score critical first win for new arena, but bigger fights loom: *San Francisco Business Times*, 11/3/15
- 21. Warriors' Arena Opponents Call out Rubber-Stamp Approval Process: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 11/4/15
 - a. When will Mission Bay Alliance quit? And more Warriors arena question: *San Francisco Business Times*, 11/4/15
- 22. Warriors' Arena Leaves Taxpayers on Hook for \$29 Million in Unfunded Costs, City Admits: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 11/10/15
 - a. Mission Bay is wrong spot for Warriors arena: *The San Francisco Chronicle*, 11/15/15
- 23. Mission Bay Alliance Appeals City's Rubber-Stamp Approval of Proposed Warriors' Arena: *Mission Bay Alliance Press Release*, 11/16/15
 - a. Appeal challenges proposed Warriors arena in Mission Bay: *The San Francisco Examiner*, 11/16/15
 - b. The myth of 'no public funding' for new Raiders, Warriors project: *San Francisco Business Times*, 11/17/15
 - c. Why Moving The Warriors Is bad For The Team And San Francisco: *Broke-Ass Stuart*, 11/17/15
 - d. Arena will be nightmare for child patients: *The San Francisco Examiner*, 11/23/15

San Francisco Chronicle

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA'S LARGEST NEWSPAPER

Big-time opposition emerges to Warriors' arena plan

Matier & Ross – April 30, 2015

The Golden State Warriors' plans for an 18,000-seat arena in San Francisco's Mission Bay are suddenly running into big-time political problems.

An anonymous group of what organizers describe as big-bucks donors to UCSF hired an imposing cast of consultants — including former UCSF Senior Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding and, for a time, Chronicle columnist and former Mayor Willie Brown — to block the plan for the arena and adjacent twin office towers in Mission Bay near the waterfront.

Also on board, and working without pay: Jack Davis, once the biggest political consultant in town and still a force to be reckoned with in semi-retirement.

"This arena is going to essentially ruin decades of good work and planning in Mission Bay and make it impossible for people to access the hospital there," said public relations pro Sam Singer, who has also been hired by the antiarena forces.

The emergence of the opposition group comes just a month before the final environmental impact report for the Warriors' arena is due to be released — raising suggestions that the effort is largely aimed at trying to force the team to scale back its ambitious plan for developing 12 acres next to UCSF.

Along with the arena, the project would include two 160-foot-tall office buildings and a central plaza larger than Union Square.

One big issue, said Singer: The Warriors plan to build just 950 parking spaces for the project, 650 of which would serve the two office towers.

Singer called the parking figures "absolutely ludicrous."

Spaulding, who spent years developing the plans for the Mission Bay medical campus, says the Warriors have shown "no serious willingness" to negotiate the terms of the project — including plans to host as many as 200 events a year at the arena.

"The Warriors are articulating that they need the whole shebang to make the economics work," Spaulding said — leaving his group in "the unfortunate position" of having to take it or leave it.

"I think there really is a preference for a different location," Spaulding said.

Anonymous nonprofit

The opponents have formed Mission Bay Alliance, a nonprofit whose contributors are allowed to remain anonymous.

Singer wouldn't say who was financing the effort, but said alliance board members include Chiron founder William Rutter, Dr. Samuel Barondes, former chairman of the Langley Porter Institute, and retired UC Hastings law Professor Richard Snyder.

Although Spaulding stopped short of saying the group was prepared to take its case to the voters — a la the “No Wall on the Waterfront” effort that knocked off the 8 Washington condo development — Singer said that was “absolutely” a possibility.

The first step, however, may be putting up a legal challenge to the environmental impact report — a move that could delay the Warriors' plans to break ground next year.

Brown at first was on board with opponents, but decided Tuesday to back out because his involvement could pose a conflict of interest with his status as a weekly Chronicle columnist.

Before dropping out, he said his intention was not to kill the arena. “We want to make it more amenable to the neighborhood,” he said.

Warriors spokesman P.J. Johnston, who used to be press secretary for Brown, questioned the validity of the opposition group.

“It's hard to know who or what this shadowy new organization may be, but they don't appear to represent UCSF, and certainly not the community,” Johnston said. “The San Francisco public overwhelmingly supports the Warriors' move to Mission Bay.”

Mayor Ed Lee's press secretary, Christine Falvey, said the Warriors' arena “has broad support across the city and in the Mission Bay neighborhood, including from UCSF.”

Falvey added that “the city is working with the hospital directly and has already addressed dozens of issues to make sure we can have a world-class hospital and a world-class arena. ... We are moving forward and making a lot of progress.”

Any serious public opposition to the Warriors' jump across the bay had seemed to fade away last year after team owners Joe Lacob and Peter Guber dropped plans to build on the waterfront at Piers 30-32 and focused instead on Salesforce-owned property in Mission Bay.

But behind the scenes, UCSF brass and benefactors have remained divided over the deal — and, at the very least, skeptical.

In a confidential Feb. 12 letter to Lee and the Warriors front office, UCSF Chancellor Sam Hawgood called on the team to remedy “what we identify as the emerging critical conditions” with the arena project, mainly parking and traffic.

Ambulance concerns

Hawgood's worries included that the development could snag ambulances in gridlock, especially when the Giants are at home at the same time an event is being held at the arena.

Hawgood hinted that unless “certain reasonable conditions” were met, UCSF might use its leverage to block the deal — namely “an enforceable and binding view easement” over a portion of the arena site protecting the hospital’s views.

Lee wrote back that “monitoring traffic conditions, determining priority access routes and constructing new ... parking structures on port property are issues for the city to resolve.”

And in a hint that things could get ugly for the hospital, he threatened to go after UCSF to pay its fair share of “transportation and utilities network” costs.

“We continue to have concerns,” Lee wrote, about the medical complex’s exemption under state law from local property taxes, parking taxes or transportation impact fees.

Since then, however, we’re told there have been negotiations between the city and UCSF that have brought the two sides closer together.

“We have been pleased with the city’s response, and how much they have been doing to try to mitigate traffic and parking congestion,” UCSF Vice Chancellor Barbara French told us Tuesday. “We continue to look forward to working with them and the Warriors to make the deal work.”

But French added, “We have to stand up and support public safety and patient care.”



Media Contact

Sam Singer or Alex Doniach

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949 or 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

29 April 2015

UCSF Stakeholders Mount Opposition to Flawed Warriors Mission Bay Stadium Plan

Significant Parking Deficits, Traffic Logjam, Blocked Access to Three UCSF Hospitals Fuel Concerns among UCSF Boosters

Only 200 Dedicated Parking Spots for Proposed Stadium of 18,000

San Francisco, Calif. – A coalition of stakeholders from the University of California at San Francisco are mounting an organized effort to fight what UCSF faculty and supporters are calling a flawed plan to build a new stadium for the Golden State Warriors at Mission Bay.

Opponents say the Warriors plan, unveiled in September, is riddled with problems, including a significant shortage of available parking to serve the proposed 18,000-seat basketball arena, the potential for traffic logjams and blocked access to the three UCSF hospitals that recently opened at Mission Bay.

“Stakeholders of UCSF are concerned about the potentially disastrous outcome this proposed stadium could have not only on the three hospital campuses recently opened in Mission Bay but also the vibrant Mission Bay community,” said Bruce Spaulding, an organization and strategy consultant to the Mission Bay Alliance, an advocacy group organized to fight the stadium plan.

Unfortunately, the Warriors and the City of San Francisco have not sufficiently addressed the impact of these concerns on the health and safety of the thousands of patients and families who rely on these UCSF hospitals daily.”

Spaulding said the Warriors have “introduced a flawed plan that only dedicates 200 parking spaces to serve an 18,000-seat arena.”

“This is totally inadequate and would result in placing undue burden on UCSF parking and facilities and on neighboring businesses and residents in the Mission Bay community,” he added. “To date, the Warriors have yet to work directly with UCSF stakeholders to mitigate this and other serious issues.”

The Warriors purchased an option for the 12-acre site at Mission Bay in April 2014 and unveiled early plans for the new stadium last September, revealing concerns for UCSF donors and staff.

A March meeting among members of the UCSF real estate committee exposed serious traffic impacts on UCSF, its neighbors and existing and future Mission Bay tenants. It also exposed the limited public transportation options and a lack of onsite and area-wide parking to meet the groundswell of demand during events – all of which could be substantially worsened in the event of a concurrent Giants game at AT&T Park. Blocked access to hospital emergency rooms due to the heavy influx of visitors is top among UCSF's growing list of concerns.

The current Warriors plan also calls for year-round use of the arena, totaling more than 200 events per year – only 20 percent of which would actually be used for Warriors basketball games.

Stakeholders are also concerned about the disastrous implications for UCSF's legacy and its future. Not only would the proposed event center land lock UCSF, but it would preclude the world-class research center from expanding – an outcome of significant concern to those who spent decades securing UCSF's foothold in the Mission Bay area.

"UCSF is a preeminent research hospital and a top medical school that is curing disease, treating patients from around the world and breaking new ground through biomedical research," Spaulding said.

"The mission of this world-class medical center should not be trumped by an entertainment center or the avarice of a few rich people seeking to double the value of the Warriors as a sports franchise."

Spaulding, a former UCSF Senior Vice Chancellor and the original instigator behind the land deal that made the 43-acre Mission Bay campus a reality, is among a growing team of UCSF stakeholders recently assembled by the Mission Bay Alliance board to publically oppose the project.

Dr. William Rutter, a famed UCSF biochemist and founder of biotech company Chiron, is currently serving as the Mission Bay Alliance president. Rutter was also involved in the acquisition of Mission Bay land for UCSF campuses and is the namesake of the William J. Rutter Center.

Dr. Samuel H. Barondes, a famed UCSF psychiatrist, author, longtime chair of the Department of Psychiatry and the former director of the Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute, is serving as the Alliance's secretary. Richard Snyder, a retired real estate attorney and former UC Hastings law professor, is serving as treasurer.

Since Genentech Hall, the first building on the Mission Bay Campus, opened in 2003, the \$1.5 billion UCSF Mission Bay hospital complex opened in February and has ballooned to a growing daily population of 6,000 UCSF faculty, staff, students and patients. The complex comprises the UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital, the UCSF Bakar Cancer Center, the UCSF Betty Irene Moore Women's Hospital and the UCSF Ron Conway Family Gateway Medical Building.

The campus is immediately surrounded by a collaborative community of more than 50 bioscience startups, nine established pharmaceutical and biotech companies, 10 venture capital firms and scientific leaders such as the J. David Gladstone Institutes, the California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences (QB3) and the Veterans Affairs research center, all of which are affiliated with UCSF and would feel the negative impacts of the proposed arena.

Spaulding said the Alliance understands the desire to bring the Warriors to San Francisco but, under the current proposal, the vision is ill-conceived and harmful to the vibrant ecosystem taking off at Mission Bay.

“We’re hopeful that the City of San Francisco and the Warriors start paying attention to the potentially disastrous impacts of this plan, not only on UCSF and surrounding Mission Bay community but on the patients and families seeking UCSF’s lifesaving care,” he said.

The San Francisco Planning Department is expected to release its draft environmental impact report next month.

A Mission Bay Community Advisory Committee will hear a special presentation from the Warriors on Thursday, April 30, at 5pm. The meeting will be held at 225 Berry St, in the 2nd Floor dining room.

--30--

Related Coverage:



Group ‘comes out of nowhere’ to try to block Warriors’ Mission Bay arena

Cory Weinberg – April 29, 2015

San Francisco’s supposed feel-good real estate story where all sides unified to build a privately financed Golden State Warriors arena just got its first major gut check.

A group of University of California, San Francisco, donors is threatening to sue or push a ballot measure against the Warriors’ potential Mission Bay arena over parking and traffic concerns. The San Francisco Chronicle first reported the news Tuesday.

The group, a nonprofit called the Mission Bay Alliance, worries that arena traffic will bottle up to ensnarl ambulances headed to nearby UCSF Medical Center and threaten the neighborhood’s ability to grow as a biotechnology hub. Its proximity to AT&T Park and possible overlapping game days will exacerbate that, the group says.

Sam Singer, who is representing the alliance’s public relations efforts, told the San Francisco Business Times that the group could take the issue to court or bring a ballot measure to San Francisco voters. “The alliance wants to see the (arena) and office towers halted completely. If that doesn’t happen through the EIR and public participation process, the alliance will consider a lawsuit and going to the ballot to stop the stadium,” he said.

Timing trouble

The timing could create problems for the project. The team, which has used Strada Investment Group as a development consultant, is due at the Planning Commission in the fall for approval of its environmental impact report, which will be released next month.

The arena is scheduled to open by the tipoff of the 2018-19 NBA season, but a Mission Bay Alliance legal challenge to the environmental impact report could delay construction at least a year. As Rick Welts, president of the team, said Monday before this news broke: "It's never over until it's over in San Francisco."

That's a reality of any big development, but a particularly harsh one for the Warriors considering the organization's ambitions.

"Remember that this is a completely privately financed, billion-dollar-plus project," Welts said Monday.

"It's no less daunting to make a successful project when you're funding the entire thing yourselves. So we have the rest of the process to go through — the process is not finished — and we have to finalize the financing on the project, which will not be a problem. But it is a daunting thing with the formula we have put in place."

Until now, it's been mostly smooth sailing.

This is the project's first brush with opposition since the team dropped controversial plans to build on Port of San Francisco's Pier 30-32 site. Instead, it agreed to buy the 12-acre site from Salesforce last year. Since then, the Warriors have received a warm welcome from Mission Bay neighbors for its 18,000-seat arena and participated in amicable monthly community meetings.

"This really comes out of nowhere," said P.J. Johnston, a spokesman for the Warriors. He added that "it's hard to know who or what this shadowy new organization may be, but they don't appear to represent UCSF, and certainly not the community."

Singer said the group won't reveal its financial backers, but said its three leaders are Chiron Corp. founder Bill Rutter, who founded the biotech company and at one point considered locating Chiron in Mission Bay; Samuel Barondes, former chairman of the UCSF-based Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute; and retired University of California Hastings College of Law professor Richard Snyder.

"These people, who were seminal in the creation of Mission Bay as bioscience, are very concerned that the city as well as the public hasn't really looked at the Warriors stadium and office tower deal," Singer said. "It makes it impossible for new biotech companies to locate in Mission Bay because there won't be parking and traffic will be at a Manhattan standstill."

The Warriors have worked to blunt opposition to the project by meeting with biotech companies in Mission Bay and community groups in the Dogpatch, Bayview and Hunters Point neighborhoods.

Parking worries

Chiefly, the dispute falls on parking.

In the transportation management plan the Warriors presented to neighbors in November, it said it would allot up to 950 parking spaces and that about 55 percent of attendees would use a car to get

there. The arena would also make use of satellite parking in underused parking garages and lots, but discourage street parking, according to the presentation.

That plan appears to give a pretty conservative estimate the number of fans and concert-goers who will arrive by ridesharing services and taxis though – which could alleviate some parking issues. It pegs that portion at 4 percent of attendees – a smaller percentage than Giants attendees even in 2010.

“The Warriors have acknowledged that people will get there through public trans, driving and rideshare. It’s built into the transportation management plan,” said Tiffany Bohee, who leads San Francisco’s Office of Community of Investment and Infrastructure during a Business Times interview earlier this month.

“There are reasonable assumptions that a certain number of people will take an alternative rideshare or carpooling,” she said.

The arena also expects to take advantage of several transit and street improvements, such as the Central Subway, new Muni bus lines, an extension of Muni rail platforms and a Muni rail spur aimed at handling more arena fans as well as neighborhood south of the arena. The EIR next month will reveal city findings about traffic impact, so it’s unclear now whether the opposition group’s concerns are founded.

The Warriors’ latest plan aims to spend big on plaza and retail space, which would give the neighborhood new flare.

The complex will also include about a half-million square feet of office space, which will sit right next to the new Uber headquarters.



Media Contact

Sam Singer or Alex Doniach

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949 or 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

30 April 2015

Warriors' Claim of No Traffic, Parking Impact "Simply Not Believable," say Foes of Proposed Mission Bay Arena and Event Center

San Francisco, Calif. – The coalition of University of California at San Francisco stakeholders fighting a plan to bring the Golden State Warriors stadium to Mission Bay said Thursday that claims of no traffic or parking impacts on the Mission Bay community were "simply not believable."

"You can't drop an 18,000-seat sports and entertainment arena into a 12-acre slice of urban land with only 200 dedicated parking spaces and no access to major public transportation lines and not expect a serious parking and traffic problem," said Bruce Spaulding, an organization and strategy consultant to the Mission Bay Alliance, an advocacy group organized to fight the stadium plan. "It is fascinating to watch the Warriors now scramble to come up with a piecemeal parking and traffic plan that, frankly, should have been addressed a year ago."

A day after the Mission Bay Alliance introduced significant concerns about the proposed project at Mission Bay, Warriors representatives and City of San Francisco officials said the project will have no significant impacts on traffic or require any special mitigation measures – even during concurrent events at AT&T Park. Instead, they cited the "underutilized" parking in the neighborhood and nearby office parking that is not expected to be in use during night games.

The current Warriors plan calls for year-round use of the arena, totaling more than 200 day and nighttime events per year – only 20 percent of which would actually be used for Warriors basketball games.

UCSF stakeholders likened these false statements to the promises of the 49ers' management who overlooked parking and traffic impacts while planning Levi's Stadium and wound up attempting to convert youth soccer fields into VIP parking for the ultra-rich – much to the Santa Clara community's chagrin.

"Of course the Warriors are trying to sweep this serious parking problem under the carpet and are saying anything to make these legitimate concerns go away," Spaulding said. "The truth is that now in the 11th hour they are frantically coming up with a plan that should have been addressed when this site was first selected."

Stakeholders are also concerned about the disastrous implications for UCSF's legacy and its future. Not only would the proposed event center land lock UCSF, but it would preclude the world-class research center from expanding – an outcome of significant concern to those who spent decades securing UCSF's foothold in the Mission Bay area.

"UCSF is a preeminent research hospital and a top medical school that is curing disease, treating patients from around the world and breaking new ground through biomedical research," Spaulding said.

"The mission of this world-class medical center should not be trumped by an entertainment center or the avarice of a few rich people seeking to double the value of the Warriors as a sports franchise."

Since Genentech Hall, the first building on the Mission Bay Campus, opened in 2003, the \$1.5 billion UCSF Mission Bay hospital complex opened in February and has ballooned to a growing daily population of 6,000 UCSF faculty, staff, students and patients. The complex comprises the UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital, the UCSF Bakar Cancer Center, the UCSF Betty Irene Moore Women's Hospital and the UCSF Ron Conway Family Gateway Medical Building.

The campus is immediately surrounded by a collaborative community of more than 50 bioscience startups, nine established pharmaceutical and biotech companies, 10 venture capital firms and scientific leaders such as the J. David Gladstone Institutes, the California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences (QB3) and the Veterans Affairs research center, all of which are affiliated with UCSF and would feel the negative impacts of the proposed arena.

The San Francisco Planning Department is expected to release its draft environmental impact report next month.

A Mission Bay Community Advisory Committee will hear a special presentation from the Warriors on Thursday, April 30, at 5pm. The meeting will be held at 225 Berry St, in the 2nd Floor dining room.

--30--

Related Coverage

San Francisco Chronicle

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA'S LARGEST NEWSPAPER

Anonymous alliance is out to kill Warriors arena

Matier & Ross – May 1, 2015

The out-the-gate attack may center around parking and traffic headaches, but the real aim of the anonymous big-bucks group of UCSF donors that's going after the proposed Warriors arena at Mission Bay is to kill it entirely — so the land can be saved for a future expansion of the school's \$4 billion hospital.

“The mission of this world-class medical center should not be trumped by an entertainment center or the avarice of a few rich people seeking to double the value of the Warriors as a sports franchise,” said former UCSF Senior Vice Chancellor Bruce Spaulding, who was brought on by the newly formed Mission Bay Alliance to put the brakes on planning for the arena.

The fight went public last week, but it has been brewing in the back rooms of City Hall and UCSF since April 2014. That’s when the Warriors struck a deal with Salesforce CEO Marc Benioff for the rights to 12 acres in Mission Bay after the company dropped its plans to turn the site into a corporate campus.

Benioff is a major benefactor of UCSF — his name graces the new UCSF Benioff Children’s Hospital at Mission Bay — so it was widely believed that the school was either on board or at least was going to be quiet about having the Warriors as neighbors.

As it turns out, however, the Warriors weren’t the only bidders for the property.

Reliable sources tell us that billionaire investor and UCSF Foundation Chairman Bill Oberndorf and a group of wealthy donors also made an offer for the property in hopes of banking the land for the medical center’s future expansion — but came in \$5 million under the Warriors’ \$150 million bid. Attempts to reach Oberndorf for comment were unsuccessful.

From what we’re told, he and his crew never got a chance to make a counteroffer. Benioff — with encouragement from Mayor Ed Lee, who was scrambling to come up with an alternative to the Warriors’ doomed scheme for an arena on Piers 30-32 — had already locked up the Mission Bay deal with team owners Joe Lacob and Peter Guber.

UCSF officials weren’t happy but stayed mum, we’re told, in part because the mayor’s people reminded them that the university has a sizable contract — \$149 million in 2014 — to run San Francisco General Hospital. They also pointed out that UCSF gets some pretty healthy tax breaks from the city.

The unspoken but received message: Both those deals could change if UCSF made waves over the Warriors deal.

City Hall’s reach, however, did not extend to the school’s mega-millionaire donors — including investment banker Sandy Robertson (who recently hosted President Obama at a fundraiser at his San Francisco home), Chiron founder William Rutter and others backing the Mission Bay Alliance.

Former Mayor Art Agnos — who has fought other developments along the waterfront but who is supporting the arena at Mission Bay — said the UCSF donors won’t win this one.

“The notion that this is going to be land-banked for the future? That train has left the station,” Agnos said.

Maybe, but that’s not the way the arena opponents see it.

Their first play will likely be to go to court to argue that the 18,000-seat arena — and its 200 planned events a year — will have a negative impact on the neighborhood.

In other words, opponents will seek to tie up the planned arena in legal knots for years. As political consultant Jack Davis, in semiretirement but working for the arena foes, told us: "We are going to litigate, litigate and litigate until the cows come home. On a 1 to 12 level, I give it a 10 that this is not going to pass."

Another possibility is an anti-arena initiative on the city ballot.

But Agnos says both sides can play in this game — and once there's a full-on campaign, the donors might not look so sympathetic.

"That would be a fool's errand because it would expose the fact that the university pays no taxes to speak of to the city, and now they're arguing that they want to bank more land for which the Warriors are prepared to pay millions in taxes," he said.

Game on.



Bag arena plan, opposition leader tells Warriors and city, or face long battle

Ron Leuty – May 1, 2015

The front man opposing the Golden State Warriors' billion-dollar Mission Bay arena development may have shot himself in the foot with an aggressive stance at a community forum Thursday.

Yet, even politically bloodied, consultant Jack Davis delivered a clear threat to the Warriors and arena supporters: His group plans to challenge the validity of the Warriors plan until the development of an 18,000-seat arena, two office towers and a retail marketplace is dead.

Davis didn't provide any new details about the so-called Mission Bay Alliance, a mysterious group that claims ties to the University of California, San Francisco. However, Davis, a volunteer with the alliance, told roughly 100 people at a meeting of the Mission Bay Citizens Advisory Council that the alliance is ready to launch a lengthy and high-stakes campaign against the project.

The group, Davis said, has "put together sufficient enough money to hire the very, very best CEQA attorneys" — drawing attention to the upcoming environmental impact report for the project required by the California Environmental Quality Act — "to go over the entirety of the Mission Bay master plan."

"There's no middle ground here," Davis said.

Davis was alluding to a strategy that could kill the arena development through a series of land-use challenges, which could effectively block the Warriors from lining up funding for the privately financed project.

The move comes as two sides of political and financial players trash talk and sharpen their elbows under the basket of one of the city's prime pieces of developable real estate.

Even as the alliance claimed to be supported by "a growing team of UCSF stakeholders," two of UCSF's largest benefactors took the group to task.

In an email Thursday afternoon to the San Francisco Business Times, Salesforce.com CEO Marc Benioff said points in a press release issued Thursday morning by the nonprofit alliance "are simply wrong, and whoever wrote it is clearly spinning a story for their own benefit."

Benioff's company had planned to build on the site but later opted to sell the 12-acre site, across Third Street from UCSF's Mission Bay campus, to the Warriors. At one point, some UCSF benefactors sought to buy the property, but people familiar with the attempt said negotiations with Salesforce (NYSE: CRM) broke down.

In another email Thursday, angel investor Ron Conway said Mayor Ed Lee, UCSF and the community are working on the issues outlined by the group, including parking, "while others ... spread mistruths to confuse the public."

Benioff and Conway are also supporters of Mayor Lee, who sees the arena as a legacy project of his administration. The duo have donated a collective \$300 million to UCSF and have helped round up other big-dollar donors to the healthcare-centric, graduate level university. Benioff's name graces the children's hospital at the recently opened UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay — kitty-corner from the proposed arena development — and the Ron Conway Family Gateway Medical Building sits on the medical center campus.

Davis, in an interview with the Business Times, called Conway "a bag of crap."

Lori Yamauchi, UCSF associate vice chancellor for campus planning, read a statement at the meeting voicing support for an arena project "that works for the neighborhood, the city and for UCSF." The statement also acknowledged potential parking and traffic issues when the planned Warriors arena and the San Francisco Giants' AT&T Park have events on the same day.

"It remains early in the process and we will continue to actively engage" to ensure that concerns are "identified, managed and addressed," Yamauchi said. "We see that the city is listening."

The statement seemed to put some distance between UCSF's administration and the UCSF-connected members of the Mission Bay Alliance.

Yet, Davis continued to take an aggressive stance. The Mission Bay Alliance will not compromise, he said.

It's unclear where the Alliance gets financial support. Davis, group spokesman Sam Singer or group consultant and retired UCSF senior vice chancellor Bruce Spaulding have not said who its backers are.

Davis provided no additional details on the makeup of the Mission Bay Alliance. So far, he's referred to a group of UCSF "stakeholders" such as Chiron Corp. cofounder Bill Rutter, whose name tops the Mission Bay campus' community center; Samuel Barondes, former director of UCSF's Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute; and Richard Snyder, a retire real estate attorney and former UC Hastings College of Law professor.

Still, Davis said, the group's leaders have fielded phone calls and emails "from people all over Potrero Hill, from the Dogpatch — just like ordinary citizens who aren't so keen" on the Warriors' plans.

At the community forum Thursday, Davis challenged Adam Van de Water, a project manager working on arena negotiations for the city, to line out details of the project. He would go on to challenge a member of the audience who disagreed with a point and talk over Citizens Advisory Council Chair Corinne Woods as she tried to cut him off so others in the audience could comment on the project, and, later, would verbally attack Business Times reporter Cory Weinberg.

Davis' screed was met with derision from the audience — some hissing when he wouldn't immediately relinquish the microphone — even as some of the following speakers also took issue with concerns raised by the Mission Bay Alliance about traffic and parking. Many of those speakers said they supported the arena project but want to ensure that the city and the Warriors provide safeguards for Mission Bay residents, employees and visitors to the UCSF Medical Center.

Davis did not say what Mission Bay Alliance would do with the property if the Warriors project was stopped and Salesforce sold to the group, and UCSF has said that its long-range plans do not include the site.



Media Contact:

Alex Doniach, Sam Singer, Singer Associates

Phone: (415) 227-9700

Cell: (415) 336-4949

Email: Alex@Singersf.com

For Immediate Release:
5 May 2015

Mission Bay Alliance Demands City Address Environmental Impacts of New Giants' Development in Review of Warriors Arena

San Francisco, Calif. – The coalition of University of California at San Francisco stakeholders fighting a plan to bring the Golden State Warriors stadium to Mission Bay demanded that City of San Francisco officials address the environmental impacts of the proposed new Mission Rock development in its review of the basketball arena.

San Francisco Giants' president Larry Baer is holding a press conference today at 10am in parking lot A near the Giants' stadium to discuss a planned ballot initiative to transform a 28-acre site near Pier 48 into the new Mission Rock development.

This proposed Mission Rock development would add more congestion to an area already overrun with cars and crowds – one of the Mission Bay Alliance's leading concerns about the 18,000-seat Warriors stadium with currently only 200 dedicated parking spaces.

It does not appear City officials have fully considered the implications.

In his event management strategy presented last week at the Mission Bay Community Advisory Committee meeting, Warriors arena project manager Adam Van der Water did not factor the impact of the proposed Mission Rock development into the parking and traffic management plan.

Instead, in the event of dual Giants and Warriors games, the City recommended staggered start times and an offsite overflow parking lots south of the proposed arena (with capacity of only 500 vehicles) to accommodate an influx of several thousand cars.

"We demand that City officials consider the possibility of yet another development at Mission Rock into its environmental review of the proposed Warriors arena," said Sam Singer, a spokesman for the Mission Bay Alliance. "These developments, when combined, would bring traffic in this region to a grinding halt. The parking to accommodate the influx of vehicles simply does not exist. The public, residents and the men and women who rely on UCSF's lifesaving services deserve to understand the full

implications of this project, and we look forward to seeing a complete analysis in the city's forthcoming environmental review."

The San Francisco Planning Department is expected to release its draft environmental impact report of the Warriors stadium next month.

--30--



Media Contact

Sam Singer, Alex Doniach, Singer Associates

Phone: (415) 227-9700

Cell: (415) 336-4949

Email: singer@singersf.com, Alex@Singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

20 May 2015

Mission Bay Alliance Files Records Request with SF Over Warriors Arena Plan

Warriors' Arena Records Demanded: Link between SF's Transit Plan and Stadium May Show Use of Taxpayer Money

San Francisco, Calif. – Opponents of the proposed Golden State Warriors' Stadium at Mission Bay are demanding public records, including emails and work plans, that may show a connection between the City of San Francisco's multi-billion-dollar transit plan and the so-called privately funded Warriors' arena and events center at Mission Bay.

In a public records request submitted to the City's Planning Department this week, Mission Bay Alliance's Bruce Spaulding said the coalition of UCSF stakeholders, donors and employees opposed to the proposed Mission Bay arena are concerned to learn of the City's plans to tear down Interstate 280 at Mission Bay and build an underground rail tunnel in what appears to be a coordinated, taxpayer-funded effort to justify an 18,000-seat basketball arena.

"We are concerned about the City's efforts to bait the public with the promise of a privately-funded stadium and then switch the vision to include massive subsidies in trying to address the consequences of the construction," Spaulding said in his Sunshine Ordinance request on May 18.

The Warriors' arena, which has been widely touted by the City and Warriors' owner Joe Lacob as being financed entirely by private dollars, has recently been exposed for its significant flaws, including a piecemealed parking plan that includes only 200 dedicated parking spaces for the 18,000-seat arena.

The arena, scheduled to host 200 events per year, is adjacent to the new UCSF children's, woman's and cancer hospitals, potentially creating significant access and congestion issues for those seeking emergency and urgent care.

Although Lacob has widely touted the stadium plan as having a "great transportation plan," the City and the Warriors have released only preliminary ideas for handling the influx of traffic and cars that will descend into Mission Bay during Warriors games and the 160 other events planned for the year.

However, recent news coverage has revealed efforts by the City to develop a "game-changing" idea behind the scenes -- unveiled two weeks ago in a closed-door meeting -- that would supposedly solve

the transportation issues by adding a Caltrain station near the proposed Warriors' arena, possibly eliminating the need for thousands of additional parking spaces.

"This idea would involve tearing down a highway and reconstructing the city's rail lines – at the taxpayer's expense -- in an effort to mitigate an un-mitigatable transportation and parking nightmare guaranteed at Mission Bay by squeezing an arena of massive scale into the tight, 12-acre space at 3rd and 16th," Spaulding said.

Spaulding said the Mission Bay Alliance was submitting the request to lend transparency to the proposed plan – in the absence of a draft Environmental Impact Report to review or any studies or documentation of the alleged plans.

In the request, Spaulding asked for all work products, studies and plans related to the Golden State Warriors arena and project at Mission Bay; all work product and presentations related to the I-280 feasibility study; and all correspondence, email, text messages or otherwise between City staff and the Warriors' employees and consultants that reference the transportation impacts related to the proposed arena.

The City has 10 days to comply with the request or ask for an extension in writing. The San Francisco Planning Department is expected to release its draft environmental impact report of the Warriors stadium in the coming weeks.

--30--

Related Coverage



Mayor Ed Lee announces new Mission Bay Project to house homeless veterans

Annie Andersen – May 22, 2015

SAN FRANCISCO (KRON) — Friday, San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee announced plans for a new 101-unit housing complete to provide house for 50 homeless veterans, and another 50 low-income families in the city's Mission Bay neighborhood. The additional unit will house an onsite manager.

The project will be built at 1150 Third Street, on land dedicated to the City's Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) for affordable housing and is supported with an initial \$5 million in private contributions from technology and business leaders marshalled by the San Francisco Citizens Initiative for Technology & Innovation (sf.citi).

The 50 new homes for veterans will help Mayor Lee as he tries to meet President Barack Obama's challenge to local communities to end veteran homelessness.

The houses for low-income families will work toward the Mayor's goal to build and renovate 30,000 housing units by 2020.

"Moving people off our streets and into supportive housing and services is among my highest priorities, especially when it comes to the brave men and women who have served our country and now find themselves without a home," said Mayor Lee. "This project in Mission Bay will help us meet our commitment to ending chronic homelessness for veterans and families and is another great example of the public and private sectors coming together to tackle homelessness, housing and other challenges that face our City. I am grateful to sf.citi and the private donors who have stepped up to help house formerly homeless veterans and to make sure our veterans have the dignity of a place to call home."

Along with the public grants, the project has private backing from several philanthropists including the Conway and Benioff families.

"The purpose of sf.citi is to engage the tech sector, its leaders and workforce in helping to tackle San Francisco's challenges and I'm very proud that so many have stepped up to partner with Mayor Lee and the Hamilton Family Foundation to house homeless veterans in Mission Bay," said sf.citi Chair Ron Conway. "Mission Bay is one of the most exciting and thriving new neighborhoods, with UCSF, biotech, new transit, new housing, new parks and a spectacular new arena for the Golden State Warriors coming soon. This new home for some of our country's bravest men and women will help keep Mission Bay a diverse and welcoming community for all San Franciscans, even as the neighborhood changes and grows.

"There are more than 50,000 homeless veterans in this country, and that's just not acceptable," said Salesforce Chairman and CEO Marc Benioff. "Every city, every leader and every individual can step up and do more for our veterans. Today, we are coming together to provide critical resources to those in San Francisco who have given so much to our country."

Construction is anticipated to start in late 2016, with occupancy in 2018.

San Francisco Chronicle

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA'S LARGEST NEWSPAPER

Opponents of Warriors arena prepare to battle impact findings

Matier & Ross – May 29, 2015

The fight over the Golden State Warriors' 18,000-seat arena at Mission Bay kicks off Friday with the release of the project's environmental impact report — and opponents have already lined up a team of five top-flight attorneys to take the report apart, piece by piece.

The Mission Bay Alliance has signed on David Boies from the New York firm of Boies, Schiller and Flexner, to serve as general counsel. Thomas Lippe, who took the city on over the America's Cup plans, Susan Brandt Hawley, who fought the 8 Washington waterfront high-rises, and Osha

Meserve and Patrick Soluri, who represented Sacramento residents opposed to the Kings' arena, are on the team as well.

"Based on preliminary documents from City Hall, they have already flagged what could be some serious legal challenges," said Sam Singer, a spokesman for the alliance.

From the looks of things, the first targets will be parking, traffic and noise.

Warrior spokesman P.J. Johnston said the team had been expecting the move.

"Someone is always going to sue," Johnston said.

In this case, however, the opponents include some very big donors to UCSF, which sits just across the street from the proposed arena.

And unlike the medical center, which is trying to work out the potential traffic problems with the city and the Warriors, the alliance does not appear to be interested in a compromise and is instead ready to tie the deal up in court.

"Until the cows come home," said Singer.

The new legal threat does not, however, appear to be taking any of the steam out of Mayor Ed Lee's support for the arena.

"They can litigate until the cows come home, but we will defend until the Warriors come home," Lee said.

By the way, Lee and his wife, Anita, gave themselves a late birthday present the other day, treating each other to one of the recent playoff games against the Rockets.

No freebies (they paid \$300 each for the seats) and no VIP treatment. They sat in the third section up from the floor — and after about 10 minutes of posing for selfies with the crowd, settled in for the rest of the game.

Bridge to a new life: Tony Anziano, Caltrans' man in charge of construction of the troubled \$6.2 billion Bay Bridge, got more than a nice going-away cake when he retired in February.

State records show he cashed out with a lump-sum \$241,693 payout for unused vacation and comp time accrued during his nearly 35 years of working for the state. That's on top of his annual \$70,548 pension. The payout was based on his final \$144,000-a-year salary.

John Hill, a spokesman for state Controller Betty Yee, said he could not tell us how many unused vacation, holiday and personal leave days Anziano had banked, calling the information "confidential."

Anziano could not be reached for comment — but he is hardly alone when it comes to getting a nice payout from the state.

A recent report by Will Evans of the Center for Investigative Reporting found that more than 35,000 California state employees have exceeded the official limit of 80 banked vacation days.

Topping the list is Bruce Wolfe, executive officer of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, who as of last June had accrued 507 days of vacation worth \$262,000.

Not so fast: State Sen. Mark Leno was one of the lawmakers who said “no” to the city’s request to author a bill to allow San Francisco to set up speed cameras. It’s not that Leno supports speeding, but he did have a couple of interesting concerns about how the cameras operate.

For starters, unlike a standard traffic ticket, where you are pulled over and made immediately aware of the violation, it would take 30 days for the notice of the \$100 fine to arrive in the mail. “You could make the same trip 30 times and keep making the same mistake before you knew what was going on,” Leno said.

Tuition timing: It’s interesting to note that the two-year UC in-state student tuition freeze worked out between Gov. Jerry Brown and UC President Janet Napolitano pretty much coincides with the sunset of the Proposition 30 tax increase approved by voters in 2012 — in part because it carried with it an implied promise that tuition would not go up.

Under the deal, UC will get more state funding — but will table Napolitano’s proposed 5 percent a year hike. After two years, tuition increases will be adjusted to meet inflation.

Keeping the lid on tuition also reinforces Brown’s image as a tightwad, which he has been cultivating in the media.

Just as important, working out a deal with Napolitano gives Brown a break from all those long and boring regents meetings and will allow him to get back to issues like climate change, which get a lot more attention on the national stage.



Media Contact

Sam Singer or Alex Doniach

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949 or 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

1 June 2015

Mission Bay Alliance Hires Top Legal Team to Review Golden State Warriors' Arena Plan

San Francisco – The Mission Bay Alliance, which is greatly concerned with the grave environmental impact of the proposed Golden State Warriors' Stadium and Events Center on the entire Mission Bay Community including the UCSF Mission Bay Campus, has retained four major law firms including some of the state's top legal minds with expertise in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to review the Warriors' stadium plan's Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

David Boies, the Chairman of the firm Boies, Schiller & Flexner, which has been described by the Wall Street Journal as a national legal "powerhouse," will serve as the Mission Bay Alliance's Lead Counsel and help the Alliance carefully vet the project and strategize tactics going forward. The Boies Schiller firm has worked on landmark cases, including *Bush v. Gore*, *United States v. Microsoft*, and the case to overturn Proposition 8 which resulted in all Californians gaining the equal right to marry the person of their choosing.

In addition to the appointment of Boies Schiller, the Mission Bay Alliance has engaged a CEQA legal team with decades of experience advising and litigating impacts of high-profile public and private projects.

The team includes:

Thomas Lippe, who has dedicated his career to environmental law with a specialty in litigating land use cases at both the administrative level and in state courts that typically require enforcement of CEQA and the California Planning and Zoning Law. Lippe has litigated dozens of high-profile cases, including many involving land use in San Francisco, recently representing environmental organizations that worked to minimize the environmental impacts of the America's Cup event in San Francisco.

Susan Brandt-Hawley of the Brandt-Hawley Law Group, who has represented hundreds of public-interest groups in widely-varied CEQA and land use issues statewide, often with special focus on historic resources. In February she won a significant land use victory when a San Francisco Superior Court Judge struck down all approvals for the controversial 8 Washington St. waterfront luxury condo project, ruling that the project EIR was inadequate.

Osha Meserve and Patrick Soluri, who are principals at Soluri Meserve, a Sacramento-based environmental law firm that also specializes in land use planning and policy and large entitlement

projects. Soluri has specific experience challenging NBA arenas and, most recently, represents a group of Sacramento residents fighting an arena deal for the Sacramento Kings. That deal includes more than \$100 million in taxpayer-funded sweeteners. Meserve has extensive experience challenging major projects on environmental grounds, most recently representing groups fighting the Governor's controversial plan to divert the Sacramento River into the so-called Delta Water Tunnels.

"Our team of attorneys – some of the nation's best – will be tasked with analyzing the Warriors' proposed plan and advising us on the environmental and civic impacts of a project that we believe would wreak havoc on Mission Bay for UCSF and bioscience research," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance.

The MBA is hopeful that litigation will not be necessary because the EIR will reveal fatal flaws, resulting in abandonment or rejection of the project. However, the MBA is preparing itself in the event that the City provides an inadequate review and a "rubber stamp approval" of a project it seems to have prejudged before any public vetting of its impacts.

"CEQA will analyze environmental impacts and identify mitigation. Our job is to protect the public's right to know what these impacts will be by ensuring the City and the Warriors comply with CEQA," said attorney Osha Meserve of Soluri Meserve.

Spaulding said the Warriors' own initial estimates indicated that development will generate 38.5 million vehicle miles traveled per year for games and events in addition to the impact of the new proposed office buildings that are part of the development. Spaulding said this means as many as an additional 450,000 vehicle trips in San Francisco every year.

"These overwhelming impacts raise obvious questions about how the City will avoid gridlock stretching for miles around the proposed Arena," Spaulding said. "We will be taking a hard look at the City's CEQA analysis of these impacts in the forthcoming Draft Environmental Impact Report."

For more information about the Mission Bay Alliance, visit www.missionbayalliance.org.

--30--

Related Coverage



Legal Team Announced to Challenge Golden State Warriors San Francisco Arena, Real Estate Development

June 2, 2015

San Francisco – The Mission Bay Alliance, which is greatly concerned with the grave environmental impact of the proposed Golden State Warriors' Stadium and Events Center on the entire Mission Bay Community including the UCSF Mission Bay Campus, has retained four major law firms including some of the state's top legal minds with expertise in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to review the Warriors' stadium plan's Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

David Boies, the Chairman of the firm Boies, Schiller & Flexner, which has been described by the Wall Street Journal as a national legal "powerhouse," will serve as the Mission Bay Alliance's Lead Counsel and help the Alliance carefully vet the project and strategize tactics going forward. The Boies Schiller firm has worked on landmark cases, including *Bush v. Gore*, *United States v. Microsoft*, and the case to overturn Proposition 8 which resulted in all Californians gaining the equal right to marry the person of their choosing.

In addition to the appointment of Boies Schiller, the Mission Bay Alliance has engaged a CEQA legal team with decades of experience advising and litigating impacts of high-profile public and private projects.

The team includes:

Thomas Lippe, who has dedicated his career to environmental law with a specialty in litigating land use cases at both the administrative level and in state courts that typically require enforcement of CEQA and the California Planning and Zoning Law. Lippe has litigated dozens of high-profile cases, including many involving land use in San Francisco, recently representing environmental organizations that worked to minimize the environmental impacts of the America's Cup event in San Francisco.

Susan Brandt-Hawley of the Brandt-Hawley Law Group, who has represented hundreds of public-interest groups in widely-varied CEQA and land use issues statewide, often with special focus on historic resources. In February she won a significant land use victory when a San Francisco Superior Court Judge struck down all approvals for the controversial 8 Washington St. waterfront luxury condo project, ruling that the project EIR was inadequate.

Osha Meserve and Patrick Soluri, who are principals at Soluri Meserve, a Sacramento-based environmental law firm that also specializes in land use planning and policy and large entitlement projects. Soluri has specific experience challenging NBA arenas and, most recently, represents a group of Sacramento residents fighting an arena deal for the Sacramento Kings. That deal includes more than \$100 million in taxpayer-funded sweeteners. Meserve has extensive experience challenging major projects on environmental grounds, most recently representing groups fighting the Governor's controversial plan to divert the Sacramento River into the so-called Delta Water Tunnels.

"Our team of attorneys – some of the nation's best – will be tasked with analyzing the Warriors' proposed plan and advising us on the environmental and civic impacts of a project that we believe would wreak havoc on Mission Bay for UCSF and bioscience research," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance.

The MBA is hopeful that litigation will not be necessary because the EIR will reveal fatal flaws, resulting in abandonment or rejection of the project. However, the MBA is preparing itself in the event that the City provides an inadequate review and a "rubber stamp approval" of a project it seems to have prejudged before any public vetting of its impacts.

“CEQA will analyze environmental impacts and identify mitigation. Our job is to protect the public’s right to know what these impacts will be by ensuring the City and the Warriors comply with CEQA,” said attorney Osha Meserve of Soluri Meserve.

Spaulding said the Warriors’ own initial estimates indicated that development will generate 38.5 million vehicle miles traveled per year for games and events in addition to the impact of the new proposed office buildings that are part of the development. Spaulding said this means as many as an additional 450,000 vehicle trips in San Francisco every year.

“These overwhelming impacts raise obvious questions about how the City will avoid gridlock stretching for miles around the proposed Arena,” Spaulding said. “We will be taking a hard look at the City’s CEQA analysis of these impacts in the forthcoming Draft Environmental Impact Report.”



Petition by community groups favoring Warriors arena in Mission Bay reaches 3,000 signatures

By Laura Dudnick – June 2, 2015

Community activists in favor of the proposed Golden State Warriors arena in Mission Bay are calling foul on a group that has promised to fight the project all the way to the courtroom.

A Change.org petition in support of the project was created May 9 by a coalition of neighbors, community-based organizations and small-business owners, and as of Tuesday morning had more than 3,000 signatures.

The petition also urges members of the Mission Bay Alliance, who do not want an arena located at Third and 16th streets across from UC San Francisco's new hospitals, to identify themselves and spell out their intentions for blocking the development.

“Obviously community input has shaped this project, and then these guys come along and threaten with lawyers,” said Patrick Valentino, vice president of the South Beach Mission Bay Merchants Association and an author of the petition. “It’s a very dark thing to do.”

The Warriors had previously proposed a waterfront arena along The Embarcadero just south of the Bay Bridge, but last year purchased land in Mission Bay from Salesforce.com amid opposition to that proposal.

The Mission Bay Alliance, led by former UCSF officials, argues that traffic congestion and a lack of parking will impact the neighborhood. The alliance recently announced it had retained a slew of prominent attorneys in preparation for a legal battle against the project.

Sam Singer, a spokesman for the alliance, said its leaders are well-known former top officials at UCSF, and that more than 1,000 people are part of the alliance. The alliance is not affiliated with UCSF, which supports the project.

The petition will ultimately be sent to Bruce Spaulding, the alliance's strategy and organizational consultant. Spaulding is also the former senior vice chancellor of advancement and planning at UCSF.



Media Contact

Sam Singer or Alex Doniach

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949 or 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

5 June 2015

Mission Bay Alliance Legal Team Will Review Golden State Warriors' Arena EIR Plan

San Francisco – The Mission Bay Alliance, which is concerned with the grave environmental impact of the proposed Golden State Warriors' Stadium and Events Center on the entire Mission Bay Community including the UCSF Mission Bay Campus, said today it will thoroughly review the Warriors' stadium plan's Environmental Impact Report (EIR) released today and go through it "with a fine tooth comb" to ensure public transparency about the impacts of the real estate development on UCSF, Mission Bay, the biosciences industry and neighborhood.

MBA just announced earlier this week it has retained four major law firms including some of the state's top legal minds with expertise in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to review the EIR.

David Boies, the Chairman of the firm Boies, Schiller & Flexner, which has been described by the Wall Street Journal as a national legal "powerhouse," will serve as the Mission Bay Alliance's Lead Counsel and help the Alliance carefully vet the project and strategize tactics going forward. The Boies Schiller firm has worked on landmark cases including the case to overturn Proposition 8 which resulted in all Californians gaining the equal right to marry the person of their choosing.

"Our team of attorneys – some of the nation's best – will be tasked with analyzing the Warriors' proposed plan and advising us on the environmental and civic impacts of a project that we believe would wreak havoc on Mission Bay for UCSF and bioscience research," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance.

The MBA is hopeful that litigation will not be necessary because the EIR will reveal fatal flaws, resulting in abandonment or rejection of the project. However, the MBA is preparing itself in the event that the City provides an inadequate review and a "rubber stamp approval" of a project it seems to have prejudged before any public vetting of its impacts.

"CEQA will analyze environmental impacts and identify mitigation. Our job is to protect the public's right to know what these impacts will be by ensuring the City and the Warriors comply with CEQA," added Spaulding.

He said the Warriors' own initial estimates indicated that development will generate 38.5 million vehicle miles traveled per year for games and events in addition to the impact of the new proposed office buildings that are part of the development. Spaulding said this means as many as an additional 450,000 vehicle trips in San Francisco every year.

"These overwhelming impacts raise obvious questions about how the City will avoid gridlock stretching for miles around the proposed Arena," Spaulding said. "We will be taking a hard look at the City's CEQA analysis of these impacts in the forthcoming Draft Environmental Impact Report."

In addition to the appointment of Boies Schiller, the Mission Bay Alliance has engaged a CEQA legal team with decades of experience advising and litigating impacts of high-profile public and private projects.

The team includes:

Thomas Lippe, who has dedicated his career to environmental law with a specialty in litigating land use cases at both the administrative level and in state courts that typically require enforcement of CEQA and the California Planning and Zoning Law. Lippe has litigated dozens of high-profile cases, including many involving land use in San Francisco, recently representing environmental organizations that worked to minimize the environmental impacts of the America's Cup event in San Francisco.

Susan Brandt-Hawley of the Brandt-Hawley Law Group, who has represented hundreds of public-interest groups in widely-varied CEQA and land use issues statewide, often with special focus on historic resources. In February she won a significant land use victory when a San Francisco Superior Court Judge struck down all approvals for the controversial 8 Washington St. waterfront luxury condo project, ruling that the project EIR was inadequate.

Osha Meserve and Patrick Soluri, who are principals at Soluri Meserve, a Sacramento-based environmental law firm that also specializes in land use planning and policy and large entitlement projects. Soluri has specific experience challenging NBA arenas and, most recently, represents a group of Sacramento residents fighting an arena deal for the Sacramento Kings. That deal includes more than \$100 million in taxpayer-funded sweeteners. Meserve has extensive experience challenging major projects on environmental grounds, most recently representing groups fighting the Governor's controversial plan to divert the Sacramento River into the so-called Delta Water Tunnels.

For more information about the Mission Bay Alliance, visit www.missionbayalliance.org.

--30--

Related Coverage



Opponents of Proposed Golden State Warriors Arena Petition to Halt Project

June 5, 2015

A coalition that includes UCSF donors and doctors is petitioning to halt the proposed Golden State Warriors stadium in San Francisco.

The Mission Bay Alliance is described on the website as "a coalition of UCSF stakeholders, donors, faculty, physicians and the working men and women of San Francisco who are concerned about the impact of the proposed Golden State Warriors stadium on the future of the vibrant community and medical campus at Mission Bay."

Golden State Warriors Victory Parade

Chief concerns expressed in the petition include traffic gridlock, difficult-to-access emergency and urgent care for both UCSF and Kaiser Permanente, and commute challenges for the staff of the Mission Bay campus.

But the coalition does not officially speak for UCSF. Representatives of the university provided a statement to NBC Bay Area in April that said in part, ". . . we are encouraged by the city's effort" to minimize traffic concerns, particularly on days when there might be events at the new stadium and nearby AT&T Park.



Media Contact:

Sam Singer or Alex Doniach

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949 or 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

18 June 2015

Mission Bay Alliance Launches Petition to Stop the Proposed Warriors' Entertainment Center in Mission Bay

San Francisco – The Mission Bay Alliance, which is greatly concerned with the proposed Golden State Warriors' Stadium and Entertainment Center, today launched a petition on Change.org demanding that the City of San Francisco stop the proposed project in Mission Bay.

The petition gives Bay Area residents an opportunity to express concerns about the serious impacts of the proposed 18,500-seat arena and entertainment center located across the street from the UCSF Mission Bay Campus, which includes children's, women's and cancer hospitals. The city is in the process of reviewing the project's draft Environmental Impact Report, which is available for public comment until July 20.

"Since our launch a month ago, we have heard from people all across San Francisco and the Bay Area with their concerns about the new proposed site for the sports arena," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance. "All of them have significant concerns about the disastrous impacts the proposed arena and entertainment center will have on access to Mission Bay and their lifesaving hospitals and to traffic, transportation in the neighborhoods surrounding Mission Bay.

"These concerns have been perfectly articulated by the draft EIR," he added. "Yet, despite these clear facts, the City continues to find new ways to circumvent the normal public review and fast track and exempt the arena from its normal environmental review process. This petition provides nearby businesses, residents, healthcare workers and all of those who have contacted us with their concerns a mechanism to collectively tell the City that Mission Bay is the wrong place for this project."

The petition calls on the city to protect the Mission Bay community from the unacceptable impacts of the project, including:

Traffic gridlock in a small, heavily congested area that is ill-equipped to handle up to 18,500 fans at 225 events per year, impeding access to other parts of the city and the Bay Bridge.

A parking nightmare as a result of fewer than 200 parking spaces dedicated the 18,500-seat entertainment center.

Difficult-to-access emergency and urgent care for patients, including Kaiser Permanente patients at the Owens Street site.

Additional commute challenges for the nurses, doctors and medical staff who work at the Mission Bay medical campus.

Noise pollution that could imperil the recovery of patients, including children, women and cancer patients who rely on Mission Bay hospitals' outstanding care.

Interference with access to UCSF's hospital campus and biomedical research center at Mission Bay and stifled growth of critically important biosciences in the region. The future of this world-class medical center should not be jeopardized by billionaires seeking to double the value of the Warriors as a sports franchise on the backs of San Francisco residents.

To sign the petition, visit: <https://www.change.org/p/city-of-san-francisco-stop-the-proposed-warriors-arena-and-entertainment-center-in-mission-bay>

The draft Environmental Impact Report was released on June 5. A public hearing will be held on Tuesday, June 30 at 1pm at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 416.

About the Mission Bay Alliance

The Mission Bay Alliance is a coalition of UCSF stakeholders, donors, faculty, physicians and the working men and women of San Francisco who are concerned about the impact of the proposed Golden State Warriors stadium on the future of the vibrant community and medical campus at Mission Bay. The Alliance fully supports the Warriors' team and congratulates its tremendous championship win. However, the Alliance believes the proposed arena and entertainment center is ill-conceived for this site. For more information about the Mission Bay Alliance, visit www.missionbayalliance.org.

--30--



Media Contact:

Bryan Parker

Cell: 650-714-7494

Email: bryan@bryanparker.org

For Immediate Release:

June 19, 2015

Oakland Port Commissioner Launches Movement to Keep Warriors in Oakland

Oakland – Oakland Port Commissioner and former Mayoral candidate Bryan Parker today announced a new “Keep the Warriors in Oakland” coalition, calling on Joe Lacob, Peter Guber and Warriors’ management to reengage with the City of Oakland to identify an Oakland-based solution to the new Warriors’ stadium search.

“We are starting a new coalition committed to preserving the longstanding partnership between the City of Oakland and the Warriors,” said Parker at an early-morning press conference at the start of Friday’s Warrior’s parade. “We know that there are plenty of opportunities here in Oakland, either by retrofitting the Oracle Arena or by identifying alternate sites like on the Port, which can give the team everything it needs and then some.

Amid news that the Warriors’ management was pursuing a new, San Francisco location for the longtime Oakland-based team, Parker rallied a cadre of volunteers and die-hard Warriors fans to solicit support from the thousands who descended on Downtown Oakland for the Championship parade.

Parker’s team distributed “Keep the Warriors in Oakland” rally signs and collected signatures for a petition calling on Lacob, Guber and Warriors’ managers to work with the City of Oakland to consider Oakland-based solutions.

The movement also launched a website, <http://www.keepwarriorsoakland.org/>, where residents and supporters can sign up to pledge their support. An online petition, also launched Friday, on Change.org.

“This team means too much to Oakland,” Parker said. “Having the team here brings good, working-class jobs, contributions to our tax base and a spirit that fills the City with hope. We’ve been there for the Warriors, filling the Oracle Arena through the darkest of times and, now, in the best of times. We’ve been here because we love the Warriors.”

“We’re hoping to encourage the Warriors’ management to start a conversation with the City to keep the team in Oakland, a City that’s been the backbone of the Warriors’ success over the past few years – and for the decades to come,” Parker added.

Parker said his coalition would advocate for the numerous opportunities in Oakland, from retrofitting Oracle, to building a new stadium on site – or at the Port of Oakland.

“We know we have a long road and even longer odds,” Parker said. “But we are just as committed to this team staying in Oakland as this team was to sacrificing everything to win a Championship. Our championship will be when we stand together, in numbers, to celebrate the Warriors staying in the City that has given so much to this team.”

Parker has been a vocal advocate of keeping the team in Oakland since Lacob first floated plans to move the team. In June, he authored an opinion piece in the Huffington Post, When Winning Extends Beyond Sports – What a NBA Title Would Mean to Oakland.

Visit www.KeepWarriorsOakland.org or the petition at Change.org to learn more.

--30--



Media Contact

Name: Michael Lighty

Cell: [\(510\) 772-8384](tel:5107728384)

Email: mighty@calnurses.org

For Immediate Release:
June 29, 2015

UCSF Nurses Call on City to Reject Mission Bay Arena and Prioritize Health First
California Nurses Association: Sports Arena Adjacent to Hospital Will Have Severe Consequences on Patients and Healthcare workers

San Francisco – The California Nurses Association, which represents the nurses of UCSF hospitals, announced today its opposition to the proposed Golden State Warriors’ entertainment complex in Mission Bay, citing its impacts on access to lifesaving care, patient health and the ability of health care professionals to access Mission Bay’s hospitals and clinics in gridlock traffic.

“Our role here is to ensure that the lifesaving hospitals in Mission Bay have a future in Mission Bay,” said XXXX “The addition of a mega sports and entertainment complex adjacent to our healthcare facilities would likely limit our ability to protect thousands of children and adults each day.”

Nurses at a Monday press conference called on the City to reject the project as proposed and, instead of enriching the wealthy owners of the Warriors and the developers of this project, put the city’s health and welfare first.

“Our membership is concerned that the City is putting so much attention, effort and resources behind a poorly planned palace when we have so many challenges in San Francisco – such as the health and welfare of our City’s sick and the ability to provide affordable housing for so many in our community who are struggling to get by,” said xx.

The City released its draft Environmental Impact Report for the project earlier this month, underscoring the impacts of this facility on the surrounding community.

The Warriors are proposing to build an 18,500-seat megacomplex in the Mission Bay neighborhood – directly across the street from the UCSF Benioff Children’s Hospital, the UCSF Bakar Cancer Center, the UCSF Betty Irene Moore Women’s Hospital and the UCSF Ron Conway Family Gateway Medical Building, in addition to other facilities, including a new Kaiser Permanente clinic.

The entertainment center would host 225 events each year – a game, convention or other special event more than every other day – that would substantially increase congestion in the area, limiting timely access to critical healthcare facilities.

Despite the size of the facility, the arena project as proposed only includes 200 dedicated parking spaces. Event traffic would be directed to park in private lots already dedicated to other facilities, such as UCSF's hospital parking lots currently utilized by patients and healthcare workers.

Even worse, the EIR illustrates how the proposed project would bring traffic in all surrounding intersections to a halt, guaranteeing complete gridlock during special events.

"If built as proposed, the draft EIR shows that the crowds and traffic generated by this arena will flood the small Mission Bay Area, grinding the area to a halt and over saturating the few existing parking lots in the neighborhood," said xx. "Add that to the impact on air quality from the congestion and idling cars, factors that have not been adequately studied or considered."

Nurses said they would raise concerns directly with the City at the June 30 public hearing at City Hall on the project's draft EIR.

The California Nurses Association/National Nurses United /AFL-CIO is the largest organization of nurses in the U.S. and in California.

--30--

Related Coverage



UCSF nurses union comes out against S.F. Warriors arena

J.K. Dineen – June 29, 2015

The Golden State Warriors could face some unexpected opposition in their drive to build an arena in Mission Bay: nurses.

On Monday, the California Nurses Association, a union that represents 900 UCSF nurses, came out against the plan for an 18,500-seat arena across the street from the new UCSF Medical Center on the southern edge of Mission Bay.

In a statement, the nurses union cited "impacts on access to care, patient health and the ability of patients, family members and health professionals to access Mission Bay's hospitals and clinics in gridlock traffic."

At a news conference Monday, three nurses expressed reservations about the Warriors' plan, although they all admitted that they were unfamiliar with the details of the team's recently released 800-page environmental impact report, which analyzes the arena's potential effects on traffic and parking.

Backed by Mayor Ed Lee and San Francisco's political establishment, the Warriors' Mission Bay arena plan faced minimal public opposition until April, when a mostly anonymous group of UCSF donors and wealthy biotech executives announced it would fight the proposal. The group, the Mission Bay Alliance, has hired no fewer than four law firms and has vowed to spend millions of dollars on legal challenges.

While the Mission Bay Alliance's legal threats have not eroded support for the development at City Hall, concerns voiced by rank-and-file nurses could help bolster the case against the basketball arena in the court of public opinion.

"Delay of care is a big concern for our nurses," CNA member Lili Cooper said at Monday's news conference.

"If you have a patient having an asthma attack (who) just needs a breathing treatment, but can't get through traffic, that is a problem of ours that needs to be addressed," Cooper said. "It's a hospital. You always have emergencies. That is what hospitals are for."

Warriors spokesman P.J. Johnston said the team is eager to talk to the nurses.

"If nurses at UCSF, or members of the California Nurses Association, have any legitimate concerns about the project, then we want to speak with them and address those concerns," he said.

At the news conference, representatives from the CNA refused to answer any specific questions about a traffic and parking plan developed by the Warriors and the city, and attempted to abruptly end questioning after only a few minutes.

CNA spokesman Charles Idelson said the group is not working with the Mission Bay Alliance, although their news conference was organized by the public relations company that also represents the alliance. "We are not working with the (Mission Bay Alliance) or representing any billionaires on any side of this equation," Idelson said. "We are not anti-Warriors. Our stake is in the patient and making sure these issues are addressed fully and appropriately. Period."

The UCSF administration is not opposing the project and is actively working with the city and the Warriors on the traffic and parking plan. UCSF said Monday that it "remains supportive of the proposed Warriors Stadium at Mission Bay, provided that traffic can be managed to ensure the safety of patients, visitors and health care workers in the Mission Bay hospitals and adjoining campus."

The statement continued: "UCSF is not affiliated with any outside groups that are either opposing or supporting the plan. However, the university supports faculty and staff who wish to have a constructive voice in the discussion via the public hearing or other means."

So far most of the debate over traffic impact centers on the "shoulder period" from 6:30 to 7:30 p.m. on weekdays, a time when downtown rush hour traffic is sluggish, when Mission Bay residents are trying to get home, and when fans would be trying to get to the arena to catch a game or concert.

The city is planning to tackle potential traffic jams through beefed-up public transit and a “traffic separation” plan aimed at funneling arena-bound cars onto certain streets while hospital and neighborhood vehicles are routed onto others.

UCSF’s Mission Bay medical facility opened in February. In the first year alone, UCSF anticipates delivering more than 2,600 infants and performing more than 9,500 inpatient and outpatient surgeries, while providing emergency care to children from San Francisco and beyond.

The CNA has frequently sided with progressive candidates and worked against measures backed by Lee, according to David Latterman of Fall Line Analytics, a political consultant who works for moderate candidates. Latterman said the group can be extremely active, even if its candidates and causes frequently lose.

“They put money into races and come at it hard, particularly in San Francisco,” he said. “They play hardball.”



Proposed Warriors Arena in San Francisco Sees New Opposition

Carolyn Tyler – June 29, 2015

New opposition has surfaced to the Golden State Warriors' plan to build a new arena in San Francisco. Nurses at nearby UCSF are raising questions about the impact on patient care.

A handful of UCSF nurses with the California Nurses Association predict gridlock that will jeopardize patient care if the Warriors are allowed to build an 18,000 seat arena across the street from their hospital complex in Mission Bay.

"One of the biggest concerns is during a game obviously if emergency [vehicles] are trying to get to our hospitals to get the patients the critical care they need, they might not be able to get through," UCSF nurse Lili Cooper said.

But the city's draft environmental impact report calls for traffic mitigation.

"Like dedicated traffic lanes, dedicated routes to the hospital for people going to the hospital, as opposed to going to the arena or any other event. It can totally be done," Warriors spokesperson P.J. Johnston said.

Opponents insist there will only be 200 dedicated parking spots for fans. The Warriors say they are building more than 1,000 and that there are already thousands more in the area that will be available on

game nights.

"Are questions about traffic legitimate? Absolutely, but scare tactics and, frankly, misinformation that's not helpful for anybody," Johnston said.

Obstetrics nurse Kierstin Clickner says she hasn't read the city's plans but wants a more thorough discussion. She said, "All the nurses and the staff love the Warriors and support the Warriors, but our priority is our patients."

The city holds a hearing on the Warriors project on Tuesday.



**UCSF employees concerned with new Golden State Warriors arena, say
congestion will hinder access to emergency care**

Bay City News – June 29, 2015

SAN FRANCISCO (BCN) — A new 18,500-seat Golden State Warriors basketball arena that developers have proposed to build on 11 acres in San Francisco's Mission Bay neighborhood is likely to exacerbate existing gridlock near the newly built University of California at San Francisco Medical Center at Mission Bay, UCSF employees said.

The mixed-use arena is proposed for the intersection of 16th and Third streets, adjacent to the medical center that opened its doors to patients earlier this year.

While San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee has expressed his overwhelming support for the arena, some UCSF employees aren't sold on the idea of it so close to the hospital.

A small group of UCSF nurses gathered near the proposed site of the arena this morning to express their concerns about the project's proximity to the hospital and the potential drawbacks.

Kierstin Clickner, a nurse at the medical center, said she and her colleagues are "concerned that the plan currently in place is not sufficient" and doesn't prioritize patient care.

Clickner said there needs to be a better plan, noting that the arena proposal stipulates very few new parking spots despite a capacity of 18,500 potential visitors, not including the arena's staff.

She said the plan for the new arena doesn't accommodate the staff and patients that need to get to the hospital, plus all the visitors who will be making their way to games and other events.

Lili Cooper, who also works as a nurse at the medical center, said she is concerned that in a medical emergency, because of the congestion in the area caused by the new arena, those in need of medical attention won't be able to get to the hospital in time.

Cooper said something as basic as an asthma attack could become a life-threatening situation if the patient is stuck in traffic and can't get timely care.

"If they can't get the critical treatment they need, that's a problem," Cooper said.

Ajax Guevara, a UCSF shuttle driver who said he knows the area around the medical center like the back of his hand, said he already has to deal with an incredible amount of congestion on game days at AT&T Park, the San Francisco Giants' ballpark located less than a mile from the hospital.

Guevara, a San Francisco resident who has been a driver for 18 years, said traffic in the area is already bad and that the Mission Bay location might not be ideal for another stadium.

He said he appreciates that the stadium will bring more jobs to residents, but said those same jobs could perhaps exist in a less congested area of the city, potentially further south of the proposed site.

Guevara said UCSF shuttles that carry workers to and from the hospitals are stuck in traffic regularly, but that more importantly, "ambulances have a hard time getting everywhere."

He said the construction of a second stadium would make it more difficult for emergency workers to help those during emergencies.

"It's too tight down here," Guevara said.

Guevara suggested San Francisco voters be given a chance at the ballot to decide what's more important to them: timely medical attention or a basketball arena.

San Francisco Fire Department spokeswoman Mindy Talmadge said that the existing roads surrounding AT&T Park don't have wide enough shoulders for ambulances and that in order to get through the area, ambulance drivers often resort to driving the wrong way down city streets.

Talmadge said congestion "will definitely be worse at certain times" if another stadium is constructed close by.

Charles Idelson, a spokesman for the California Nurses Association, which represents about 900 registered nurses at UCSF, said that while "everyone loves the Warriors," he wants the city to provide assurances that any projects in Mission Bay won't impede medical access.

"We want the city to do its due diligence," Idelson said, explaining that there is a high likelihood that if the arena is constructed, a lot of cars will idle next to the hospital, negatively impacting air quality and possibly obstructing access to care during an emergency.

"Let's take our time and make sure it's done right," Idelson said.

The Warriors had previously proposed to build an arena on the waterfront at Piers 30-32, but scrapped those plans last year and purchased the land in Mission Bay. The team is currently planned to build the arena in time for the 2018-2019 season.

When opponents of the Mission Bay plan first came forward this past April, Warriors spokesman P.J. Johnston said the team is working with UCSF and the city to address any concerns, particularly over traffic congestion.

Johnston said in April that the city has conducted studies showing that the arena should have no impact on ambulances reaching the hospital and that first responders may have an easier time getting around on event days since traffic control officers will be on scene to help handle crowds around the arena.

He has noted that there are 17 other arenas around the country within a few blocks of a hospital, including in major cities like Atlanta, Chicago and Brooklyn.

A public hearing before the city's Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure Commission will be held at 1 p.m. Tuesday at San Francisco City Hall.

Public comments on the adequacy of the draft subsequent environmental impact report for the project will be accepted through July 20, according to the city's planning department.



Media Contact:

Sam Singer or Alex Doniach

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949 or 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

30 June 2015

Proposed Warriors' Entertainment Complex Flunks Environmental Test for Traffic, Congestion, Draft EIR Shows

San Francisco –The Mission Bay Alliance and representatives from the UCSF healthcare community will share concerns about the proposed Golden State Warriors' arena and entertainment center in Mission Bay, including the impacts on traffic and parking outlined in the project's draft environmental impact report (EIR), at 1pm hearing today at City Hall (room 416).

A day after nurses from UCSF held a protest to voice their concerns about the proposed project, members of the Mission Bay Alliance say that while attorneys are still reviewing the draft Environmental Impact Report released earlier this month, initial review of the more than 1,000-page environmental document has already highlighted major concerns.

In fact, the EIR shows that major intersections receive a failing score of "E" and "F" during special events, according to the report's "Level of Service" traffic impact analysis. The scoring calculates the delays per vehicle and assigns an A-F letter grade for each Mission Bay intersection – the vast majority of which would fail during games and special events. A score of "A" or "B" would mean traffic is flowing smoothly while a score of "E" and "F" equates to congestion and gridlock. These problems are anticipated despite substantial transit and transportation investments promised by the City to ease the proposed arena and entertainment center's traffic.

"The draft EIR shows that the Warriors' proposed entertainment complex in Mission Bay fails major intersections and will grind traffic in Mission Bay to a screeching halt during games and events," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance. "While our team of attorneys continues to review the project, the draft EIR admits this project will have significantly negative impacts on nearby residents and UCSF patients and healthcare workers."

While the City is holding a public hearing about the project today, formal comments to the City's planning department are due July 20 (45 days after the draft EIR was released).

After an initial review of the 1,000-page EIR, the Mission Bay Alliance's legal team is now asking for an additional 45 days to provide adequate time to review and comment on the multiple City documents written over a 25-year period that comprise the environmental review for the project.

“Forty-five days is simply not enough time to meaningfully review and comment on the draft Environmental Impact Report,” said Mission Bay Alliance attorney Tom Lippe in a letter to the City requesting the extension.

Representatives for the Mission Bay Alliance will be able available to provide comment to the media at 12:30pm today, Tuesday, June 30, on the City Hall steps immediately prior to the public hearing.

For more information about the Mission Bay Alliance, visit www.missionbayalliance.org.

The three-volume 2015 draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report can be found at www.gsweventcenter.com.

Snapshots from the City’s traffic analysis, showing major intersections around the project that would be, in many cases, downgraded to an “E” or “F” Level of Service grade during games:

INTERSECTION	GRADE
King St and Third St	E
King St and Fourth St	E
King St and Fifth St at I-280 Ramp	E
Fifth St/ Bryant at I-80EB on ramp	F
7 th /Mississippi at 16 th Street	F
Fifth St/Harrison at I-80 WB off-ramp	F
Seventh St and Mission Bay Dr	F
Fourth St and 16 th St	E
Owens St at 16 th St	E

--30--

Related Coverage



Opponents: Warriors proposed arena fails environmental test for traffic

Sharon Song – June 30, 2015

SAN FRANCISCO (KRON) — The battle over the Golden State Warriors’ proposed new \$1 billion arena is heating up as a group of opponents on Tuesday plans to raise their concerns about traffic and parking before city officials.

San Francisco’s Mission Bay neighborhood has been designated for the NBA championship team’s 18,000-seat arena and entertainment center. But the project is facing a major showdown as the Mission

Bay Alliance, a newly formed coalition that includes UCSF stakeholders, donors, and faculty point to an environmental report that it says gives the project a flunking grade on the subject of traffic in the area.

On Tuesday, the Mission Bay Alliance along with other representatives from the UCSF healthcare community plan to share those concerns during a public hearing, as they highlight findings of the recently released draft environmental impact report (EIR). The opponents are worried the arena will create dangerous delays for patients and physicians trying to get to the new UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital San Francisco at Mission Bay.

"The draft EIR shows that the Warriors' proposed entertainment complex in Mission Bay fails major intersections and will grind traffic in Mission Bay to a screeching halt during games and events," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance. "While our team of attorneys continues to review the project, the draft EIR admits this project will have significantly negative impacts on nearby residents and UCSF patients and healthcare workers."

The group says major intersections in the area receive a failing score of "E" and "F" during special events, according to the report's "Level of Service" traffic impact analysis. The scoring calculates the delays per vehicle and assigns an A-F letter grade for each Mission Bay intersection. The Mission Bay Alliance says the report shows the vast majority of those intersections would fail, facing heavy congestion and gridlock during games and special events. The alliance says these problems are anticipated despite substantial transit and transportation investments promised by the city to ease traffic in the area.

City officials are planning a public hearing about the project Tuesday and formal comments to the city's planning department are due July 20 (45 days after the draft EIR was released), said the Mission Bay Alliance. After an initial review of the EIR, the Mission Bay Alliance's legal team wants an additional 45 days to review and comment on city documents used to support the environmental report for the project.

"45 days is simply not enough time to meaningfully review and comment on the draft Environmental Impact Report," said Mission Bay Alliance attorney Tom Lippe in a letter to the city requesting the extension.

The latest move follows a protest on Monday by UCSF nurses who voiced their concerns about the proposed project.



Warriors SF arena plan: Cash vs. money

Monte Poole – July 2, 2015

After being denied the opportunity to create a palatial arena of their dreams at Piers 30-32 in San Francisco, Warriors ownership last year confidently pivoted to Plan B, a China Basin site a few blocks south of the Giants ballpark.

There was tremendous civic support when the Warriors announced their intentions to move to the current 12-acre arena site, which sits across the street from the sprawling new UCSF Mission Bay medical campus. Mayor Ed Lee, after previously supporting the proposal at Piers 30-32, hopped aboard the new plan.

But this is San Francisco, where ambitious waterfront plans often die before the blueprints dry.

That's where the Mission Bay Alliance and its deep pockets come in. The newly formed non-profit group dedicated to the medical facility wants the Warriors to scrap the arena plan, citing its impact on traffic and parking near the hospital. The mere thought of ambulances stuck in traffic is bound to strike a chord with citizens.

The group also has its own vision, preferring that the proposed arena site be utilized for biotechnology research.

MBA spokesperson Sam Singer, a high-profile local PR specialist, expresses extreme confidence that the project will be derailed.

"I'd bet my bottom dollar," he said Wednesday night. "I can guarantee you that we'll get this done."

Warriors owners Joe Lacob and Peter Guber believe they've done their homework, including the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which was released last month, and are ready to act in hopes of getting the new facility open in 2018.

"Anytime somebody threatens to sue your project, you have to take it seriously," team spokesman P.J. Johnston said Thursday morning. "And you certainly have to take it seriously when that threat is coming from a bunch of anonymous billionaires. We have to assume they're going to be able to put a lot of money behind their litigation."

"Nevertheless, we sort of always anticipated somebody would likely challenge the EIR or sue us because that's just what happens in San Francisco, or any big project in California. So we've been extra careful and extra cautious about dotting our I's and crossing our T's all the way along."

What we have is a battle between two deep-pocketed entities that could threaten the team's projected '18 opening.

The MBA has hired a platoon of lawyers and launched a petition in hopes of killing the arena plan through community disapproval or by litigating the Warriors into submission.

The MBA was formed shortly after the arena project was unveiled in 15 months ago. The coalition of UCSF stakeholders, donors, faculty, physicians and other San Franciscans – but not the university itself – didn't like what it heard as the Warriors made their presentations to various civic groups. So they lined up in opposition.

The California Nurses' Association joined the MBA's cause by protesting earlier this week. There was on Tuesday a public hearing at City Hall during which speakers filled the air with pros and cons related to the EIR, which in some ways actually acquitted the Warriors.

The Warriors seemed to have broader support. Most of the speakers were behind them, as well as the political establishment. It was evident the Warriors had coordinated with the various city and county agencies that would be involved.

"It has been a very transparent open process, and that will serve us well if and when this should get into the courts," Johnston said.

For all the progress the Warriors have made on the basketball court, last month winning their first NBA championship since 1975, the San Francisco arena pursuit continues to be hazardous and fraught with headaches, if not overt rejection.

The point is that this still may happen. Might even be likely to happen. But it won't be as smooth as the Warriors would like.

The Warriors contend San Francisco deserves something it does not have – a world-class arena worthy of top-shelf sports and entertainment. It is the only American city of its size that lacks such a venue. The Warriors, who have an option to buy the land from Salesforce.com, also say they will construct without public funds.

Sounds like a great idea, made even greater by the rise of the team's profile during its championship run. The Warriors are hot, and it's hard to imagine them getting any hotter.

That does not intimidate the MBA.

"Fortunately for us, we don't have to play the Warriors team," Singer said. "We'd be in big trouble if we did. They're really good at basketball.

"We have to play the owners. And we think we can take Joe Lacob and Peter Guber."



Media Contact:

Sam Singer or Alex Doniach

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949 or 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

14 July 2015

Mayor Lee Misled Public on Warriors Arena Plan, Mission Bay Alliance Claims

Mayor Lee Told Media, KQED that Mission Bay Master Plan Included Sports, Entertainment Arena: But That's Not True, Facts Show

San Francisco – The Mission Bay Alliance today challenged San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee on false statements he made on KQED's Forum last week where he said the proposed Golden State Warriors' arena and entertainment complex was included in the Mission Bay master plan "since its inception."

In a wide-ranging interview, Mayor Lee defended the ill-conceived entertainment center, telling KQED's Michael Krasny that "historically the arena has been part of the master plan for Mission Bay since its inception, and so we can't lose that opportunity to have an entertainment center – not just Warriors' basketball but the number of things that we have not had the capacity to do at Moscone Center."

But an examination of the actual Mission Bay master plan – a roadmap for the area approved by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 1998 – reveals that the Mayor's statement are, in fact, false. While the master plan does allow for bars or other small venues with "nighttime entertainment," it does not include an arena or entertainment center.

"Mayor Lee should correct the record and admit that his statement to Michael Krasny, KQED Forum listeners, is false," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance.

"In his eagerness to fast-track an ill-conceived sports arena directly across the street from the City's largest hospital complex, it appears Mayor Lee has resorted to spreading made up facts to mislead the public," Spaulding said. "No stadium plan was ever included in the original master plan developed in 1998. To state otherwise is patently false and purposely misleading."

According to the Mission Bay North and South Redevelopment Plans, which were approved in 1998, Mission Bay was designed to accommodate the new UCSF research campus containing 2.65 million sq. ft. of building space, a state-of-the-art UCSF hospital complex, 6,000 housing units and several other facilities such as a library, park space and new police and fire stations.

The plan also allowed for limited "nighttime entertainment," including restaurants, bars, night clubs and other similar evening-oriented activities. It said nothing about a sports arena or major concert hall.

“The stadium’s proponents are attempting to circumvent the original intentions of the master plan and twist the definitions to fulfill their current agenda,” said Osha Meserve , an attorney for the Mission Bay Alliance. “For anyone who reads the master plans, it is crystal clear that this 18,500-seat arena does not fit within the definition of ‘nighttime entertainment’ and was not part of the original vision for this area.”

Adding to the problem, the master plan says nothing about daytime events, of which there would be many under the Warrior’s plan. The proposed entertainment complex would accommodate 225 events per year, only 18 percent of which would be Warriors’ basketball games. Many of the other 185 annual events include conventions, conferences, civic events and others with anticipated audiences of 9,000-18,5000 that could occur during the day.

Previous environmental review in 1998 and 1990 did not analyze the environmental impacts of daytime use with such significant attendance.

The Mission Bay Alliance says these different uses of the event center have not been adequately analyzed or mitigated – and should be before the proposed Warriors’ arena draft Environmental Impact Report is considered.

“The original master plan for Mission Bay did not consider a major entertainment complex and event center on site when it laid out an original plan for the region,” Spaulding said. “The City must be held accountable and stick to the facts when discussing the proposed Warriors’ complex. Not only would this project defy the original master plan but it would have disastrous impacts on traffic and access to the Mission Bay area and its lifesaving hospitals and clinics.”

About the Mission Bay Alliance

The Mission Bay Alliance is a coalition of UCSF stakeholders, donors, faculty, physicians and the working men and women of San Francisco who are concerned about the impact of the proposed Golden State Warriors’ stadium on the future of the vibrant community and medical campus at Mission Bay. The Alliance fully supports the Warriors’ team and congratulates its tremendous championship win. However, the Alliance believes the proposed arena and entertainment center is ill-conceived for this site. For more information about the Mission Bay Alliance, visit www.missionbayalliance.org.

--30--

Related Coverage



Opponents accuse mayor of misleading public on Warriors arena plan

Sharon Song – July 14, 2015

SAN FRANCISCO (KRON) — A group of opponents rallying against the Golden State Warriors' proposed new \$1 billion complex in San Francisco is accusing the city's mayor of making false statements about the arena plan.

The Mission Bay Alliance, a newly formed coalition that includes UCSF stakeholders, donors, and faculty, on Tuesday challenged Mayor Ed Lee on statements that the group says he made about the proposed complex being included in the Mission Bay master plan "since its inception."

The group says the mayor made the statements last week during an interview on KQED's Forum.

The Alliance says an examination of the actual Mission Bay master plan reveals that the mayor's statement is false. The master plan is a roadmap for the area approved by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 1998. The group says that while the plan does allow for bars or other small venues with "nighttime entertainment," it does not include an arena or entertainment center.

"Mayor Lee should correct the record and admit that his statement to Michael Krasny, KQED Forum listeners, is false," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance.

The Alliance says that furthermore, the master plan says nothing about daytime events. The group says under the proposal, the entertainment complex would accommodate 225 events a year, and only 18 percent would be Warriors' basketball games. The group contends that many of the other 185 events would include conventions, conferences, and other programs with anticipated audiences of 9,000-18,500 that could occur during the day.

The Mission Bay Alliance says these different uses of the event center have not been adequately analyzed and says these factors should be reviewed before the plan's draft Environmental Impact Report is considered.

"The City must be held accountable and stick to the facts when discussing the proposed Warriors' complex," Spaulding said. "Not only would this project defy the original master plan but it would have disastrous impacts on traffic and access to the Mission Bay area and its lifesaving hospitals and clinics."

KRON 4 has reached out to the Mayor's Office and is awaiting a response.

The Mission Bay Alliance and other opponents have expressed concern that the proposed arena will create dangerous delays for patients and physicians trying to get to the new UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital San Francisco at Mission Bay.



CONTRA COSTA BEE

Warriors Arena at Mission Bay shows power of money over people

July 14, 2015

While communities in Contra Costa wake up to the impact increasing regional planning will have on their communities, San Franciscans also have to face down monied interests and the blind ambitions of irresponsible leaders. No better example is the proposed Warriors Arena that San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee, wants to shoehorn into the planned Mission Bay community.

Despite claims of Mayor Ed Lee to KQED that the Warriors Arena was part of the Master Plan for Mission Bay from its beginning in 1988, "The original master plan for Mission Bay did not consider a major entertainment complex and event center on site when it laid out an original plan for the region," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance.

"The City must be held accountable and stick to the facts when discussing the proposed Warriors' complex. Not only would this project defy the original master plan but it would have disastrous impacts on traffic and access to the Mission Bay area and its lifesaving hospitals and clinics."

In addition to the Mission Bay Alliance, the California Nurses Association at a June 29th CNA press conference, cited "impacts on access to care, patient health and the ability of patients, family members and health professionals to access Mission Bay's hospitals and clinics in gridlock traffic, the California Nurses Association, today voiced opposition to the current plan for the proposed Golden State Warriors' entertainment complex in Mission Bay."

"The addition of a large sports and entertainment complex adjacent to our healthcare facilities would likely limit our ability to protect thousands of children and adults each day," said Randy Howell, RN who works at UCSF Mission Bay.

"For nurses, our concern is to make sure our patients, their family members, and those who care for them are assured of having full access, 24-hours a day, to the critical healthcare facilities," Howell added.

The Mission Bay land for the Warriors Arena is owned by Marc Benioff of Salesforce. Benioff has been a long-time supporter of Lee and is in line for a very sweet payday for that support if Ed Lee gets his way. Many speculate that the Warriors arena is not only payoff to a major supporter but something of a legacy item for Ed Lee, a trophy of his terms in office that drives him to lie to the public.

Even more sinister is that Warriors' owners Joe Jacob and Peter Guber, get richer at the expense of Oakland residents. Oakland still has 12 more years on a 160 million bond..... a lot of bond payments that no one will be paying. What does that mean for Oakland? Jacob and Guber are doing this for their own bottom line – but at what expense? This is a great article that starts questioning this angle: Oracle Arena Made Dreams Come True so Why are the Warriors Ditching it?

For citizens the Warriors Arena debacle is another example of how, even after years of planning and citizen input, real local citizen involvement, that produced public documents and plans that memorialize and implement a community's wishes, are summarily swept away to payoff the rich and powerful leaving taxpayers and residents to suffer.

See the announcement below challenging Ed Lee's claims to KQED that the Warriors arena was a part of Master Plan for the Mission Bay project.

The Mission Bay Alliance today challenged San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee on false statements he made on KQED's Forum last week where he said the proposed Golden State Warriors arena and entertainment complex was included in the Mission Bay master plan "since its inception."

In a wide-ranging interview, Mayor Lee defended the ill-conceived entertainment center, telling KQED's Michael Krasny that "historically the arena has been part of the master plan for Mission Bay since its inception, and so we can't lose that opportunity to have an entertainment center – not just Warriors' basketball but the number of things that we have not had the capacity to do at Moscone Center."

But an examination of the actual Mission Bay master plan – a roadmap for the area approved by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 1998 – reveals that the Mayor's statement are, in fact, false. While the master plan does allow for bars or other small venues with "nighttime entertainment," it does not include an arena or entertainment center.

"Mayor Lee should correct the record and admit that his statement to Michael Krasny, KQED Forum listeners, is false," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance.

"In his eagerness to fast-track an ill-conceived sports arena directly across the street from the City's largest hospital complex, it appears Mayor Lee has resorted to spreading made up facts to mislead the public," Spaulding said. "No stadium plan was ever included in the original master plan developed in 1998. To state otherwise is patently false and purposely misleading."

According to the Mission Bay North and South Redevelopment Plans, which were approved in 1998, Mission Bay was designed to accommodate the new UCSF research campus containing 2.65 million sq. ft. of building space, a state-of-the-art UCSF hospital complex, 6,000 housing units and several other facilities such as a library, park space and new police and fire stations.

The plan also allowed for limited "nighttime entertainment," including restaurants, bars, night clubs and other similar evening-oriented activities. It said nothing about a sports arena or major concert hall.

"The stadium's proponents are attempting to circumvent the original intentions of the master plan and twist the definitions to fulfill their current agenda," said Osha Meserve, an attorney for the Mission Bay Alliance. "For anyone who reads the master plans, it is crystal clear that this 18,500-seat arena does not fit within the definition of 'nighttime entertainment' and was not part of the original vision for this area."

Adding to the problem, the master plan says nothing about daytime events, of which there would be many under the Warrior's plan. The proposed entertainment complex would accommodate 225 events per year, only 18 percent of which would be Warriors' basketball games. Many of the other 185 annual events include conventions, conferences, civic events and others with anticipated audiences of 9,000-18,500 that could occur during the day.

Previous environmental review in 1998 and 1990 did not analyze the environmental impacts of daytime use with such significant attendance.

The Mission Bay Alliance says these different uses of the event center have not been adequately analyzed or mitigated – and should be before the proposed Warriors' arena draft Environmental Impact Report is considered.

“The original master plan for Mission Bay did not consider a major entertainment complex and event center on site when it laid out an original plan for the region,” Spaulding said. “The City must be held accountable and stick to the facts when discussing the proposed Warriors’ complex. Not only would this project defy the original master plan but it would have disastrous impacts on traffic and access to the Mission Bay area and its lifesaving hospitals and clinics.”



Media Contact:

Sam Singer or Alex Doniach

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949 or 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

17 July 2015

Public Receives One-Week Extension to Provide Comments on the Proposed Warriors' Arena Environmental Impact Report

Mission Bay Alliance's Request for Additional Review Triggers Seven-Day Extension

San Francisco – The City of San Francisco's Planning Department has extended the public comment period on the proposed Golden State Warriors' Arena and Entertainment Center by seven days following a request by the Mission Bay Alliance's legal team. Public comments are now due July 27.

The Mission Bay Alliance said the weeklong extension represents a win for residents of San Francisco and supporters of the MBA, a coalition of residents and UCSF employees and stakeholders, who need more time to exhaustively review the 1,000-page draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

"From the very start, the City has acted as an agent of the Warriors' administration by attempting to short-circuit the environmental review process and push this project through," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance. "This extension provides the public with a few days of extra breathing room to give this incredibly complex, 1,000-pages plus of environmental review documents spanning a 25-year period the extra attention and scrutiny that residents of San Francisco deserve."

The draft EIR – a document required by state law to help the City and public analyze and consider the project's impacts on the environment, parking, traffic, public safety and other areas – was released on June 5 followed by a 45-day review period for the public to review the document and provide comments.

Tom Lippe, an attorney for the Mission Bay Alliance, requested an extension on June 30, arguing that 45 days was not sufficient to thoroughly review a project with a "long and complex environmental review history under CEQA (the California Environmental Quality Act)."

Spaulding said despite the condensed timetable, the MBA was committed to providing the comprehensive legal analysis that the City could not be trusted to provide given Mayor Ed Lee's eagerness to see this legacy project realized – possibly at the expense of the City's health, safety and environment.

Just last week, Mayor Lee falsely claimed on KQED's Forum that the proposed arena was part of the Mission Bay master plan approved in 1998.

"Historically the arena has been part of the master plan for Mission Bay since its inception, and so we can't lose that opportunity to have an entertainment center – not just Warriors' basketball but the number of things that we have not had the capacity to do at Moscone Center," Mayor Lee told KQED's Michael Krasny.

However, the actual Mission Bay master plan – a roadmap for the area approved by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 1998 – tells a different story.

While the master plan does allow for bars or other small venues with "nighttime entertainment," it does not include an arena or entertainment center. It also specifically allocates only 50,000 sq. ft. for entertainment-oriented uses in the Mission South area where the arena is proposed, and 400,000 sq. ft. total of entertainment-oriented uses in the entire 313-acre Mission Bay master plan area. This is far fewer than the 750,000 sq. ft. envisioned for the proposed 18,500-seat arena. [See page 6 of the attached 1998 adopted CEQA Findings]

"The Mayor's eagerness to fast-track and make false statements about an ill-conceived sports arena directly across the street from the City's largest hospital complex is precisely why this project needs a thorough review public review process," Spaulding said. "The public, neighbors and thousands of patients and families of Mission Bay's hospitals and clinics deserve nothing less."

To view the EIR, visit <http://www.gsweventcenter.com/>

Submit comments directly to the city by emailing warriors@sfgov.org or mailing to:

Tiffany Bohee, OCII Executive Director, c/o Brett Bollinger
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

About the Mission Bay Alliance

The Mission Bay Alliance is a coalition of UCSF stakeholders, donors, faculty, physicians and the working men and women of San Francisco who are concerned about the impact of the proposed Golden State Warriors' stadium on the future of the vibrant community and medical campus at Mission Bay. The Alliance fully supports the Warriors' team and congratulates its tremendous championship win. However, the Alliance believes the proposed arena and entertainment center is ill-conceived for this site. For more information about the Mission Bay Alliance, visit www.missionbayalliance.org.

--30--

Related Coverage



Big players, sharp elbows in fight over Warriors' Mission Bay arena project

Ron Leuty – July 17, 2015

The Golden State Warriors are world champions on the basketball court. Now they are gearing up to win a tougher contest in the court of San Francisco public opinion.

The fight over a 12-acre Mission Bay site, where the Warriors want to build an 18,000-seat arena in time for the tipoff of the 2018-19 season, has turned from an easy layup into a surprisingly close game as the team and its opponents, the Mission Bay Alliance, battle for the hearts and minds of San Franciscans.

Both sides are ramping up the rhetoric and cranking out the sound bites: the Warriors' team points to the largely unidentified, secretive big-money donors backing the Mission Bay Alliance, while alliance spokeswoman [Alex Doniach](#) accuses Warriors owners [Joe Lacob](#) and [Peter Guber](#) of "turning their backs" on Oakland.

"The Warriors," she said, "are not wed to anything but themselves."

Both sides are squaring off on social media — the "Warriors Ground SF" Facebook page has more than 1,500 "likes," the alliance, 325, as of July 12. There are duelling Change.org petitions designed to pressure (or shame) the other side.

Both sides have rolled out some of San Francisco's best-known PR and political guns to make their cases: Sam Singer and [Jack Davis](#) for the alliance; [P.J. Johnston](#), the press secretary for former Mayor [Willie Brown](#), for the Warriors.

Both sides have lined up influential labor support. The California Nurses Association, which represents 900 registered nurses at the Mission Bay medical center, says it opposes the current plan for the arena.

Meanwhile, the San Francisco Labor Council, which includes the CNA among its 150 member-unions, and Local 2, which represents food service workers at sports venues, favor the project.

"The first thing the Warriors did was call the Labor Council. They've been transparent," council Executive Director Tim Paulson said. "It's exactly the way a developer — no matter what the product is — should be acting."

In the end, though, the game will be played both with political skill and a certain amount of intimidation. For example, moments before an April 30 meeting of the Mission Bay Citizens Advisory Committee — the day after the Mission Bay Alliance came out of stealth — longtime acquaintances Davis and Johnston crossed paths: "You're on the wrong side," Davis growled, pushing a finger into Johnston's chest.

Battle tested

The Warriors have been through this before. Forced by a neighborhood group last year to abandon an arena plan along the Embarcadero, the franchise acted quickly to build community support in Mission Bay. Since last summer, for example, they have met close to 100 times with groups of 10 or fewer people.

“I’m meeting with neighbors one-on-one in living rooms or 30 people in conference rooms at the Madrone and Radiance (housing developments in Mission Bay),” said Theo Ellington, who has led the team’s outreach efforts as director of public affairs.

“We need to know our neighbors,” Johnston added, noting that the Warriors were reaching out to neighbors and community groups long before formal arena opposition arose.

In all, the project includes an arena for at least 41 Warriors home games each year — plus scores of other events — a half-million square feet of office space in two towers and a Union Square-sized restaurant/retail area.

Ellington and, often, Warriors President Rick Welts have regularly attended the Mission Bay CAC meetings, which the team has used as a sounding board, Ellington said. As a result, the development’s designs have been tweaked, including changes to a bayside overlook and reworking a wind tunnel that neighbors complained might keep them off their balconies.

Most recently, responding to calls for more parking, the Warriors bought 135 nearby parking garage spaces, bringing the total number of onsite and dedicated spots to 1,085.

The Warriors’ outreach took on new urgency and importance when the Mission Bay Alliance showed itself in late April. It ratcheted up during the team’s NBA championship run, when the Warriors held viewing parties that doubled as ways to generate arena support.

“Winning helps,” said Ellington, who was born and raised in the Bayview and worked on the campaign of Supervisor Malia Cohen and the failed mayoral bid of Dennis Herrera.

The Warriors also have seized on longer-term relationships with community groups such as Young Community Developers Inc. in the Bayview and Hunters Point.

“The Warriors are more than just a basketball team,” said Dion-Jay Brookter, the organization’s deputy director. “They will be a partner in the community.”

The nonprofit, which oversees job-training programs, arranged for as many as 50 young people over the past two seasons to work pre-game staging and event support for Warriors games at Oracle Arena in Oakland.

“The project is political in nature, but our approach has been consistent since day one,” Ellington said. “We’re going to continue doing what we’re doing in a genuine way.”

The Mission Bay Alliance, on the other hand, got into the game late. That leaves the impression that the group is chucking desperation half-court shots in its efforts to kill the arena development, presumably so UCSF one day can acquire the land for expansion.

The alliance, a collection of mainly retired employees and donors to the University of California, San Francisco, claims that a Warriors arena would smother the biotech industry that has nestled around the UCSF campus in Mission Bay. The alliance's big-money backers include Bill Rutter, Chiron Corp. founder and father of UCSF's biochemistry program, but because it is organized as 501(c)4 nonprofit, the alliance isn't required to disclose its other financial backers, and has declined to say who is providing its money.

Nonetheless, the cash from the alliance's backers has enabled the hiring of a crack legal team, led by the legendary David Boies, that is looking for holes in the city's environmental impact report.

The group has taken off the frontlines the caustic Davis, whose political string-pulling includes a last-minute mailer that in 1992 killed a San Francisco Giants move to San Jose. But other Singer associates are stepping up to canvass Dogpatch, Potrero Hill and Mission Bay.

What's more, UCSF employees are recruiting co-workers, Doniach said, though the Warriors and UCSF have said they are working on parking, traffic and hospital access issues.

The alliance had collected more than 7,000 signatures in a petition drive started in mid-June, Doniach said. That support, she added, has tapped into an undercurrent of people who didn't know about the project or who otherwise feel voiceless or powerless.

"The more people understand the economic downside of cramming a Fisherman's Wharf development into biotech, the more they sign on," she said. "This has not been a hard sell."

Big backers

The Warriors also are supported by big players, including Mayor Ed Lee, who has called the arena his legacy project. State Sen. Mark Leno sponsored legislation that extended a Jan. 1, 2016, environmental review deadline for the arena.

An EIR for the project could be certified this fall by the city's Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure, whose decision then could be appealed to the Board of Supervisors.

The EIR is shaping up as one of the key skirmishes. If supervisors approve the report, the alliance — or anyone else — could sue. Alliance supporters say they are girding for a long and expensive legal battle, promising to vigorously contest every step in the process.

At a June 30 EIR hearing, both sides had impressive showings among the 50-plus speakers, but the numbers leaned toward the Warriors. Doniach later countered that arena backers were mainly business and community groups that would directly benefit from the development. The bulk of the alliance's supporters, in her view, are neighbors of the project or UCSF employees, particularly nurses.

Veterans of bruising political battles at all levels, the California Nurses Association represent a key endorsement for the Mission Bay Alliance, and another opportunity for the alliance to tell its story.

On the day the union announced its opposition, Doniach — a Singer & Associates employee — was handing out CNA press releases outside the UCSF Medical Center while three nurses spoke against the project at a hastily arranged press conference with the hospital as a backdrop.

Johnston pre-empted the press conference with a report showing cities where pro basketball and hockey arenas are within three miles of hospitals.

The nurses said their main worry is patients. If the arena is built kitty-corner from the hospitals, expectant mothers, children and their families may not be able to push through arena crowds to get the care they need, they said. But pressed by reporters, the nurses acknowledged they hadn't seen plans by the Warriors and city officials for dealing with those traffic and parking issues.

"You have to go out and talk to people," Doniach said afterward. "That's the only way we're going to get the message out."

Basketball and more

Here are the types of events that would be expected at the Mission Bay arena.

- Family shows:** 5,000 attendance, 55 events
- Warriors games:** 17,000 attendance, 41 events
- Other rentals:** 9,000 attendance, 31 events
- Arena concerts:** 12,500 attendance, 30 events
- Other sports events:** 7,000 attendance, 30 events
- Theater concerts:** 3,000 attendance, 15 events
- Warriors preseason:** 11,000 attendance, 3 events



Environmentalists, Transit Enthusiasts Push For Voter-Approved Downtown CalTrain Extension

Hannah Albarazi – July 24, 2015

Environmentalists and transit enthusiasts are urging San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee to prioritize a ballot measure that passed in 1999 that required an extension of the Caltrain line to the Transbay Terminal in downtown San Francisco.

The passage of the 1999 ballot measure, known then as Proposition H, required that Caltrain be extended to the Transbay Terminal and prohibited the city from taking any actions that would conflict with extension.

Alex Doniach, a spokeswoman for the Mission Bay Alliance, a non-profit group that wants to see the Caltrain downtown extension brought to fruition, and also stands unwaveringly against the proposed Golden Gate Warriors stadium, said San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee should honor the original Downtown Rail Extension (DTX) agreement.

Transit enthusiasts from groups such as the Train Riders Association of California, Bay Rail Alliance, Friends of Caltrain, Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund, and the Coalition of San

San Francisco neighbors, among others, gathered outside City Hall today to urge the mayor not to postpone the DTX project any longer.

The 1999 measure, however, did not set a strict timeline for construction of the project, resulting in years of postponement by elected officials.

Doniach said the proposed 18,500-seat Warriors stadium, which could be built at 16th and Third streets, next to University of California at San Francisco's newly constructed medical center on the Mission Bay campus, could be "disastrous" and cause traffic congestion that could negatively impact the Medical Center and the neighborhood.

She said San Francisco voters approved the DTX project but that Lee hasn't supported the project to route Caltrain from 4th and King streets to the new Transbay Transit Center at First and Mission streets, as the ballot measure instructs the city to do.

Instead, transit supporters say the mayor has plans to possibly reroute Caltrain through Mission Bay to the site of the proposed stadium.

Transit enthusiasts, however, say the extension should no longer be postponed since the amount of residents and commuters is growing rapidly and that congestion and air pollution is also growing. They say it would take cars off the road and alleviate congestion at BART's Embarcadero and Montgomery stations.

According to the Transbay Joint Powers Authority, the lead agency on the DTX, the plan calls for a 1.3-mile underground extension from 4th and King streets to the new downtown Transit Center, but gives virtually no timeframe for its creation.

Mark Simon, Caltrain's executive officer of public affairs, said, "We think the downtown extension is a good idea and one that has been sought by the city and Caltrain for many decades."

Extending Caltrain into downtown will save commuters almost an hour a day in travel time, and will result in less driving and more people taking the train into the city from the Peninsula, according to Caltrain.

Caltrain spokesman Will Reisman said Caltrain's Environmental Impact Report projects that the Caltrain system will be carrying 111,000 passengers a day by 2040, and that those projections assume that the downtown extension project will be built by then.

Howard Strassner, the San Francisco transportation chair at the Sierra Club, said he agrees that the extension would help battle climate change by getting more commuters to their final destinations faster, encouraging more people to leave their cars at home.

"It's too much to ask people to make two transfers," Strassner said, explaining that commuters from the Peninsula going to San Francisco don't have easy access to downtown San Francisco.

Transit enthusiasts maintain that 16 years after San Francisco voters approved the extension, it has been held up by various development projects.

They called on the mayor to expedite the project's funding and construction.

Doniach said that the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the new stadium has just been released and that the stadium has not yet been approved, despite the mayor's enthusiasm for it.

According to the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure Commission, the Draft SEIR finds that implementation of the proposed project would lead to significant, unavoidable impacts related to transportation and circulation, wind, noise and air quality in the area.

Doniach said that Lee's proposal to tear down Interstate Highway 280 in the city and reroute Caltrain to Mission Bay would cost taxpayers billions of dollars and would be designed only to accommodate the new Golden State Warriors' arena.

She said it would further postpone the DTX project and cost the taxpayers significantly.

"It is unacceptable," she said.

A public hearing by the city's Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure Commission is scheduled for 1 p.m. on June 30th in Room 416 in City Hall at which time comments from members of the public regarding the Draft SEIR on the construction of the arena will be heard.

San Francisco Chronicle

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA'S LARGEST NEWSPAPER

Warriors' proposed arena could clog downtown S.F.

By Matier & Ross – July 26, 2015

Most of the debate over the Warriors' proposed arena has centered around car congestion in Mission Bay, but the city's environmental impact report also raises the specter of "significant and unavoidable" traffic impacts all the way to the Bay Bridge.

According to the report, the 60-plus "peak" events a year at the arena — basketball games, concerts and the like — could draw more than 3,000 additional cars into the area. Most would be rolling in between 6 and 8 p.m.

About 30 percent of the arena-bound cars are expected to come from within San Francisco. More than a quarter are likely to come from the East Bay, 10 percent from the North Bay and nearly a third from the Peninsula and South Bay.

That would amount to an extra 1,000 cars coming over the Bay Bridge and another 1,000 driving up Interstate 280 and Highway 101 — all converging on Mission Bay.

The result will likely be “a significant impact” on as many as 11 key intersections in the South of Market, according to the environmental impact report.

It will also mean “significant and unavoidable” backups on the already heavily used downtown freeway ramps at Fifth and Harrison and Fifth and Bryant streets, as well as on the ramps coming off I-280.

The report also concluded that “no feasible mitigations are available” to ease the problem — at least from an infrastructure standpoint — because there’s no room to widen the freeway ramps or city streets.

“By its nature, the report is supposed to outline a worst-case scenario, and that is what it has done,” said Warriors spokesman Nathan Ballard. “But there are also solutions, and the arena will generate more than enough money to make them work.”

Most notably, the city is proposing to post traffic control officers at major intersections to keep vehicles moving.

Arena opponents, however, are expected to unveil their own analysis Monday that says the report, if anything, paints a far too rosy and limited picture of the possible traffic snarls.

“Our analysis shows that if you add in the ripple effect from the other building projects that are going on in the area, the number of intersections impacted grows from around 10 to 25,” said Tom Lippe, attorney for the group of UCSF Mission Bay donors called the Mission Bay Alliance. Its funders, many of whom are clinging to their anonymity, want the arena site reserved for the medical center’s possible expansion.

And even if traffic officers help at downtown intersections, they won’t be able to do much about the Bay Bridge. Anyone who tries to cross the bridge into San Francisco before a Giants game, even on weekends, knows how bad the backup can be now.

You’d think that adding a Warriors or concert crowd to the bridge on the same day the Giants are in town could create an epic bridge jam. Yet, “our transportation analysis does not predict that off-ramp congestion will in any way impact the free flow of traffic on the bridge,” said Adam Van de Water of the mayor’s Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure.

Interesting to note, however, that the environmental impact report includes a couple of “potential” solutions if a Bay Bridge problem should arise. They include turning on the bridge’s metering lights to slow traffic onto the span — which would result in bigger backups on the Oakland side — or even raising tolls during the crunch to encourage people to use public transit.

But when we asked about those options, the mayor’s development director, Ken Rich, said, “The city has no plans to ask Caltrans to make any changes to tolls or traffic metering on the Bay Bridge as a result of the Warriors arena project.”

The Warriors have their own comeback, starting with pointing out that the arena project will provide \$14 million a year in taxes for transportation improvements.

Plus, the team says it would provide the same number of traffic control officers as the Giants do on game nights, although the arena would hold fewer than half the number of fans who pack into AT&T Park.

Mazzola muscle: The Mazzola family's labor dynasty lives on.

On Thursday, plumbers union rep Larry Mazzola Jr. handily defeated Operating Engineers Union rep Charley Lavery in a secret ballot for president of the San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council.

"I'd say it looked as though Larry had been working the phones pretty good," said Michael Theriault, the council's secretary-treasurer. "It's all old-fashioned democracy — getting the votes out."

Mazzola announced he was running after his dad, former union leader and Airport Commission President Larry Mazzola Sr., surprised many in the trades when he dropped his bid to stay on as head of the council.

As we had earlier reported, the elder Mazzola had become a political lightning rod amid disclosures that he had tried to help his nephew land a new airport job after he was forced to resign from another position there for having porn on his work computer.

In February, the San Francisco Ethics Commission told a whistle-blower that "there is reason to believe a violation of law may have occurred" and that the panel would pursue a full investigation.

City Hall sources say that case could be wrapped up in the next couple of months. But we're already hearing that the commission is likely to take action against Mazzola, which could result in anything from a warning or fine to recommendation that Mayor Ed Lee remove him from the airport post.



Media Contact

Sam Singer

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949

Email: singer@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

27 July 2015

**Massive Traffic Jams, Life-Threatening Congestion, Degradation of Life Quality
Result From Proposed Warriors' Arena, Opponents' EIR Filing Shows**

*Mission Bay Alliance Identifies more than 50 Environmental Violations as part of Flaws of
Proposed Warriors' Arena and Entertainment Center*

San Francisco – Opponents of the proposed Golden State Warriors' arena and entertainment complex today called the project "fatally flawed," citing more than 50 violations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) including severe traffic congestion, blocked emergency access and seismic safety threats as part of the its filing today to the City of San Francisco's Planning Department.

The Mission Bay Alliance said the City's draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Warriors' Arena in Mission Bay would create a traffic jam that would stretch from the Bay Bridge through SOMA, Dogpatch, and Potrero Hill all the way to Highway 101.

The Warriors' proposal calls for more than 225 events at the 18,500 seat arena that provides only 200 parking spaces for visitors.

"Our engineers and experts have scrutinized the City's draft EIR and determined with certainty that this is a fatally flawed project that will gridlock traffic, threaten patient access to lifesaving care and be a disaster for the Mission Bay neighborhood, the hospitals and City as a whole," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance, a coalition of residents, UCSF employees, UCSF patients, and stakeholders who oppose the proposed Warriors' arena.

The responses from the Mission Bay Alliance cite various elements of the City's 1,000-plus page draft EIR – from transportation impacts and noise pollution to Mission Bay land use policy. Lawyers for the coalition confirmed the project's environmental study fails in its attempt to accurately analyze the true environmental impacts of the proposed 18,500-seat arena and entertainment center.

Conclusions about Emergency Access are Not Supported by Data, Leaving Public at Risk

The emergency room entrance to the newly opened UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital is located about 1,050 feet from the proposed Warrior's arena and entertainment center – "Yet incredibly, [the draft EIR]

concludes that the subject project would not result in inadequate emergency access when capacity events are taking place,” writes Dan Smith, of Smith Engineering & Management, who was hired by Mission Bay Alliance to analyze the traffic and access study of the City’s draft EIR.

“The draft EIR offers no objective data to support its conclusion that emergency access would not be adversely impacted in event travel peaks,” Smith said.

Instead, the City’s draft EIR relies on subjective “rationalizations” for why emergency vehicles would not be slowed. When roadways are congested with cars and sidewalks are filled with rowdy crowds, it is an inconceivable conclusion that emergency vehicles will not experience delay, Smith concluded.

Seconds or minutes could mean the difference between life and death. And patients in emergency situations are not always shuttled to the hospital by an emergency vehicle, meaning that traffic patrol officers and other drivers may not recognize an emergency situation.

The City’s draft EIR’s “conclusions about emergency access impacts are not only unsupported by objective data but incorrect and implausible,” Smith said.

Incomplete Traffic Study Paints a Limited Picture of the Project’s Traffic Nightmares

While the City concedes that the project will grind the intersections in the immediate vicinity to a halt, the study’s traffic analysis fails to comprehensively address the project’s impact on surrounding neighborhoods including SoMA, Dogpatch, Potrero Hill or the stretch of Highway 101 leading to the Bay Bridge.

The City’s draft EIR arbitrarily selected only 23 intersections to grade on a scale of “A” through “F” with “A” designating free-flowing traffic and “F” being total gridlock. While it assigns “E” and “F” grades to many of the intersections studied, the limited scope paints an incomplete picture that does not convey the nightmarish conditions experienced by commuters in both the Financial District and SoMa, according to Larry Wymer, a licensed traffic engineer, who analyzed the City’s EIR’s traffic study.

In his comment letter, Wymer said the City must at the very least analyze the roads North of the project to Market Street and it must do so in the context of the 21 other nearby construction projects – all of which also have their own impact on traffic gridlock. Finally he asks that the City revise its analysis to incorporate findings from the “2040 San Francisco Transportation Plan,” a City-produced study that predicts overall SoMa and Mission Bay auto trips to organically increase by 82 percent between 2012 and 2040.

“The impact of the proposed Warriors’ arena must be studied not in isolation but as a piece in the connected fabric of San Francisco’s roadways,” Spaulding said. “Everyone who travels on San Francisco’s roads and highways knows that traffic is bad and getting worse. Traffic caused by this project will compound in a multiplier effect that will grind this City to a screeching halt.”

Misleading Reliance on 17-Year-Old Data

Beyond incomplete data, the City’s draft EIR also relies on old information dating back to a 1998 Mission Bay Master Plan to mislead the public and deceptively conclude that the proposed 18,500-seat arena with 730,000 square feet of office and retail space will have limited impacts on Mission Bay, its

surrounding neighborhoods or the thousands of patients and families who visit the area for care at UCSF hospitals and nearby clinics.

Datasets forming the basis of significant portions of the City's draft EIR are borrowed directly from outdated EIRs prepared in 1990 and 1998 for the City's 1998 Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan. The 1990 and 1998 EIRs broadly analyzed all 303 acres in the Mission Bay area and omit site-specific reviews on pollution, hazardous materials and seismic safety of the current 11-acre site, attorneys found.

Yet, the City claims that many of those old evaluations remain valid today.

"The City's strategy of relying on a very general environmental review document that is more than 17 years old for topics required to be analyzed and mitigated in detail does not work for the public, nor is it compliant with CEQA's most basic requirements," write attorneys Osha Meserve and Patrick Soluri in a July 27 comment letter to the City on behalf of Mission Bay Alliance.

The attorneys say the risk of this site literally dissolving during an earthquake due to liquefaction and amplification, for example, has not been properly analyzed because seismic risks were studied differently in the 1990s. The proposed site would be built on soft landfill ground that today is considered a high risk for earthquake damage – risks not properly analyzed in the draft EIR.

The City will now have several months to revise its draft EIR, released on June 5, and address the noted concerns. The final version may be released later this fall.

If the Mission Bay Alliance does not believe the final product resolves the EIR's legal defects, it will consider litigation, Spaulding said.

"As it stands, the significant issues identified by our legal team all but prove that this ill-conceived project would spell disaster for Mission Bay and the city as a whole," he said.

About the Mission Bay Alliance

The Mission Bay Alliance is a coalition of UCSF stakeholders, donors, faculty, physicians and the working men and women of San Francisco who are concerned about the impact of the proposed Golden State Warriors' stadium on the future of the vibrant community and medical campus at Mission Bay. The Alliance fully supports the Warriors' team and congratulates its tremendous championship win. However, the Alliance believes the proposed arena and entertainment center is ill-conceived for this site. For more information about the Mission Bay Alliance, visit www.missionbayalliance.org.

--30--

Related Coverage



CONTRA COSTA BEE

San Francisco Mayor threatens UCSF Hospital at Mission Bay — play ball for Warriors or else!

July 27, 2015

Opponents of an 11th hour proposal by the the City of San Francisco and the Golden State Warriors of the NBA to shoe horn a new arena and entertainment complex into the Mission Bay development today revealed leaked documents in which San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee threatens UCSF Hospital at Mission Bay with economic sanctions if it does not play ball for the Warriors and support the last minute arena project.

The correspondence (below) between UCSF Chancellor Sam Hawgood and Mayor Ed Lee expresses the Chancellor's concerns about parking and traffic impacts of the proposed Warriors arena, and then illustrates the Mayor's heavy-handed and threatening response. Mayor Lee notes investments in the area by the SF Giants, UCSF, Mission Bay neighbors and (eventually) revenue from the Warriors event center. He then (Sec #5) explains that each property's "fair share contribution toward public infrastructure," will be scrutinized, (Sec #6) pointedly referring to the UCSF footprint in the area and its tax exempt status.

Plain as day, Mayor Ed Lee threatens UCSF Hospital at Mission Bay, that unless it supports the City's plans to bring the Warriors' proposed arena to Mission Bay, the City will aggressively seek compensation from UCSF and attempt to squeeze every million dollars it can out of the hospital. This is clearly a Chicago-style threat and ham-fisted politics intended to strong arm the Chancellor into supporting the City's and Warriors' plans.

Worse, Mayor Lee clearly confuses the public-legal and social benefit roles and obligations of a not-for-profit hospital with the Warriors' for-profit, commercial enterprise. For the sake of a personal "legacy," not only does Lee threaten UCSF's exemption from property, parking, transportation and other taxes, but insinuates that taxation on non-profit institutions ought to support for-profit schemes like the Warriors entertainment center, not the other way around.

Additionally, in a press release and news conference today, the Mission Bay Alliance released details of 50 violations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including severe traffic congestion, blocked emergency access, and seismic safety threats, as part of the its filing to the City of San Francisco's Planning Department. The Mission Bay Alliance is a coalition of UCSF stakeholders, donors, faculty, physicians and the working men and women of San Francisco who are concerned about the impact of the proposed Golden State Warriors' stadium on the future of the vibrant community and medical campus at Mission Bay.

The Warriors' proposal calls for more than 225 events at the 18,500 seat arena that provides only 200 parking spaces for visitors. According to Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance, the Warriors proposal is a "fatally flawed project that will gridlock traffic, threaten patient access to lifesaving care and be a disaster for the Mission Bay neighborhood, the hospitals and City as a whole." Practically adjacent to the UCSF Hospital Emergency Room, street and crowd traffic will severely impact access to emergency treatment and cost lives, say opponents.

The Master Plan for Mission Bay Master Plan, located at Piers 30-32 south of AT&T Park, was developed over years of city and community involvement, and never had an arena component despite claims by

Lee. Then in April of 2014 Warriors' owners Joe Lacob and Peter Guber, shifted plans for a new arena from Oakland to San Francisco. The deal allows the Warriors walk away from Oakland and build on the new site without voter approval. The land for the proposed arena was purchased tech tycoon (Salesforce) Marc Benioff, long-time supporter of Ed Lee who sees the arena as his precious legacy project at any cost.

Opponents of the proposed Golden State Warriors' arena and entertainment complex today called the project "fatally flawed," citing more than 50 violations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) including severe traffic congestion, blocked emergency access and seismic safety threats as part of the its filing today to the City of San Francisco's Planning Department.

The Mission Bay Alliance said the City's draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Warriors' Arena in Mission Bay would create a traffic jam that would stretch from the Bay Bridge through SOMA, Dogpatch, and Potrero Hill all the way to Highway 101.

The New York Times

A Basketball Arena Battles for San Francisco's Heart

Matt Richtel – September 5, 2015

Prosperity is the sound of jackhammers and pile drivers in the morning.

Across San Francisco, cranes loom and the noise from construction sites can sound "like the city is being bombed," as one manager of a senior center near downtown put it recently, or like the amplified cork-popping of a decade-long party.

Since 2000, median home prices in the city have nearly quadrupled; city coffers have doubled. Tech workers from the likes of Google, Facebook and Twitter line up at high-end restaurants and seek out trendy ice cream shops for a scoop of Balsamic Caramel.

And the cherry on top? That would be a giant sports and entertainment complex, surrounded by public parks and plazas, on 12 acres of abandoned port land. It is a proposal that has city officials salivating partly because, unlike most such arenas, taxpayers are not funding it. San Francisco did not plead with stadium developers by offering public lands or years-long tax abatements. Some rich people were willing to take all the risk.

Namely, the owners of the Golden State Warriors, a team currently based in Oakland and fresh off an N.B.A. championship. They have purchased the land rights, plan to privately finance the arena and two adjoining office towers — an estimated \$1.4 billion investment — and bring San Francisco one of the few things it lacks: a major indoor entertainment complex.

What's not to like?

Well, this is San Francisco. So plenty.

At least to a hard-core group of well-financed opponents. The stadium, they say, wastes a chunk of one of the last stretches of undeveloped land in the city. They have loftier aims than mere entertainment:

They would like the land used for biotechnology, a health care company or another enterprise consistent with the Mission Bay neighborhood, which already has a health care hub at the University of California, San Francisco.

Just across the street from the proposed 18,000-seat arena is a new children's hospital, which is invoked by opponents in their more agitated moments. Arena traffic, could lead to "deaths of people stuck in ambulances," said Bruce Spaulding, a former senior vice chancellor of the University of California, San Francisco, who helped create the medical hub and now leads the opposition. "Entertainment doesn't trump health care and patient lives," he said.

To stop the project, opponents have hired David Boies, the superstar litigator who brought the government's antitrust case against Microsoft in 1998, represented Vice President Al Gore at the Supreme Court in the 2000 presidential election, and with Theodore B. Olson, brought an important same-sex-marriage case to the courts.

A basketball arena's rising in San Francisco is no constitutional crisis, but the dispute taps into a growing anxiety that the city's increasing affluence is displacing enterprises more consistent with its heritage.

Recent local newspaper articles have chronicled, for instance, how medical research groups, arts groups and working-class families have been priced out of the city by exorbitant rents. More generally, there is the constant tension over gentrification — for example, the protests over Google buses.

"San Francisco has always been that other city with a different set of values," said Jeff Sheehy, a governing board member of the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine, the largest stem cell funding agency in the world. The institute is moving to Oakland after the expiration of a free-rent deal on its space near the proposed complex; it discovered that office rents in San Francisco were prohibitively high. He sees the arena, which he opposes (he would like affordable housing on the land), as suggestive that San Francisco secretly wanted mainstream credibility all along.

"We should have an arena because New York has Madison Square Garden. We should compete for the Olympics and the Super Bowl," he says, mocking the pro-arena attitude. He describes the new San Francisco as "just another capitalist, consumerist, profit-driven, money-motivated Disneyland."

To which opponents might say, "Give me a break. Why can't we have a little fun?"

That is the point of Marc Benioff, the founder of Salesforce, a software giant and San Francisco mainstay. He sold the rights to buy the land to the Warriors, but is also a major hospital benefactor (he and his wife gave \$100 million to the U.C.S.F. Benioff Children's Hospital).

"If I want to see U2, I have to go to San Jose," he lamented, adding, "without great sports franchises, we can't be a great city."

"This is about the future of San Francisco," he said. "What is San Francisco going to be?"

Looking to Buy

One August morning, I met with Joe Lacob, a venture capitalist, and Peter Guber, a Hollywood producer, in Mr. Lacob's corner office in downtown Oakland. As the majority owners of the Warriors, they are the arena's boosters, and Mr. Guber became particularly animated while trying to explain its allure with what seemed like a tangential point: our obsession with cellphones.

"Have you ever seen a bunch of young people sitting together at a table and they're all texting?" he said, leaning forward. "They're texting each other!"

His point was that people crave interactive stimulation but also the intimacy of togetherness and that live events — sports, concerts — provide both. That, he said, is the future of entertainment.

Mr. Guber, the chairman of Mandalay Entertainment, has credibility in the entertainment realm, having made a fortune in movies as executive producer of hits like "The Color Purple" and "Rain Man." Mr. Lacob made his money as a venture capitalist with Kleiner Perkins Caufield & Byers, all the while chasing his childhood dream of owning a sports franchise.

The men teamed up in 2010 (with around 30 minority partners) and paid \$450 million for the Warriors, at the time the largest price commanded for an N.B.A. team.

Their plan assumes that the arena will host roughly 220 events each year, only about 50 of them being basketball games. The rest will range from pop concerts and opera performances to political conventions and theater, enabled by a space in which seats and walls could be reconfigured for different audiences. The average crowd might be 9,000, half the size of the crowd for a Warriors game.

This revolving use is the only way to justify the \$1 billion investment, Mr. Lacob said. "We do have to fill the building to make it work."

Rodney Fort, co-director of the Center for Sport Management at the University of Michigan, said the vision fit the new national model of arenas (such as stadiums in Brooklyn, Detroit and Minneapolis). "All of these places are 24/7," Mr. Fort said. "Switch in hours from fine art to rock to a TED talk." The arena owners get the spoils of shared ticket revenue, concessions and parking.

The Warriors' owners are only leasing their current home, the Oracle Arena, so they cannot fully cash in on current entertainment trends. They do not control concessions, manage nonbasketball events or sell naming rights. So, with their lease deal running out in 2017, they went looking for new digs.

The team first tried to relocate to San Francisco in 2012, at a spot on the pier south of the Bay Bridge (more than a mile north of the Mission Bay site). The city embraced the idea, but a grass-roots campaign fought back, saying it would ruin the waterfront.

Then, last year, Mr. Lacob got a call from Mr. Benioff. Salesforce spent \$278 million in 2010 for 14 acres in Mission Bay with the intention of building a headquarters across from the hospital. But then the company found another space downtown. Mr. Benioff invited Mr. Lacob and Mr. Guber to his Presidio Heights home to propose a sale.

"You could own your own land, control your destiny," Mr. Benioff recalled telling Mr. Lacob.

They reached a deal in which, Mr. Benioff said, the Warriors agreed to pay a \$30 million nonrefundable deposit for the rights to buy the land. The eventual price will be about \$150 million, Mr. Benioff said, if the proposal goes forward.

A poll commissioned by the Warriors this summer showed strong support for the arena. Those who want the stadium say it would bring pleasures and benefits — a murky concept that economists have started to try to quantify in recent years.

For instance, Brad Humphreys, an associate professor of economics at West Virginia University, used an economic technique called contingent value economics to study whether Canada was getting its money's worth after investing \$110 million to train athletes for the 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver.

Based on his research, the answer was yes. Canadians valued their athletes' performance at \$300 million to \$700 million, a veritable happiness profit.

On the other hand, a separate study using more traditional quantifiable metrics, also by Dr. Humphreys, found that when the Seattle SuperSonics left for Oklahoma City in 2008, condo prices rose in the immediate Seattle neighborhood, suggesting that noise and traffic from the arena had been having a "downward pressure on housing prices."

No such analyses have been done in San Francisco — after all, the city is not paying for the arena, thus lowering the bar for skeptics. But Dr. Humphreys said it would be fair to assume that San Franciscans could enjoy intangible emotional benefits valued over the years at several hundred million dollars (along with a relatively paltry \$14 million in annual tax revenue the city estimates the arena will generate).

"This is the place to put an arena," Mr. Lacob said. "It's a world-class city without a world-class entertainment venue."

From Mess to Success

"Mud, weeds, broken glass and decrepit buildings" is how a recent article in The San Francisco Business Times described the state of Mission Bay in the late 1980s. Once a rail yard and port, it had been abandoned as the shipping business moved elsewhere, notably Oakland, and the need for rail fell sharply.

Then Mr. Spaulding got involved.

Formerly a municipal executive in Fresno and Las Vegas, he became the senior vice chancellor of U.C.S.F. in 1988 and was charged with finding a second campus for the teaching hospital and research center. He homed in on Mission Bay, then about 303 decrepit acres designated for redevelopment.

From that mess has risen a municipal success story: a sprawling life sciences center with 3.1 million square feet of labs and offices in six research buildings; a 289-bed medical center, surrounded by 1.7 million square feet of biotech commercial space, including the offices of Bayer and Pfizer; and at least nine venture capital firms specializing in life sciences, according to U.C.S.F.

The development provides the surprising answer to a trivia question: What industry employs more people than any other in San Francisco? It is not finance or tech, but life sciences and health care.

“Scientists run into other scientists. Students run into professors,” Mr. Spaulding said recently as he walked through the campus. By his own admission, he is loquacious to a fault, a walking filibuster, and as he toured, he waxed about the “ambience”: broad walkways with views to the water, pleasant quads between buildings and open staircases inside buildings so that, even there, “scientists could bump into each other.”

Putting an entertainment complex in this neighborhood, he said, would not only poison the existing atmosphere but also discourage other life science enterprises from filling the handful of still-vacant lots.

“That’s what this place is all about.”

Mr. Spaulding clearly feels strongly about the Warriors’ arena. He is also being paid to make the point by the Mission Bay Alliance, a nonprofit group. The way it is incorporated keeps its membership private.

Seizing on this mystery, the Warriors and their allies have called the alliance a “shadow” group of billionaires. The Warriors and their allies suggest this group may even want the land to itself.

Nonsense, Mr. Spaulding countered. He said the alliance members wanted their privacy because some of them were associated with the university — as donors, doctors, nurses — and they did not want to run afoul of management. A handful of the alliance’s members have stepped forward, including the big-name San Franciscans William J. Rutter, a highly regarded U.C.S.F. researcher and biotech pioneer, and Jeanne Robertson, former chairwoman of the U.S.C.F. Foundation, a fund-raising group. (Her husband, Sandy Robertson, sits on the Salesforce board.)

The city expects to approve the project’s environmental review by November, which in theory paves the way for construction. But there will be a challenge. The Mission Bay Alliance said that the 800-page environmental impact report for the arena did not accurately account for the impact of noise, trash and traffic.

If their claim is rejected, the group may try to force a referendum or otherwise stall until the project dies. Mr. Boies said that he was “very dubious” that there could be sufficient mitigation to preserve the neighborhood. A lawsuit is not out of the question.

City officials say opponents have created a false dichotomy; not only can the hospital and arena coexist, but there also remains plenty of land within a mile or two of Mission Bay — as much as eight million square feet, noted Ken Rich, the city’s director of development — for other purposes. Besides, while the city wanted life science to be the “core idea” in the area, he said, we “never intended it to be exclusively life sciences.”

Somewhere in the middle lies the university itself, which manages the hospital and research campus. Its chancellor, Dr. Sam Hawgood, has offered qualified support for the Warriors, as long as the owners and the city address his big concerns about traffic, including creating dedicated lanes for health emergencies and increasing public transportation options and the number of parking lots.

Negotiations are continuing, but Dr. Hawgood said he was confident that the opposing sides would reach an agreement by the end of September. As to whether a Warriors arena will change the

ambience, he said it undoubtedly would, and that's O.K. "Injecting some variety I don't think is necessarily a bad thing at all," he said.

'Into the Lion's Den'

Scholars who study sports arenas say the Warriors' opponents face long odds of winning. The land is private, and the Warriors plan to finance themselves, making the dispute one that the courts would be reluctant to enter into, said Mark Rosentraub, a professor of sports management at the University of Michigan.

It is "good news for San Francisco," Mr. Rosentraub said. The city gets an arena without paying for it — an enviable position — and "tip your hat" to the entrepreneurs for knowing they have to pick up the bill, he said.

Sam Singer, a spokesman for the opponents, countered that there were tens of millions of dollars in "hidden" costs involving transportation, parking and police staffing.

The public relations battle rages on. And each side is well armed. The Warriors have retained a former spokesman for Willie Brown, the onetime mayor of San Francisco. The opponents have landed one of the city's best-known operatives, a political consultant named Jack Davis, who successfully ran three San Francisco mayoral campaigns and was described by The San Francisco Chronicle as "one of the most feared and loathed political players" in the city.

Mr. Davis, 68, got involved in the fight not because he is antigrowth or outraged by gentrification, but as a personal favor to Mr. Spaulding. When Mr. Davis's brother, who lived in Arizona, learned he had cancer, Mr. Davis told him to get on a plane to San Francisco and go to U.C.S.F. He told him, "I'll call Bruce Spaulding and get you squared away with the best doctor you can find."

Shortly after that, Mr. Davis, who now lives part time in Wales, came to San Francisco and told Mr. Spaulding: "I owe you big time. Is there anything I can do for you?" He said his longtime friend answered, "Yeah, there is," and told him about the arena. And Mr. Davis said, "Oh, yeah, sure, count me in."

Mr. Davis, who relayed this story via FaceTime from Wales, said his goal was to help the alliance — he called it "a group of billionaires" — get on the map. "So I decided the right way to do it was to go right into the lion's den and start a brawl."

He succeeded. On April 30, at a fairly standard informational meeting at the nearby Mission Creek Senior Community, Mr. Davis stood and gave what several meeting attendees described as an acerbic presentation that was out of character with what had been months of tame negotiations. He was "so combative that he drew boos and hisses," read a piece in the next day's San Francisco Chronicle. Mr. Davis said arena opponents would not stop until the Warriors project was undone, adding, "There will be litigation until the cows come home."

He laughed when he recalled it. "They're still talking about the cows coming home, aren't they?" Shortly after that meeting, the local nurses' union, with support from the Mission Bay Alliance, announced its opposition to the project, saying it was "fundamentally incompatible" with the hospital.

Dr. Hawgood, the university chancellor, said he disagreed with the nurses who worked for him. At the same time, he said he understood where they were coming from. “There is a background anxiety, which is that it’s harder to get around than it was five or 10 years ago,” he said. “People are responding to a booming city.”

Every square foot of San Francisco has become a morsel for the prosperous. For this countercultural city, which long took pride in being different, it is a bit like having been an awkward adolescent who derided his parents’ status car, then later decided, after having grown up, that a BMW was a really smooth ride and not so stupid after all. He may well enjoy the fancy car but still feel the occasional heart tug when a Volkswagen bus rumbles by.



If the Warriors build it, will the fans, the victories, and the passion come too?

Holly McDede – September 17, 2015

Victory for the Bay

When the Golden State Warriors won the NBA championship back in June, fans across the Bay Area exploded with pure, rapturous joy. For Oakland residents like Jesus Yanex, the victory was about more than just basketball.

“It feels real good,” Yanex said. “Oakland needs this. We’re tired of just having these homicides. We have a championship to our side. Oakland is the heart of the Bay. Forget San Francisco because San Francisco faces Oakland.”

But then the fireworks blasted, the parade died down, and the fans went home.

And the Warriors did not forget San Francisco. Fans looking to fill the void between seasons can pick up a copy of the 1600-page environmental impact report on the logistics of the team’s proposed move. The team hopes for approval this fall, and to move into a new stadium in San Francisco’s Mission Bay neighborhood by 2018.

The report mentions parking lots, traffic control, and job creation. But it says nothing of the passion that flooded the streets of Oakland the night the Warriors won. And that passion matters: the power of fans is intangible but crucial to making big sports franchises work. So what happens when that power is tested?

Dubb Nation meets the Hello Kitty Supercute Friendship Festival

Dubb Nation doesn’t close down when Warriors season is over, but what’s inside the stadium does change. For example, earlier this summer it was home to the Hello Kitty Supercute Friendship

Festival. Hundreds of children, and more adults than you would think, wore Hello Kitty headbands and sang their hearts out along with her.

Over the rest of the year, Oracle also houses Ricky Martin, the Who, and Frozen: On Ice.

Clearly, the arena itself isn't the only place Dubb Nation lives. And yet, it's a huge part of the team's identity. Months before the championship, New Orleans Pelicans coach Monty Williams suggested that screaming Dubb Nation fans may have sent the decibel level at Oracle Arena soaring above legal limits.

And when the Warriors finally won the title, they did it in Cleveland, while 17,000 fans packed a sold out Oracle to make noise for a team that couldn't even hear them.

"Roaracle" and victory

The role fans play in a team's success can be a little intangible. But don't underestimate the power of those screams.

"The fact of the matter is that in the NBA a team at home is 7 - 10% more likely to win than a team on the road," said Brett Green, a sport economics researcher at UC Berkeley.

Noise can play a role in victory. This season, the Warriors won 39 home games, compared to just 28 games on the road.

"One theory for why home court advantage exists is because of the fans. Oracle Arena, where the Warriors play, is known as being one of the loudest stadiums in the NBA," Green said.

Fans actually call it Roaracle.

Inside the Mission Bay

PJ Johnson, spokesperson for the Warriors, says passionate fans, like sport stadiums, can be built.

"It's sort of the thing where if you build it, it will eventually will come," Johnson said.

Johnson says that, even without the team, Mission Bay is coming onto its own. It used to be a collection of warehouses, concrete plants, and muddy fields. Now it's home to biotech companies like Illumina, Twist Bioscience, Bayer Healthcare Pharmaceuticals, and UCSF's new medical campus. It'll soon host Uber's huge corporate headquarters. Now, it just needs a little nightlife. And, he says, a team.

"What the arena will bring is not only the Warriors, this beloved basketball team, but also a number of restaurants and cafes and retail amenities that the Mission Bay just doesn't have right now," Johnson said.

The Mission Bay Alliance goes on the defense

When Sam Singer watched the Warriors in Game 5 against the Cleveland Cavaliers, he watched them as a lifelong fan. But when he's Sam Singer, UCSF stakeholder and well-known political operative, he's prepared to fight. He represents the Mission Bay Alliance, a nonprofit group that wants the Warriors to stay in Oakland.

"We have no illusions that they're not a world class opponent," Singer said. "But we're not playing the NBA champions themselves. We're playing the owners of the team, and we think we match up quite well in height and depth. We can go long. We can go short. We think we're going to beat the owners in the championship to keep them out of Mission Bay."

The Mission Bay Alliance says the Warriors will bring massive traffic jams -- they actually call it "life-threatening congestion" -- to the neighborhood, plus crowds and noise.

Local nurse Cosima Singleton is also a lifelong Warriors fan. Like Sam Singer, being a fan doesn't change her worries about the project. She lives in Russian Hill, and works at the UCSF Medical Center, just blocks from the Warriors plan to move.

"It may change the area. My top priority would have local stay local and to have residential areas available to people born and raised in San Francisco and normal people," Singleton said.

Creating fans

The Warriors move has forced fans like Singleton to look at their team as a big business franchise instead of a favorite team. And sports economist Brett Green says that changed perspective could have a real effect on the games.

"I think that there's some concern that a move from Oracle from the area where the Warriors have been for 40 years, to San Francisco, will change the composition of people that attend games," he said. "If they were to move to Mission Bay they would be more created fans, and less of the die-hard fans."

These created fans would be the fans who like the idea of a winning team more than the team itself.

"The new stadium might not be as loud, as supportive, for the home team," Green said.

Simmering down in Santa Clara

Not too many people have studied this. But we do have one local example. The new Levi Stadium that opened in 2014 was eerily quiet for most of the season. This was a sharp contrast to the chaotic Candlestick Park atmosphere where the 49ers played for 43 seasons. Their last year at Candlestick, the 49ers won six games at home and only lost two. The year they moved, they lost as many games at home as they won.

Still, more people attended games, and they paid more for them: 10,000 more fans, paying an average of \$117 a ticket. That's 40% more than they would have paid at Candlestick. Sports economist Brett Green says the Warriors may see a similar bump.

"I think that part of the reason for the team moving to San Francisco, besides getting the new stadium, would be to attract the sort of typical San Franciscan who is probably wealthier than the typical person from Oakland," Green said.

If the Warriors move to San Francisco on schedule, the new stadium will open by 2018. Ticket sales will be one way to test fan devotion. Another will be the volume and quantity of their screams, when the diehards and the newbies sit side by side.



Media Contact

Sam Singer or Alex Doniach

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949; 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

24 September 2015

Proposed Warriors' Arena in Mission Bay Spells 'Disaster,' say Top Ranked UCSF Scientists

Coalition of UCSF Science Leaders Calls on Mayor Ed Lee to Abandon Proposed 18,500-seat Arena and Protect Biotech/Life Sciences in S.F. from "Critical Harm"

San Francisco – A coalition of world-renowned scientists from the University of California at San Francisco and the U.S. National Academy of Sciences today said the proposed Golden State Warriors' Arena in Mission Bay would be a "disaster" for the City's growing biotech and life science hub and called for San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee to abandon the proposed plans.

The UCSF scientists joined the California Nurses Association and the Mission Bay Alliance, a coalition of UCSF employees, stakeholders and neighbors who oppose the 18,500-seat arena and entertainment center, in their decisive opposition of the proposed project, saying it would threaten "the entire future of UCSF as the center of a world-class academic/biotech/medical complex."

"Our major fear is that the Mission Bay site will lose its appeal – not only for the new biomedical enterprises that the city would like to attract here, but also for most of its current occupants," according to the letter, which was delivered to Mayor Lee and signed by more than 20 of UCSF's leading scientists and researchers.

"The result could critically harm not only UCSF, but also the enormously promising, larger set of biomedical enterprises that currently promises to make San Francisco the envy of the world," the letter said.

The letter cites traffic gridlock as a leading concern for both residents accessing UCSF's emergency services and for the hospital workers and scientist and researchers who have turned Mission Bay into one of the most "prominent academic-industry biotechnology/medical complexes in the world."

"It is unavoidable that terrible, and possibly even life-threatening, traffic congestion will be associated with the planned complex, given that it is intended to be the site of some 220 events per year, held both in the evening and during the day," wrote the scientists. "Many of us have experienced the hours-long gridlock that paralyzes all Mission Bay streets before and after San Francisco Giants home games. The

absolute paralysis that it creates is already a non-trivial problem, which the planned stadium promises to both greatly expand and intensify.”

The UCSF faculty who signed the letter are among the most prestigious and acclaimed scientists in the world and include Bruce Alberts, UCSF Chancellor’s Leadership Chair for Biochemistry and Biophysics for Science and Education, who is the former president of the National Academy of Sciences, a membership organization of the world’s leading scientists and Noble Prize winners. Other signatories include:

Elizabeth Blackburn, Professor of Biochemistry and Biophysics, and Nobel laureate
James Cleaver, Professor of Dermatology and Pharmaceutical Chemistry
John A. Clements, Professor of Pediatrics and Julius H. Comroe Professor of Pulmonary Biology, Emeritus
Robert Fletterick, Professor of Biochemistry, Pharmaceutical Chemistry, and Cellular and Molecular Pharmacology
Carol Gross, Professor of Microbiology
Christine Guthrie, Professor of Biochemistry and Biophysics
Lily Jan, Professor of Physiology, Biochemistry and Biophysics
Yuh-Nung Jan, Professor of Physiology
Alexander Johnson, Professor of Microbiology and Immunology, and Biochemistry and Biophysics
Cynthia Kenyon, Emeritus Professor, UCSF, and Vice President, Aging Research, Calico Life Sciences
Gail Martin, Professor Emerita, Department of Anatomy
Frank McCormick, Professor Emeritus, UCSF Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center, David A. Wood Distinguished Professorship of Tumor Biology and Cancer Research
Ira Mellman, Professor (Adjunct) of Biochemistry and Biophysics
William J. Rutter, Chairman Emeritus, Department of Biochemistry, and Chairman, Synergenics LLC
John Sedat, Professor Emeritus, Department of Biochemistry & Biophysics
Michael Stryker, William Francis Ganong Professor of Physiology
Peter Walter, Professor of Biochemistry and Biophysics
Arthur Weiss, Professor of Medicine, and of Microbiology and Immunology
Zena Werb, Professor of Anatomy

The scientists said special traffic routes proposed to protect UCSF employees would not work.

“Those of us at Mission Bay have experienced the unruly behavior of frustrated drivers stuck for long times in traffic jams,” they wrote. “In fact, there is no believable transportation solution for two very large complexes placed in such close proximity at Mission Bay.”

Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance said he commended the courage of UCSF’s preeminent scientists and researchers for taking a stand and protecting the growth of Mission Bay’s biotech and life science community.

“These concerns are consistent with those shared by Mission Bay Alliance and the healthcare employees, neighbors and others who recognize what a disaster this project would be on the thousands of people and budding industries in this growing community,” Spaulding said. “This is a significant community and a quality of life issue in San Francisco. We hope the Mayor recognizes the danger to public health and life sciences of this ill-conceived project.”

Anchored by UCSF's new, \$1.6 billion hospital and research campus, Mission Bay has given rise to San Francisco's flourishing life science and biotech industry, generating nearly \$4 billion in economic activity, \$1.4 billion in income and 21,000 jobs.

The City's Mission Bay project – the largest ongoing biomedical construction project in the world – can be credited for the City's biotech success and would be jeopardized by the proposed stadium.

"We face increasing competition from other rapidly growing complexes of this type, both in the US and abroad," the scientists wrote. "It will be critical to keep moving aggressively forward, if we are to continue to attract the very best talent – both academic and private sector – to San Francisco....We are seriously concerned that this future is threatened by the plan to construct a very large sports, entertainment, and event arena in our midst."

About the Mission Bay Alliance

The Mission Bay Alliance is a coalition of UCSF stakeholders, donors, faculty, physicians and the working men and women of San Francisco who are concerned about the impact of the proposed Golden State Warriors' stadium on the future of the vibrant community and medical campus at Mission Bay. The Alliance fully supports the Warriors' team and congratulates its tremendous championship win. However, the Alliance believes the proposed arena and entertainment center is ill-conceived for this site. For more information about the Mission Bay Alliance, visit www.missionbayalliance.org.

--30--

Related Coverage



Group Of Prestigious UCSF Scientists Says Warriors Arena Could Be 'Disaster' For Mission Bay

Jay Barman – September 24, 2015

In a slightly different tactic, the coalition of UCSF-connected enemies of the proposed Warriors Arena have just presented a letter to the mayor signed by 20 of the university's leading scientists and researchers declaring that the stadium proposal could spell disaster for the growing biotech and life science hub in the neighborhood. PR rep for the Mission Bay Alliance, Sam Singer Associates, sent out a release about the letter to members of the press Thursday afternoon, echoing earlier doom-filled warnings that have come from the UCSF Medical Center regarding potential traffic congestion on event nights.

The Mayor's Office has yet to issue its response, but groups of supporters of the arena gathered at the Ramp in Mission Bay last night to rally, as the Chron reports.

The letter expresses some sour grapes about the already "paralyzing" and "hours-long gridlock that paralyzes all Mission Bay streets before and after San Francisco Giants home games." Sounds like Mission Bay scientists don't enjoy the sports so much, and this has all just been a hassle.

The City produced its own report in July about potential traffic impacts, and there will be "significant" impacts at 11 key intersections on game nights, according to that report.

But this letter from the scientists goes further to say, "Our major fear is that the Mission Bay site will lose its appeal — not only for the new biomedical enterprises that the city would like to attract here, but also for most of its current occupants."

And it suggests that "the entire future of UCSF as the center of a world-class academic/biotech/medical complex" is at stake here.

Now, is that because of traffic? Many, like the Warriors Arena proponents themselves, are going to argue that public transportation is the bigger answer here, but people like Professor of Anatomy Zena Werb and Professor of Biochemistry, Pharmaceutical Chemistry, and Cellular and Molecular Pharmacology Robert Fletterick see the arena as sullyng their insular world over there, at least whenever they need to go outdoors during basketball season.

Also, it should be noted that as of July, a majority of San Francisco (61%) supported the arena project, which Mayor Lee is not likely to back down from anytime soon.



CONTRA COSTA BEE

Warriors Arena at Mission Bay endangers biotech boom in SF

Bill Gram-Reefer – September 24, 2015

Concerned scientists believe that the Golden Gate Warriors Arena at Mission Bay endangers the multi-billion-dollar economic development potential of a growing biotech boom in San Francisco if the arena is built adjacent to UCSF Medical Center, a critical hub to biotech and life sciences research and innovation.

A coalition of world-renowned scientists from the University of California at San Francisco and the U.S. National Academy of Sciences today said the proposed Golden State Warriors Arena at Mission Bay would be a "disaster" for the City's growing biotech and life science hub and called for San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee to abandon the proposed plans.

In a letter to San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee, more than 20 of UCSF's leading scientists and researchers went on record to say, "Our major fear is that the Mission Bay site will lose its appeal – not only for the new biomedical enterprises that the city would like to attract here, but also for most of its current occupants."

The City's Mission Bay project – the largest ongoing biomedical construction project in the world – can be credited for the City's biotech success and would be jeopardized by the proposed stadium.

Anchored by UCSF's new, \$1.6 billion hospital and research campus, Mission Bay has given rise to San Francisco's flourishing life science and biotech industry, generating nearly \$4 billion in economic activity, \$1.4 billion in income and 21,000 jobs.

The UCSF scientists joined the California Nurses Association and the Mission Bay Alliance, a coalition of UCSF employees, stakeholders and neighbors who oppose the 18,500-seat arena and entertainment center, in their decisive opposition of the proposed project, saying the proposed Warriors Arena at Mission Bay threatens, "the entire future of UCSF as the center of a world-class academic/biotech/medical complex."

The letter cites traffic gridlock as a leading concern for both residents accessing UCSF's emergency services and for the hospital workers and scientist and researchers who have turned Mission Bay into one of the most "prominent academic-industry biotechnology/medical complexes in the world."

"It is unavoidable that terrible, and possibly even life-threatening, traffic congestion will be associated with the planned complex, given that it is intended to be the site of some 220 events per year, held both in the evening and during the day," wrote the scientists. "Many of us have experienced the hours-long gridlock that paralyzes all Mission Bay streets before and after San Francisco Giants home games. The absolute paralysis that it creates is already a non-trivial problem, which the planned stadium promises to both greatly expand and intensify."

The UCSF faculty who signed the letter are among the most prestigious and acclaimed scientists in the world and include Bruce Alberts, UCSF Chancellor's Leadership Chair for Biochemistry and Biophysics for Science and Education, who is the former president of the National Academy of Sciences, a membership organization of the world's leading scientists and Noble Prize winners.

The scientists said special traffic routes proposed to protect UCSF employees would not work.

"Those of us at Mission Bay have experienced the unruly behavior of frustrated drivers stuck for long times in traffic jams," they wrote. "In fact, there is no believable transportation solution for two very large complexes placed in such close proximity at Mission Bay."

Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance said he commended the courage of UCSF's preeminent scientists and researchers for taking a stand and protecting the growth of Mission Bay's biotech and life science community.

"These concerns are consistent with those shared by Mission Bay Alliance and the healthcare employees, neighbors and others who recognize what a disaster this project would be on the thousands of people and budding industries in this growing community," Spaulding said. "This is a significant

community and a quality of life issue in San Francisco. We hope the Mayor recognizes the danger to public health and life sciences of this ill-conceived project.”

“We face increasing competition from other rapidly growing complexes of this type, both in the US and abroad,” the scientists wrote. “It will be critical to keep moving aggressively forward, if we are to continue to attract the very best talent – both academic and private sector – to San Francisco....We are seriously concerned that this future is threatened by the plan to construct a very large sports, entertainment, and event arena in our midst.”



Media Contact

Sam Singer or Alex Donaich

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949; 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

28 September 2015

New Site Proposed for Golden State Warriors Arena in San Francisco Near Pier 80

Mission Bay Alliance Calls on Warriors, City to Explore Alternative Arena Site near Pier 80 to Avoid Critical Harm to Bioscience Research, UCSF in Mission Bay

San Francisco – Opponents of the proposed 18,500-seat Golden State Warriors’ arena at Mission Bay today called on the City of San Francisco and Warriors’ management to pursue an alternate arena site near Pier 80 on the Third Street Corridor that would reduce environmental impacts including traffic gridlock on UCSF and San Francisco’s world-renowned life sciences and bio science research hub.

The new alternative 21-acre site is bounded by Cesar Chavez Street, Islmais Creek Channel, and Highway 280. It is being championed as a viable option without traffic nightmares and posing no risk to lifesaving medical care at UCSF.

With easy access to Highways 280 and 101, ample surface parking, and Muni bus and light rail lines, the site could better meet the needs of a Warriors’ arena and entertainment center – without the life-threatening or environmental impacts of the proposed arena in Mission Bay, according to the Mission Bay Alliance, a coalition of UCSF stakeholders, employees, healthcare workers and neighbors opposing the Mission Bay arena. The new proposed site is already owned in part by the City of San Francisco and the SFMTA. The City’s property interests could facilitate the Warriors’ development of the site.

“This is a great solution for the Warriors’ relocation to San Francisco,” said Mission Bay Alliance spokesperson Bruce Spaulding. “This site would not threaten access to life-saving medical care or imperil biosciences,” he added. “A new arena at this alternate location would border open space and industrial warehouses – not three brand-new UCSF hospitals, a children’s emergency room and a world-renowned bioscience research campus, all of which would be irreparably harmed by the massive arena and entertainment center.”

Spaulding said the Alliance wants to help the Warriors and the City develop a site that could work for the Warriors. Although it had no obligation to do so, the Alliance took the practical step of searching for a better site for the arena when no one else did. Its efforts have now culminated in success: the new alternative site can meet project objectives and lessen environmental impacts.

“The site is the best location for the Warriors and the environment. After they analyze it, the City and the Warriors should come to the conclusion that we did: it is a far superior site in the best interests of the environment and everyone,” Spaulding said.

Last week, a coalition of world-renowned scientists from UCSF and the U.S. National Academy of Sciences joined the California Nurses Association and the Mission Bay Alliance in calling the proposed Warriors’ Arena a “disaster” for Mission Bay. In a letter to Mayor Ed Lee, they asked the City to abandon the Mission Bay plans that would threaten “the entire future of UCSF as the center of a world-class academic/biotech/medical complex.”

Meanwhile, the Mission Bay Alliance points out that the proposed 18,500-seat Mission Bay arena is fatally flawed and has identified numerous violations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in the ongoing environmental review process, including failure to mitigate traffic congestion, blocking emergency access, and failing to address seismic safety threats.

“The City and the Warriors must give the site near Pier 80 a fair look,” said Mission Bay Alliance attorney Osha Meserve. “That’s what San Francisco citizens deserve and what our environmental laws require.”

The alternative site, 11 blocks south of the Warriors proposed Mission Bay arena location, would have less traffic and other impacts and quick access to nearby highways and transit options. It is flanked by ample surface parking.

By contrast, the Warriors’ proposed arena at Mission Bay includes only 200 dedicated parking spaces to accommodate thousands of fans at the arena’s proposed 225 events per year. At the new site near Pier 80, event-goers could likely park in the area for as little as \$15 as opposed to \$55 or more.

“This neighborhood is much less developed than Mission Bay, so there’s plenty of underutilized land for retail options, restaurants and housing,” Spaulding said.

The current 11-acre site proposed by the Warriors in Mission Bay contains asbestos and other environmental toxins and could trigger significant cost overruns due to the need for major excavation and dewatering during below-grade construction of an underground parking lot.

“The Warriors and City should jump at the opportunity our proposed site near Pier 80 provides,” Spaulding said.

About the Mission Bay Alliance

The Mission Bay Alliance is a coalition of UCSF stakeholders, donors, faculty, physicians and the working men and women of San Francisco who are concerned about the impact of the proposed Golden State Warriors’ stadium on the future of the vibrant community and medical campus at Mission Bay. The Alliance fully supports the Warriors’ team, however, the Alliance believes the proposed arena and entertainment center is ill-conceived for Mission Bay. For more information about the Mission Bay Alliance, visit www.missionbayalliance.org.

Related Coverage

San Francisco Chronicle

Bay Bridge builder in black despite penalties

By Matier & Ross – September 25, 2015

Even after being penalized millions of dollars for problem-plagued work, the lead builder of the new Bay Bridge eastern span is walking away a financial winner — thanks to its rush job to get the bridge open by Labor Day weekend in 2013.

The Bay Bridge project's oversight committee decided last week that the lead contractor, the joint venture American Bridge/Fluor, was partly to blame for the construction fiasco that resulted in 32 high-strength steel rods snapping on the span's seismic stabilizers. Throw in a few bucks for the continuing troubles with rods at the base of the signature tower, and American Bridge/Fluor was docked a cool \$11 million.

But don't feel too bad — when the bridge opened to traffic on time in September 2013, thanks to a last-minute sprint, American Bridge/Fluor was rewarded with almost \$49 million in bonuses.

By our math, even with the penalties, that still puts the bridge's builder ahead by \$38 million.

"The incentive was to get the bridge built by Labor Day — that was the deal written into the contract, and they met it," said Randy Rentschler, spokesman for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. "The question of construction defects became a separate issue," he said, "and now that subject has been dealt with — like it or not."

Arena buzz

The group opposing the Golden State Warriors' planned Mission Bay arena is pushing the team to consider yet another site — an industrial patchwork 11 blocks south of the current proposed spot.

The Warriors already shifted plans once, transplanting their dreams from Piers 30-32 to a spot next to UCSF's Mission Bay medical center. Now the Mission Bay Alliance — a group of deep-pocketed UCSF donors who want the proposed arena site set aside for the medical center's expansion — says there's a much better spot.

It's a 20-acre mix of warehouses, lumberyards and empty lots off Cesar Chavez Street, some of which is already owned by the city. It's next to Muni's Third Street light-rail line and Interstate 280, and about a third of a mile from Highway 101.

"It's tailor-made for the Warriors, right on a Muni rail line, and there is ample parking," said Mission Bay Alliance spokesman Sam Singer.

The group has met privately with both Mayor Ed Lee and the Warriors' lawyers to discuss the idea. We're told the alliance members — led by mega-rich UCSF donors Bill Oberndorf and Sandy Robertson — even offered to help finance the land purchase.

The Warriors, however, are showing little interest.

“The Warriors are focused on the site in Mission Bay,” said team spokesman P.J. Johnston. “The public clearly supports this location.”

He also accused the alliance of playing politics.

“The oldest play in the book is to say, ‘We love a project — we just want it at a different location,’” Johnston said.

Lee’s office was equally blunt, sending us a statement Friday saying alliance members “have no interest in being reasonable or working with the city to resolve what they say their concerns are.”

The group’s strategy, the statement said, is “to bring in the high-priced lawyers and litigate.”

A-ticket: Leading the minority in the House may not be a dream job, but there was one major perk last week: the number of tickets available to hand out for Pope Francis’ speech to Congress.

While most lawmakers had one prized ticket to give out, Rep. Nancy Pelosi, D-San Francisco, had at least eight.

Her guests included such heavyweights as:

- Salesforce chief and big-time charity and political donor Marc Benioff and his wife, Lynne. Benioff is active in San Francisco’s Catholic community and a close friend of Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone, whose anti-same-sex marriage campaigning has raised hackles among liberal parishioners.
- Megabucks environmentalist and possible gubernatorial contender Tom Steyer and his wife, Kat Taylor.
- Service Employees International Union president Mary Kay Henry, whose union represents 1.5 million public employees and health care workers nationwide.
- Matilda Cuomo, widow of New York Gov. Mario Cuomo.
- Plus Pelosi’s brother, former Baltimore Mayor Thomas D’Alesandro III, and the congresswoman’s husband, Paul Pelosi.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein gave her ticket to Democratic donor Elizabeth Bagley, who is active in children’s issues.

Oakland Democratic Rep. Barbara Lee’s ticket went to the Rev. Jay Matthews, rector at the Cathedral of Christ the Light in Oakland, while Rep. Mark DeSaulnier, D-Concord, gave his to St. Mary’s College President James Donahue.

Rep. Jackie Speier, D-Hillsborough, brought her son’s godmother, Katy Lawson, to the event and rounded up about 120 tickets for congressional janitors, police officers and other support staff.

Deja vu: The design hasn’t change much, but George Lucas is scaling back the Chicago version of his Museum of Narrative Art.

Chicago Tribune architecture critic Blair Kamin is calling it "the Weight Watchers version of Jabba the Hutt."

San Jose Mercury News

Golden State Warriors must address traffic issues to win key San Francisco arena ally

Matthew Artz – September 28, 2015

SAN FRANCISCO -- The Golden State Warriors might have to limit events at its proposed San Francisco arena when the Giants are in town in order to receive the blessing of a key neighbor and potential ally.

University of California, San Francisco leaders said Monday that they expect to back the Warriors' planned 18,500-seat arena across Third Street from the university's 4,000 person medical campus in San Francisco's Mission Bay District. But their support will be contingent on a deal that ensures patients won't be stuck in traffic on game nights or any other night the arena is in use.

"While we are all big sports fans and very enthusiastic about the new arena, our number one priority is patient safety," Kim Scurr, executive director of UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital San Francisco, said during a news conference.

Mindy Magnusson said it took her 30 minutes to drive her sick 9-year-old daughter a half-mile through Giants game day traffic on Friday evening and feared the arena could make matters worse. "It's important for kids come in when they need to come in," she said.

The Warriors are hoping to build their privately-financed arena in time for the 2018-19 NBA season. They have already purchased the 12-acre site 10 blocks south of AT&T Park and have the support of Mayor Ed Lee as well as many San Francisco residents, according to a recent poll.

But a group calling itself the Mission Bay Alliance, whose members include medical center donors, are fighting the project they say will limit the medical center's potential for expansion and tie-up traffic all the way to the Bay Bridge.

"Our engineers and experts have scrutinized the city's draft (environmental impact report) and determined with certainty that this is a fatally flawed project that will gridlock traffic, threaten patient access to lifesaving care and be a disaster for the Mission Bay neighborhood, the hospitals and City as a whole," Mission Bay Alliance member Bruce Spalding said Monday in a prepared statement.

UCSF Vice Chancellor for University Relations Barbara French said the university was independent from the Alliance and that it was optimistic an agreement on traffic mitigations would be reached.

"We think the message that patients need access to the hospital is a message that both the Warriors and the mayor can support and will agree with," French said.

With an estimated 2 million people expected to visit the Warriors' arena every year, UCSF wants a binding agreement reserving certain roads only for medical center use and identifying funds to pay for additional traffic mitigation measures. And, if no other fixes work, UCSF wants the city to have authority to regulate or restrict nights when the arena would host an event during a Giants home game.

For example, French said, the city would have "the ability to say to the Giants and the Warriors, let's schedule this so we do not have, say, Madonna here on the same night that the Giants are playing the Cardinals."

Warriors arena spokesman P.J. Johnston praised UCSF for being "an honest broker all along," in a prepared statement. "We understand UCSF's concerns, and we're determined to address them successfully ... The Warriors will be good neighbors."

Getting anything built in San Francisco is famously difficult, but the Warriors do have some leverage of their own. A team-commissioned poll released earlier this month showed that 61 percent of respondents supported the arena project, which could make opponents less likely to challenge the arena at the ballot box.

Opponents can sue over the city's environmental review, but they likely won't be able to hold it up in court for very long. Earlier this year, Gov. Jerry Brown approved fast-track status for the arena project. That means a judge would have to rule on any lawsuit contesting whether the arena plan includes adequate traffic mitigations within 290 days.

If the San Francisco arena gets further delayed, East Bay officials have said the Warriors are welcome to stay in the Oracle Arena. A proposed redevelopment of the land surrounding arena would include an option for the team to extend its lease.



Opponents of Warriors arena in Mission Bay want project moved south

Laura Dudnick – September 28, 2015

Opponents of a plan to build a Golden State Warriors arena in Mission Bay have identified an alternative location for the project and are urging city and team leaders to consider the site.

The 21-acre site near Pier 80 in the Bayview has been proposed by the Mission Bay Alliance, a group led by former UC San Francisco officials who argue the arena in Mission Bay will create detrimental traffic congestion and permanently scar the neighborhood.

The suggested site, more than half of which is owned by The City, is 11 blocks south of where the arena is currently planned on about 11 acres of waterfront land at Third and 16th streets, across from UCSF's new hospitals and research centers.

It marks the first specific alternative site proposed by the Mission Bay Alliance, the primary opposition to the project in Mission Bay. UCSF nurses have also expressed concerns with building an arena adjacent to the new hospitals, but UCSF leaders announced support for the project over the summer, contingent on a plan for managing traffic in the long term.

In the draft environmental report, city planners outlined nearly \$40 million in transit improvements slated for Mission Bay that are aimed to curb traffic congestion created in part by the proposed arena. That includes purchasing new Muni light-rail vehicles, allowing crossover tracks for the vehicles to pass on the T-Third Street line, and extending the adjacent Muni platform near the arena.

But the alliance remains vehemently against the arena in Mission Bay and noted numerous "fatal flaws" in building a multi-use facility across from UCSF Medical Center, including noise, air pollution and traffic.

The alliance met with the Warriors on Sept. 22 and Mayor Ed Lee the previous week to share the proposed alternative, said Sam Singer, a spokesman for the alliance.

"They listened politely and with interest to the information we provided them about the alternative location near Pier 80," Singer said.

However, it appears that Lee still favors the Mission Bay site.

"The mayor is focused on the site that has been discussed with the community for more than a year and he joins many, many others in strong support for an arena in Mission Bay, where it will be a great neighbor and partner to UCSF and a great asset to the community," Christine Falvey, the mayor's spokeswoman, wrote in an email to the San Francisco Examiner.

PJ Johnston, a spokesman for the Warriors, declined to comment on any location other than the current site in Mission Bay, but said that spot has been thoroughly vetted.

"The opponents want the Mission Bay property for themselves, but just because they have a lot of money doesn't mean they can grab the land or highjack the public process," Johnston wrote in an email to the San Francisco Examiner.

"The Warriors, The City and the community have been engaged in a public planning process for more than a year on the Mission Bay location. San Franciscans are overwhelmingly supportive of the plan," he added.

The Mission Bay Alliance plans to formally submit its proposed Bayview site to The City as part of the environmental impact review process, Singer said. The draft EIR was released in June, and a final draft is expected this fall.

“The Warriors were in a rush to find a new site when they realized...The Embarcadero wasn’t going to work out. They grabbed the first piece of property without doing the appropriate due diligence,” said Singer, referring to the previous controversial effort to build the arena at Piers 30-32 before the Warriors purchased the current Mission Bay plot from Salesforce.com.

Singer touted advantages of the site near Pier 80, including additional and less expensive parking. The site borders Interstate Highway 280 and is just off the Third Street Muni lightrail route. There are parcels on the site – mostly warehouses and for industrial uses – that are privately owned, but Singer said the owners contacted by a real estate representative of the alliance have indicated they might be interested in selling their property.

“You couldn’t ask for a better location if you were the Warriors,” Singer said.



Media Contact

Sam Singer or Alex Donaich

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949; 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

13 October 2015

Mission Bay Alliance Requests Formal City Review of Alternative Golden State Warriors' Arena Site Near Pier 80

Alliance Submits Letter Calling on the City of San Francisco to Explore Alternative Arena Site at Third St. and Cesar Chavez, Avoid Critical Harm to Bioscience Research, UCSF in Mission Bay

San Francisco – The City of San Francisco must consider an alternate arena site near Pier 80 that would reduce traffic and other impacts on UCSF and San Francisco's world-renowned life sciences and bio sciences research hub, according to opponents of the proposed location of the 18,500-seat Golden State Warriors' arena at Mission Bay.

In a letter submitted this week to San Francisco's Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure Executive Director Tiffany Bohee, attorneys for the Mission Bay Alliance say the City must provide good-faith consideration of an alternative location — a 21-acre site bounded by Cesar Chavez Street, Islais Creek Channel, and Highway 280 — in its Environmental Impact Report. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) instructs public agencies to consider alternatives in order to avoid approving harmful projects if feasible alternatives exist.

The Mission Bay Alliance, a coalition of UCSF stakeholders, employees, healthcare workers and neighbors opposing the Mission Bay arena, went through considerable efforts to identify the site because it wants to avoid the catastrophic impacts of the Mission Bay site.

"The draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) concludes that locating the Warriors' Event Center in Mission Bay would create significant environmental impacts," said Mission Bay Alliance attorney Susan Brandt-Hawley, who has represented hundreds of public-interest groups in CEQA and land use issues statewide, including those that recently won legal challenges to the controversial 8 Washington waterfront luxury condo project. "The City cannot approve the project proposed in Mission Bay if another adequate site would both accomplish the Warriors' objectives and substantially reduce environmental problems."

But rather than awaiting objective review of the Pier 80 alternative in the EIR, Mayor Ed Lee has publicly dismissed it out of hand.

“We’re calling on the City and the Warriors to comply with state environmental guidelines that require analysis of alternatives when considering a project with disastrous impacts, like the arena proposed in Mission Bay,” said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance. “Failure to do so will demonstrate what we’ve long suspected – that the Warriors and the City are in such a rush to get this project approved, that in the process they’ve ignored elementary principles of state environmental law at the expense of the public good.”

The City’s draft EIR review of the proposed Mission Bay arena identified the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts. Concerned about these impacts and the failure by the City’s EIR project consultants to search for a better site, the Mission Bay Alliance took the practical step of finding a better site for the Warriors’ arena and event center.

The proposed site near Pier 80 is majority-owned by the City of San Francisco and the SF MTA – property interests that could facilitate the Warriors’ development of the site. The site is a viable option without traffic nightmares, no risk to lifesaving medical care, easy access to Highways 280 and 101, ample surface parking, and access to Muni bus and light rail lines.

The site provides several key advantages, including:

Convenient location. A location only 11 blocks south of the Mission Bay site, yet conveniently situated next to multiple transit options and Highways 280 and 101.

Ample size. The arena requires less than 7 acres and could be positioned in one of three configurations on the site.

The site’s size and location are conducive to ancillary revitalizing development of retail, restaurants, and housing of all market types.

“Rather than gamble with people’s lives and access to healthcare during games and special events, we’re proposing a Pier 80 location that would not rely on flawed agreements in order to facilitate emergency access during life or death moments,” Spaulding said.

Attorneys for the Mission Bay Alliance have also called the proposed 18,500-seat Mission Bay arena fatally flawed, citing numerous violations of CEQA along with severe traffic congestion, blocked emergency access, and seismic safety threats.

A coalition of world-renowned scientists from UCSF and the U.S. National Academy of Sciences have now joined the California Nurses Association and the Mission Bay Alliance in calling the proposed Warriors’ Arena a “disaster” for Mission Bay. In a letter to Mayor Ed Lee, they asked the City to abandon the Mission Bay plans that would threaten “the entire future of UCSF as the center of a world-class academic/biotech/medical complex.”

“As repeatedly held by California courts, project alternatives form the core of every EIR,” Brandt-Hawley said. “We expect the City to follow California law and provide an objective, comprehensive analysis of an alternative Warriors’ arena site near Pier 80 – a site that meets all of this project’s objectives without any of the devastating, life-threatening consequences of a major arena in Mission Bay.”

Related Coverage

COLUMBIA JOURNALISM REVIEW

San Francisco Chronicle suspends reporter for press release copy-and-paste

Tony Biasotti – October 13, 2015

The San Francisco Chronicle has suspended its Golden State Warriors beat reporter after he wrote an article Monday that was nearly a word-for-word copy of a team press release.

Rusty Simmons wrote the piece after the Warriors issued a press release announcing their purchase of land from the tech company Salesforce in San Francisco's Mission Bay neighborhood, where the team plans to build a new arena. The piece was posted to SFGate, the Chronicle's website, on Monday morning, and stayed there until 5:45pm, when it was replaced by a much shorter version of the story. The new story had no byline and an editor's note that read: "A previous version of this story was a lightly edited press release issued by the Golden State Warriors. The story is now written by a Chronicle staffer."

On Tuesday, Audrey Cooper, the Chronicle's editor-in-chief, told CJR that Simmons had been suspended without pay pending an investigation of his entire body of work with the paper. Simmons has been a sportswriter with the Chronicle since 2002. In a statement emailed to CJR, Cooper said she was "extremely disappointed."

"Integrity is one of our company's top values and we will not employ journalists who do not adhere to the strictest ethical protocols," she wrote.

In a subsequent phone interview, Cooper said she would be "very surprised" if the review of Simmons' work reveals that copying press releases is a "chronic practice."

Simmons told CJR via email that he has no comment.

The headline for the original Chronicle story and the Warriors' press release on NBA.com were the same: "Warriors formally purchase Mission Bay site." The initial story was identical to the release, except that the team referred to itself as the "NBA Champion Golden State Warriors" in its lede, and the Chronicle story left out the "champion" superlative. The only other change was a semicolon in the press release that became two sentences in the Chronicle story.

"The writer copy-and-pasted the press release into a premade story folder and tried to edit out what he saw as overly effusive language," Cooper said. "In his haste, he didn't put enough critical thinking into whether this was the right procedure. He now realizes that it was not."

The story was edited before it was posted, Cooper said. The editor had not seen the Warriors' press release.

Cooper said the problem with Simmons' story wasn't brought to her attention until late in the afternoon, when the story had been live for hours. Sam Singer, a renowned publicist in San Francisco and a paid spokesman for the arena's organized opposition, Mission Bay Alliance, spotted the duplication and sent an email to many of his contacts in San Francisco, but not to anyone at the Chronicle, Cooper said. Singer sent a separate email to CJR on Monday evening.

Joe Fitzgerald Rodriguez, a reporter for the San Francisco Examiner, took Singer's tip late Monday and tweeted screen shots of the press release and the Chronicle story.

It is, of course, always unacceptable for a reporter to put his name at the top of a press release and for a newspaper to publish that story as its own work. The Chronicle's screw-up is especially unfortunate on a story like this one, about a live political controversy— —the Mission Bay project has much more political support than the Warriors' previous attempt at finding an arena site, but there is still a very vocal opposition group, the Singer-affiliated Mission Bay Alliance. Singer is a smart operator and a frequent adversary of the Chronicle, and it is probably inevitable that he would find the copy-and-paste job and flag it widely.

"As distasteful as it is to take ethical instructions from Sam Singer, unfortunately, he was right," Cooper said.



Media Contact

Sam Singer or Alex Donaich

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949; 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

14 October 2015

**Mission Bay Alliance Demands Release of Emergency Access Deal Struck
Between UCSF and Warriors after City, UCSF Stonewall Public Access**

City officials claim they do not have a copy of the UCSF-Warriors' agreement announced last week in a City-issued Press Release while UCSF Remains Unresponsive

"What are the City, the Warriors and UCSF trying to hide?"

San Francisco — Opponents of the proposed 18,500-seat Golden State Warriors arena and entertainment center in Mission Bay are demanding the release of the public safety "agreement" struck between the Warriors and UCSF last week after City of San Francisco officials and UCSF have refused to produce any documentation beyond a City-issued press release.

In the joint announcement of UCSF's project endorsement, UCSF Chancellor Sam Hawgood hailed the "agreements" between UCSF, the Warriors and the City as providing necessary safeguards by creating a dedicated transportation fund and a "special circumstances cap" limiting dual events to protect access to emergency services. UCSF's emergency room sits only 1,000 feet from the proposed stadium.

Yet few details about what this agreement actually entailed emerged in the City's one-page press release. And while a Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Ordinance was introduced at the Board of Supervisors meeting and subsequently made available, both the City and UCSF have refused to provide the agreement between UCSF and the Warriors.

The Mission Bay Alliance has formally requested the agreement as a public record, but the City has claimed it does not have a copy. UCSF has yet to respond to a request for the document.

"What are the City, UCSF and the Warriors trying to hide by denying public review of an agreement that will impact the health and safety of thousands of UCSF patients and families?" said Sam Singer, a spokesman for the Mission Bay Alliance. "We demand full disclosure of this so-called agreement so that the public can be fully informed of a package that we believe to be no more than a smoke and mirrors' PR stunt."

The Mission Bay Alliance, a coalition of UCSF stakeholders, employees, healthcare workers and neighbors opposing the Mission Bay arena, is further challenging the media to demand release of these documents. The agreements were broadly and often favorably reported when announced last week – it appears even without any review beyond the City’s released statements.

“We’re calling on the hardworking men and women of the news media to dig beneath the released rhetoric and challenge UCSF, the City and the Warriors to provide some answers,” Singer said. “The residents of the City of San Francisco deserve to know what’s really going on beneath the spin and behind closed doors.”

This week, the Columbia Journalism Review reported that a San Francisco Chronicle reporter was suspended after it was discovered that he’d published a Warriors’ press release online as his own reporting. Once it came to the Chronicle’s attention, the story was taken down and rewritten and Editor in Chief Audrey Cooper issued an apology and announced an investigation.

“This arena project is too massive and too disastrous for it to slip through the cracks without appropriate and vital public scrutiny,” Singer said.

Related Coverage

San Francisco Chronicle

An alternative – albeit wacky – site for the new Warriors arena

C.W. Nevius – October 16, 2015

Who knew the heretofore stuffy Mission Bay Alliance had such a sense of humor? The opponents of the Warriors’ proposed new arena in Mission Bay claim they have found a terrific alternative site near Pier 80 that the team should consider.

Having driven down there, I have one reaction — surely this is a joke. Too harsh? Ok, put it this way: This would work if we could solve a few pesky problems.

Like the fact that the spot is already occupied. There are already thriving businesses at the site — I counted 14. Or that half the land is owned by either the city or the Port of San Francisco, and that those plots are in full use by the Municipal Transportation Agency, which has no intention of giving them up.

The site, nearly two miles south of AT&T Park, is set in the bleak, but bustling, warehouse district next to Cesar Chavez Street. A big new basketball arena would fit in about as well as a spaceship. Trucks and heavy equipment make navigating the narrow streets a traffic challenge, and that’s after you negotiate the increasingly congested Third Street corridor to get there.

Ever optimistic, Mission Bay Alliance spokesman Sam Singer is doing all he can to turn those negatives into a positive.

For example, take the fact that, unlike the Mission Bay location, which is a vacant lot, this site is populated with businesses, warehouses and city or port property.

That, Singer says, is a good thing.

“More than 50 percent of the land is owned by the city,” he said. “And the city has said that it desires the Warriors.”

So, once San Francisco realizes what a gem this industrial grid really is, it will just hand over the land and turn it into an arena in-waiting.

Uh, no.

The largest city plot is currently in use by Muni. And we’re not talking about storing a couple of buses.

This is a fenced, concrete and asphalt staging center just completed last year for fueling buses and launching bus routes.

“That large space is something we’ve been working on for probably 15 years,” said MTA director Ed Reiskin. “It’s a long-planned project and just two weeks ago we broke ground on phase two.”

That will include the construction of a large, permanent maintenance building on the south end of the lot. So to the question of whether the city is going to hand over that land for an arena, let’s mark that down as “doubtful.”

With that off the table, we turn to the rest of the site, beginning with two large warehouse buildings, which would not only have to be taken down, the businesses in them would have to relocate. And that’s only if the owners of the structures were willing to sell.

More good news, Singer says.

“We hired real estate brokers to contact the owners of the buildings,” he said. “And all of them expressed interest.”

But it turns out there are a few qualifiers to the term “expressed interest.”

“The brokers didn’t mention the Mission Bay Alliance (or an arena),” Singer said. “They just said, ‘I’m representing a company that is putting this deal together.’”

But a 18,500-seat basketball arena is not what the landowners have in mind, according to Jim Luo, who owns a quarter of one of the warehouses where his marble and tile outlet is located. He says the owners are thinking about a residential housing plan that would include some 1,000 housing units.

So unless the new arena’s luxury boxes are going to be condominiums, it would be safe to say the Alliance and the current owners are not on the same page.

That leaves a plot in the center of the site. It is owned by the Port of San Francisco, and while Reiskin says “it’s the Port’s call,” MTA has been a longterm tenant there, using it for maintenance and repairs.

Even with that land Reiskin said, “We don’t have enough space to meet demand.”

So to review: This is a perfect site if all the businesses agree to move, the landowners agree to sell, MTA decides to abandon a 15-year project and Warriors’ fans embrace the idea of traveling halfway to Candlestick Point to see a game.

It’s not going to happen. And the Alliance knows that. This is a cynical attempt to slow down the process and stall the groundbreaking at Mission Bay.

On the other hand, if we’re just tossing out wacky ideas, why should they have all the fun? Chronicle architectural critic John King suggests the arena could go into the Buffalo Paddock in Golden Gate Park. Plenty of room, easy access via The Wiggle for cyclists and actual bison viewing before the game.

Good idea, but this is San Francisco, so there’s always the risk of raising the ire of bison advocacy groups.

A better suggestion came from a reader who is pitching the idea of a floating arena. Not only would it not displace anyone, it could be towed back and forth across the bay from SF to the East Bay so Oakland could still host half of the home games. It’s a win-win, as long as the waves don’t kick up during a game.

Crazy idea? No more so than the one the Alliance has already proposed.



The Warriors Face Backlash In Their Move To San Francisco

Tyler Primas – October 19, 2015

The roaring fans shouting “MVP!” and “Let’s go Warriors!” is what gave the “Roaracle” its name. Ever since I can remember, I’ve cheered on the Golden State Warriors from section 108 at the Oracle Arena, but that’s about to change.

After calling Oakland their home for 43 years, the team announced Oct. 12 that they purchased a 12-acre parcel of land in San Francisco’s Mission Bay District. They plan to open a new arena there at the beginning of the 2018-2019 season, according to Forbes.

After years of initially promising yet ultimately disappointing seasons, the Warriors picked up their momentum this year and transformed into a golden team. The Splash Brothers, Klay Thompson and Stephen Curry, dominated the court and brought so much energy to the Oracle that the arena exploded with blue and yellow. The city of Oakland has been at the heart of that success.

My closet is full of Warriors jerseys: Baron Davis, Jason Richardson, Monta Ellis and more. When my dad comes home with Warrior tickets, I get so excited to see them play in my hometown. Walking in the south entrance of the arena to get to our seats is so surreal to me. That arena holds years of my family's memories, from watching the Warriors play to seeing my favorite artists, like Beyoncé, perform there.

The Oracle Arena holds a special place in my heart.

Though the Golden State Warriors were the San Francisco Warriors until 1971, San Francisco was not always their official home court. They bounced around, from the Cow Palace to arenas in Oakland and San Jose, and even played home games in San Diego. Once they permanently moved to the Oakland Coliseum in 1972, they became the Golden State Warriors, claiming Oakland as their home court.

Oakland has been their home for more than 40 years, and that shouldn't change just because they want a new arena.

The new arena doesn't have to be built in San Francisco. They can build a new arena in Jack London Square in Oakland or expand the Oracle Arena. Oakland citizens deserve something for supporting the team through the rough years. We deserve a new arena or an expansion of the existing arena in Oakland; the city in which we, as Warrior fans, have thrived alongside the team.

Furthermore, in the months when basketball season and baseball season overlap, the San Francisco Giants and the Golden State Warriors will most likely have games on the same day, which will increase traffic coming across the Bay Bridge and on BART.

Around the world, Oakland is seen as a dangerous, crime-ridden city, and people don't see its beauty. The Warriors winning a championship finally started to paint Oakland in a good light. Oakland residents finally have something to be proud of, and they're taking it away from us. It feels like the team is abandoning the loyal fans that have supported them through rough seasons, like myself, to move on to a bigger and better arena since they're champions now. The Warriors owe it to the loyal fans to stay in Oakland and let us enjoy living in a championship city.

San Francisco is already known for being the home of the 2012 and 2014 World Series Champions, the San Francisco Giants. We should let Oakland have the thrill of being the home of the 2015 NBA Champions, the Golden State Warriors. Let the Oracle continue to roar.



Blood on the Hardwood

Joe Eskenazi – October 23, 2015

Along the southern half of Mission Bay's main drag sits an unsightly vacant lot. But in the not-too-distant future, it could be hosting concerts, tractor pulls, and conventions all year long—in a sleek new Golden

State Warriors arena. The project is fervently backed by Mayor Ed Lee, as was an earlier iteration slated for Piers 30–32. Having hired a small army of fixers to push through their politically blessed endeavor, the team thought it had an easy dunk. Until, suddenly, a Shaq-like behemoth emerged—a pugnacious outfit that has enlisted Al Gore’s lawyer and has more money than God. As battles in the paint go, this one looks to be a barn burner. Somebody oughta sell tickets.

The Mission Bay Alliance

"There will be litigation until the cows come home." —Jack Davis

Roster

Samuel Barondes, director of UC San Francisco’s Center for Neurobiology and Psychiatry; Jeanne Robertson, former chair of the UCSF Foundation; Bruce Spaulding, former senior UCSF vice chancellor and driving force behind the UCSF Mission Bay campus; Bill Rutter, former UCSF biochemistry and biophysics department chair and cofounder of Chiron; Jack Davis, bon vivant and consultant; Sam Singer, spokesman.

Scouting Report

Fielding a deep bench of self-professed billionaires, the Mission Bay Alliance can play defense (it has hired a cadre of land-use attorneys) and offense (it has acquired the services of onetime Bush v. Gore attorney David Boies and Molotov-tossing operatives Davis and Singer). Following its attorneys’ recent perusal of the project’s environmental impact report, the alliance accused the arena of over 50 violations of the California Environmental Quality Act and claimed that it would create a traffic Armageddon that would—no joke—actually kill people by marooning them on congested streets en route to the ER

The San Francisco Establishment

"Without great sports franchises, we can't be a great city." —Marc Benioff in the New York Times Roster

Ed Lee, mayor; Joe Lacob and Peter Guber, Warriors owners; Marc Benioff, Salesforce chief executive officer and owner of the land slated for purchase by the Warriors; Ron Conway, tech baron, mayoral financier, and dabbler in politics; Adam Silver, commissioner of the National Basketball Association; Jesse Blout, former deputy chief of staff for Mayor Gavin Newsom and principal at Strada Investment Group; P.J. Johnston, former Mayor Willie Brown spokesman; Nate Ballard, former Mayor Gavin Newsom spokesman.

Scouting Report

Working hand in glove with city hall, the Warriors are claiming that the stadium will be a boon to San Francisco: They’ll bear all the costs, and the city will benefit by having a world-class arena. The question of who’s on the hook for transit, infrastructure, and other development-related costs notwithstanding, Lacob and Guber will be putting their money where their mouths are—and getting it back: Unlike at their municipally owned Oakland digs, they’ll take the cream from concessions sales and the hundreds of events per year that don’t feature NBA basketball.

SFGATE

\$60 million for transportation in latest Warriors arena plan

J.K.Dineen – October 23, 2015

San Francisco unveiled details Friday of a \$60 million transportation plan for the proposed Golden State Warriors arena in Mission Bay, setting the stage for an election day showdown on the \$1 billion site.

Coming in at 2,500 pages, the final environmental impact report, which includes hundreds of pages of comments from the opposition group Mission Bay Alliance, calls for the creation of a “transportation improvement fund” to be administered by a neighborhood advisory group.

It also includes plans for a light-rail center boarding platform with “crossover tracks,” similar to the one in front of AT&T Park, that will “increase T-Third transit capacity and reduce walking distance to the arena and hospital,” according to the document.

And it calls for the purchase of four new rail cars for the T-Third line and the creation of two satellite parking lots on Port of San Francisco property south of Mission Bay. All of the improvements, as well as \$6 million in annual operating costs, will be funded by fees collected at the arena from special taxes on ticket sales, parking and concessions.

The commission of the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, the city agency responsible for administering environmental reviews of projects in Mission Bay, will vote on whether to certify the environmental report on Nov. 3 — election day. If the commission approves the project, as expected, the Mission Bay Alliance will probably appeal it to the Board of Supervisors.

“Now we are in the homestretch,” said Warriors spokesman P.J. Johnston. “Even when you’re proposing a privately funded venue on private property, you have to engage the community and conduct an appropriate public planning process. That’s what we have done here.”

While the arena has the backing of UCSF, the Mission Bay Citizens Advisory Committee and most of the biotech companies located in the neighborhood, it is opposed by a well-funded group of UCSF scientists and biotech executives who formed the Mission Bay Alliance.

On Friday, the alliance accused the city of pushing an “accelerated approval schedule that short-changes necessary public review and jams through a flawed project that will cause severe traffic congestion, blocked emergency access and severe environmental impacts in Mission Bay.”

“These guys are trying to railroad it through,” said Mission Bay Alliance spokesman Sam Singer. “To have the hearing date on election day is an obvious slap in the face to the public, and the public is going to slap the city and Warriors back.”

Ken Rich, who oversees development for Mayor Ed Lee, said the 11-day period between the publication of the final EIR and the commission vote is about standard.

“We have reached another important milestone on the path to bringing the world champion Golden State Warriors home to San Francisco,” Lee said.

The Mission Bay Alliance said the EIR includes 50 “significant violations of the California Environmental Quality Act.” These include severe traffic congestion, blocked emergency access and seismic safety threats.

“Despite the city’s attempt to circumvent a transparent public process, we are fighting to ensure it receives the diligent scrutiny San Francisco residents deserve,” said Osha Meserve, an attorney for the Mission Bay Alliance. “There are many serious problems with the EIR that we don’t believe the city has adequately considered to protect public health and safety. We are now demanding the time to evaluate the true risks of this project and prevent life-threatening disasters.”

Larry Wymer, a traffic engineer hired by the alliance to analyze the EIR, said the city should have studied the roads north of the project to Market Street and considered the cumulative traffic impact from 21 other nearby construction projects.

“Everyone who travels on San Francisco’s roads and highways knows that traffic is bad and getting worse. Traffic caused by this project will compound in a multiplier effect that will grind this city to a screeching halt,” said Bruce Spaulding, a consultant for the alliance.

But Peter Albert, who oversees planning at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, said the arena’s transportation plan would actually improve everything from public transit to bike and pedestrian safety in Mission Bay and help “build a much more sustainable Mission Bay for the future.”

“We at MTA want to make sure we get benefits out of this as well,” Albert said. The changes proposed “elevate the quality of the service above and beyond what is needed to accommodate the arena. The goal of our involvement was to help make sure MTA is in a better place because of these agreements.”



Should S.F. pay Oakland for stealing away the Warriors?

Cory Weinberg – October 28, 2015

The TNT network broadcast its pregame show for the NBA season opener at Fisherman’s Wharf instead of Lake Merritt, a move that Oaklanders see as a slap in the face.

But the Warriors' future Mission Bay arena choice also snubs Oakland in favor of San Francisco. Is that move more like a knockout punch?

To make amends, San Francisco should pay Oakland to make up for the potential negative economic effects that the NBA champs' departure could have on the East Bay city, the Mission Bay arena opponents say.

It's one of the (farfetched) suggestions in the 2,500-page environmental impact report that was finalized last week and led to San Francisco's unveiling of a \$60 million plan to manage transportation by the future hospital-adjacent Mission Bay arena.

Traffic, public transit and land use are driving the debate as the arena plan goes up for approval next week. But opposition group Mission Bay Alliance also tried to throw another wrench into San Francisco's environmental analysis, arguing the city should have studied whether the Warriors' move could lead to "urban decay" near Oracle Arena.

Economist Philip King wrote to one of the Mission Bay Alliance's many land-use attorneys – who then submitted the letter to the city – that the Oakland arena "will likely stand dormant and invite the physical deterioration that is characteristic of urban decay."

King adds that he projects Oakland will directly lose \$44.9 million and 494 jobs due to the move. He adds that "most Warriors fans will continue attending games after the relocation rather than seeking local substitutes. The relocation of the Warriors, then, constitutes a significant redistribution of economic activity within the larger Bay Area."

To even out that shift of wealth to the region's richest big city, King suggests that San Francisco pay a mitigation fee to the City of Oakland. San Francisco could also preserve arena jobs for Oakland residents or shift some of the taxes/fees from the project to Oakland.

The alliance, of course, has admitted it's doing everything it can to poke legal holes in Mayor Ed Lee's self-proclaimed "legacy project."

This possible hole closed pretty quickly. San Francisco calls the suggestion bogus, and its economics consultant wrote a 25-page report refuting the claim – including eight case studies of arenas that have found new life after teams left.

The whole response by ALH Urban & Regional Economics is on pages 354 to 377 [here](#). (As a side note, the Warriors say that 59 percent of Warriors game attendees are from the East Bay and 41 percent from San Francisco and the Peninsula.)

The firm says King "greatly overstated" the potential jobs and economic impacts on Oakland, particularly because Warriors' revenue derives from many other sources besides ticket sales.

While the area around Oracle Arena certainly needs an economic spark, the consultants seriously doubt that the arena will fall victim to "urban decay." Oakland has also been planning for the future of the arena site, which sits in the Coliseum Specific Plan area. The plan is designed to try to keep the Warriors, A's and Raiders on the site, but it also plans for other potential uses for the space like housing, retail and

technology offices. (Although that plan is in doubt after New City Development was shown the exit door this summer).

The arena also now houses concerts, not just Warriors games, and could be repurposed, wrote Amy Herman of ALH Urban & Regional Economics.

“The area of Oracle Arena is not currently experiencing urban decay and there is no information that is currently available...to conclude that urban decay is likely to occur,” she wrote. “While the future use of the Arena area is uncertain, in the event the Warriors relocate to San Francisco, many arenas throughout the country have been repurposed under similar circumstances (and) the site is well-positioned geographically to attract new uses.”



Media Contact

Sam Singer or Alex Donaich

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949; 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

2 November 2015

S.F., Warriors Proposed Arena Final SEIR Released Just Now: Only Gives Public One Week to Comment

Mission Bay Alliance says it will challenge SF's plan to rush proposed Warriors' arena without adequate public input or review

SF's own initial EIR Report shows Warriors' Arena threatens Mission Bay with massive traffic jams, life-threatening congestion, degraded quality of life

San Francisco – Opponents of the proposed Golden State Warriors' arena and entertainment complex say the City of San Francisco's accelerated approval schedule short-changes necessary public review and jams through a flawed project that will cause severe traffic congestion, block emergency access and have severe environmental impacts in Mission Bay.

The city's Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure released the project's final Environmental Impact Report today and has already scheduled a Nov. 3 (election day in San Francisco) meeting to approve it, leaving the public only seven days to review the final EIR and prepare comments. Approval by OCII will be appealed to the Board of Supervisors. The report can be found at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1828>

"The City's attempt to railroad this arena through the approval process shortchanges the public of adequate vetting and puts residents at risk with a rushed and flawed project," said Osha Meserve, an attorney for the Mission Bay Alliance, a coalition of residents, UCSF employees, UCSF patients, and stakeholders who oppose the proposed Warriors' arena. "Despite the city's attempt to circumvent a transparent public process, we are fighting to ensure it receives the diligent scrutiny San Francisco residents deserve."

A seven-day review process of a final EIR is highly unusual for a controversial project of this size and impact – especially after members of the public and the Mission Bay Alliance identified more than 50 significant violations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in the draft EIR, including severe traffic congestion, blocked emergency access and seismic safety threats. Public comments were due to OCII on July 27.

The project's draft EIR showed that the proposed 18,500-seat arena would create a traffic jam that would stretch from the Bay Bridge through SOMA, Dogpatch, and Potrero Hill all the way to Highway 101. Situated about 1,000 feet from the new UCSF emergency room, the proposed arena would also threaten life-saving emergency access for the region's most vulnerable.

Others have raised similar concerns. The California Nurses Association said the project would hurt patient access, safety and care. In September a coalition of more than 20 world-renown scientists from UCSF and the prestigious National Academy of Sciences said the proposed arena would be a "disaster" for the City's growing biotech and life sciences hub, threatening the "the entire future of UCSF as the center of a world-class academic/biotech/medical complex."

"Nurses, scientists, parents and neighbors agree: this project is a disaster that will gridlock traffic, threaten patient access to lifesaving care and destroy the Mission Bay neighborhood, hospitals and City as a whole," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance.

Attorneys for the Mission Bay Alliance say an initial review of the final EIR reveals that the city largely ignored hundreds of pages of comments that relied on outside experts to confirm the project's risks and flaws. For example, a recent Mission Bay Alliance-commissioned study shows the site to contain elevated toxins, including asbestos, that the city's EIR fails to address.

"There are many serious problems with the EIR that we don't believe the City has adequately considered to protect public health and safety," Meserve said. "We are now demanding the time to evaluate the true risks of this project and prevent life-threatening disasters."

Other concerns raised by the Mission Bay Alliance include:

Conclusions about Emergency Access are Not Supported by Data, Leaving Public at Risk

The emergency room entrance to the newly opened UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital is located about 1,000 feet from the proposed Warriors' arena and entertainment center – "Yet incredibly, [the EIR] concludes that the subject project would not result in inadequate emergency access when capacity events are taking place," writes Dan Smith, of Smith Engineering & Management, who was hired by Mission Bay Alliance to analyze the traffic and access study of the City's EIR.

"The EIR offers no objective data to support its conclusion that emergency access would not be adversely impacted in event travel peaks," Smith said.

Instead, the City's EIR relies on subjective "rationalizations" for why emergency vehicles would not be slowed. When roadways are congested with cars and sidewalks are filled with rowdy crowds, it is an inconceivable conclusion that emergency vehicles will not experience delay, Smith concluded.

Seconds or minutes could mean the difference between life and death. And patients in emergency situations are not always shuttled to the hospital by an emergency vehicle, meaning that traffic patrol officers and other drivers may not recognize an emergency situation.

The City's EIR's "conclusions about emergency access impacts are not only unsupported by objective data but incorrect and implausible," Smith said.

Incomplete Traffic Study Paints a Limited Picture of the Project's Traffic Nightmares

While the City concedes that the project will grind the intersections in the immediate vicinity to a halt, the study's traffic analysis fails to comprehensively address the project's impact on surrounding neighborhoods, including SoMA, Dogpatch, Potrero Hill or the stretch of Highway 101 leading to the Bay Bridge.

The City's EIR arbitrarily selected only 23 intersections to grade on a scale of "A" through "F" with "A" designating free-flowing traffic and "F" being total gridlock. While it assigns "E" and "F" grades to many of the intersections studied, the limited scope paints an incomplete picture that does not convey the nightmarish conditions experienced by commuters in both the Financial District and SoMa, according to Larry Wymer, a licensed traffic engineer who analyzed the City EIR's traffic study.

In his comment letter, Wymer said the City must at the very least analyze the roads north of the project to Market Street and it must do so in the context of the 21 other nearby construction projects – all of which also have their own impact on traffic gridlock. Finally he asks that the City revise its analysis to incorporate findings from the "2040 San Francisco Transportation Plan," a City-produced study that predicts overall SoMa and Mission Bay auto trips to organically increase by 82 percent between 2012 and 2040.

"The impact of the proposed Warriors' arena must be studied not in isolation but as a piece in the connected fabric of San Francisco's roadways," Spaulding said. "Everyone who travels on San Francisco's roads and highways knows that traffic is bad and getting worse. Traffic caused by this project will compound in a multiplier effect that will grind this City to a screeching halt."

Misleading Reliance on 17-Year-Old Data

Beyond incomplete data, the City's EIR also relies on old information dating back to a 1998 Mission Bay Master Plan to mislead the public and deceptively conclude that the proposed 18,500-seat arena with 730,000 square feet of office and retail space will have limited impacts on Mission Bay, its surrounding neighborhoods or the thousands of patients and families who visit the area for care at UCSF hospitals and nearby clinics.

Datasets forming the basis of significant portions of the City's EIR are borrowed directly from outdated EIRs prepared in 1990 and 1998 for the City's 1998 Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan. The 1990 and 1998 EIRs broadly analyzed all 303 acres in the Mission Bay area and omit site-specific reviews on pollution, hazardous materials and seismic safety of the current 11-acre site, attorneys found.

Yet, the City claims that many of those old evaluations remain valid today.

"The City's strategy of relying on a very general environmental review document that is more than 17 years old for topics required to be analyzed and mitigated in detail does not work for the public, nor is it compliant with CEQA's most basic requirements," write attorneys Meserve and Patrick Soluri in a July 27 comment letter to the City on behalf of Mission Bay Alliance.

The attorneys say the risk of this site literally dissolving during an earthquake due to liquefaction and amplification, for example, has not been properly analyzed because seismic risks were studied

differently in the 1990s. The proposed site would be built on soft landfill ground that today is considered a high risk for earthquake damage – risks not properly analyzed in the draft EIR.

Pending OCII approval on Nov. 3, the project could go before the Board of Supervisors as early as mid-November.

Mission Bay Alliance has said it will consider litigation if the city approves a project that does not address significant legal defects.

“As it stands, the issues identified by our legal team all but prove that this ill-conceived project would spell disaster for Mission Bay and the city as a whole,” Spaulding said.

Related Coverage

San Francisco Chronicle

Warriors arena opponents take more shots at the plan

J.K. Dineen – November 2, 2015

The approval process for the proposed Golden State Warriors arena at Mission Bay tips off Tuesday, and opponents spent Monday taking shots at the \$1 billion plan.

On Tuesday, the board of the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, which is charged with signing off on Mission Bay developments, is scheduled to certify the project’s environmental impact report. On Thursday, the Planning Commission will vote on the design and allocate the 580,000 square feet of commercial space the Warriors are planning to construct next to the arena.

But on Monday, the Mission Bay Alliance, a group of former UCSF administrators and donors who oppose the project, held a news conference to point out what they feel are the plan’s weaknesses. Economist Jon Haveman, who has been hired by the alliance, criticized plans to fund its \$60 million transportation plan with fees and taxes, arguing the Warriors should pay for those improvements up front and out of pocket.

He called the transportation improvements, which include the acquisition of four light rail cars and a new larger boarding platform, a “massive subsidy.”

“That might not be San Francisco’s first priority of where to spend \$60 million in terms of transportation infrastructure,” he said. “It’s more to facilitate events at the Warriors’ event center.”

He said that \$60 million could be used on affordable housing or other priorities.

But Ken Rich, who heads up real estate development for Mayor Ed Lee, said spending arena-generated fees on transportation improvements in a rapidly growing neighborhood is “totally appropriate.”

"The improvements are going to benefit Mission Bay as a whole," he said. "This is an investment in the future of Mission Bay."

In addition, the Mission Bay plan requires that the Warriors pay about \$18 million in impact fees, some of which will be used for affordable housing.

Monday's Mission Bay Alliance presentation also included criticism from the mother of a patient who uses the UCSF hospital across the street from the arena site. Jennifer Wade, mother of a 5-year-old boy with a congenital heart defect, said she is worried the arena will not only cause gridlock around the hospital but also make it a less pleasant place to be a patient or worker.

"It is ridiculous to put this next door to a hospital where people need to heal," she said.

She said families of children with serious conditions often spend weeks or months at the hospital and compared the plan to having a massive sports venue move in across from your house.

UCSF supports the arena plan.

Warriors spokesman P.J. Johnston said the Warriors "intend to be great neighbors." He said the Mission Bay Alliance "has no standing."

"They don't represent UCSF," Johnston said. "They don't represent the biotech community. They don't represent the neighborhood. They only represent their own secretive super PAC members; it's time for them to stop this nonsense."

The Mission Bay Alliance says it will appeal the environmental study, should it be approved, to the Board of Supervisors, which would have final say.



Warriors New Arena Still Getting Push Back

Scott Lettieri – November 2, 2015

On Tuesday, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors will take up the matter of the proposed new basketball arena in Mission Bay.

The effort to stop the project is pumping up.

One day before the board votes on the just released 5,000 page Mission Bay Environmental Impact Report an outside economic analyst hired by the Mission Bay Alliance says the taxpayers could be on the hook for millions if the arena is built also

“Every parent I’ve spoken to, I don’t know anyone who is happy about this. Now I can go to the Warriors game while my kid is sick in the hospital.”

Jennifer Wade is the parent of five-year-old who has a rare congenital heart disease. She’s concerned about the additional traffic and congestion in Mission Bay once the arena is built.

“And I just worry that if UCSF becomes an environment where doctors are frustrated by traffic, they’re frustrated by noise, if they can’t keep good nursing staff in place because of logistical difficulties. I just worry that people will leave, because they can leave. They can go anywhere they want.”

Warriors principal owner Joe Lacob says that the issue has been addressed with an agreement with transportation officials to upgrade infrastructure in the area.

The proposed site for the arena is right across from the hospital.



Media Contact

Sam Singer or Alex Donaich

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949; 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

3 November 2015

UCSF Parents, Economic Expert Raise Concerns about Warriors' Arena on Eve of City Vote

Mother of 5-Year-Old UCSF Patient Fears Arena Will Block Emergency Access, Ruin Quality of Life at Hospital

Economist says Arena EIR includes \$60 million Transportation Plan that Leaves Taxpayers on Hook for Millions

San Francisco – The City of San Francisco is expected to certify a 5,000-page Environmental Impact Report on the Golden State Warriors' Arena and Entertainment Center on Election Day, despite rising concerns by families of patients at adjacent UCSF hospitals and a new analyst review that exposes the arena's true economic realities and raises questions about the city's much-touted \$60 million transportation deal.

Only 10 days after releasing the project's final EIR, the city's Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure is scheduled to certify it at a public hearing at 10 a.m. on Tuesday Nov. 3.

This is an unusually accelerated schedule that's raised concerns among Warrior arena opponents and now the mother of a five-year-old patient at UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital, who says traffic to the 18,500-seat arena will threaten her son's access to lifesaving care. The hospital's emergency room is only 1,000 feet from the planned arena's entrance.

"My number one concern is that I won't be able to get my son to UCSF when he has a medical emergency," said Mission District resident Jennifer Wade, whose five-year-old son receives regular treatment at UCSF for a congenital heart condition. "Traffic around the hospital is already difficult enough, especially during Giant's games at AT&T Park. With an 18,500-seat basketball arena across the street and 225 annual daily events proposed, access to emergency care will no longer be something I can rely on."

Even though the Warriors' ownership and UCSF Chancellor Sam Hawgood signed an agreement in October that claimed to 'protect patient safety,' the Mission Bay Alliance, a coalition of arena opponents, UCSF stakeholders and residents, say the agreement is so riddled with exceptions as to be

without value. The agreement would only cap dual events in certain special circumstances, and does not include any proactive measures to avoid unacceptable traffic conditions.

It also doesn't guarantee emergency access during arena events – a "locals only" lane is isn't an ironclad mitigation – or prevent the steady stream of gridlock traffic, noise, air pollution and other nuisances expected to regularly descend on Mission Bay during the Arena's 225 annual events.

"It is ridiculous to put this right next door to a hospital where people need to heal," Wade said. "When a child is in the hospital, the whole family is in the hospital, sometimes for months on end. In this case we'll be stuck with the noise, traffic and rowdy, drunk crowds. This is a quality of life issue for all of us."

The city is also proposing a new transportation ordinance that it claims will help address the traffic impacts from the new arena. But the new ordinance does not generate any additional funds for traffic mitigation, and simply directs a segment of future fees and taxes toward improvements for the arena, according to Bay Area economist Dr. Jon Haveman.

Normally, project developers are expected to pay up front the cost for mitigating their own project's impacts. Here the Warriors' owners get to "pay back" the city for millions on purchasing new Muni cars and other infrastructure projects for the arena through a creative accounting process by which the City Controller will determine how much taxes and fees are being generated by the arena.

"In essence, the ordinance codifies the reality that project infrastructure and other needed support will be effectively paid through subsidies from the city's general fund," said Dr. Haveman, an economist with two decades of experience previously at the Bay Area Council Economic Institute and now at Marin Economic Consulting.

The new transportation ordinance would commit the city to using most if not all taxes and fees expected to be generated from Arena-related taxes and commercial activities to pay for \$60 million in transportation improvements for the arena. But these expenditures will come at the expense of other city needs, including system-wide Muni improvements or affordable housing.

"This ordinance guarantees that the rest of the city won't see a dime of the money generated by arena operations," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance. "All the money assumed to be from fees and taxes at arena events will be put back into fixing the problems caused by the arena – the traffic nightmares, the need for extra policing, and public transportation headaches. And if those funds aren't enough, the city taxpayers will be on the hook to make up the difference."

While the city has said the arena is estimated to generate \$14 million per year in revenues, the city appears to be basing its revenue hopes on overly rosy projections of how much the arena will generate in fees and taxes, according to Dr. Haveman. That's because the ordinance is built around projections from the city Controller's office that rely on revenue sources other than the arena itself. Nearly 20 percent of the anticipated undedicated funds are expected to come from off-site activities, including more than \$1.7 million annually in additional hotel taxes.

"Arena supporters love to brag that no taxpayer dollars are being used in the development, but that's simply not accurate," Spaulding said. "If the city Controller's revenue projections from the arena fall short, as they inevitably will, the city taxpayers will have already paid for the improvements and services needed by the arena."

It is also likely that some other development, such as the original Salesforce plan or something designed to accommodate more biotechnology in the area, could generate greater net revenues for the City. Haveman found that a biotech facility could bring in as much as an additional \$7 million per year in revenue above what the Warriors' arena would generate or nearly \$150 million over 20 years.

"The city likes to talk about how much it's getting by hosting the Warriors, but in reality, another use would yield greater net value," Dr. Haveman said. "What is the City giving up to get the Warriors? In a city starved for land, it must be asked whether high-yield commercial space or sorely needed housing would be a better use of this land than an arena."

While residents have reason to be concerned by the ill-conceived project's impacts on transportation and emergency access, the city's fast-tracked approval process provides little opportunity to raise questions or get answers. After releasing the final EIR on Oct. 23, the city only left members of the public 10 days to review the 5,000 page document that largely ignored or dismissed the significant concerns raised by the Mission Bay Alliance, including failure to adequately analyze and mitigate traffic, air pollution, hazardous materials and seismic safety threats.

If the OCII rubber stamps approval of the EIR as anticipated, Spaulding said the next step will be to appeal the project to the Board of Supervisors.

Related Coverage



Warriors score critical first win for new arena, but bigger fights loom

Ron Leuty – November 3, 2015

The Golden State Warriors won approval of a critical environmental impact report Tuesday for the franchise's planned \$1 billion-plus, 18,064-seat arena in San Francisco's Mission Bay neighborhood.

The vote by the oversight board of the city's Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure pushes forward the privately financed project, including two office towers and a Union Square-size plaza lined by shops and restaurants. But it doesn't mean opponents are out of the game.

The Mission Bay Alliance, a collection of former administrators, benefactors and faculty at the neighboring University of California, San Francisco, has until Nov. 13 to file an appeal of the OCII board's approval of the EIR with the Board of Supervisors. Plus, the group could legally challenge the project on other grounds.

"Only if they're right," Warriors President Rick Welts said during a break in the meeting.

The overflow crowd of about 100 people at the City Hall hearing at times seemed as much pro-arena as they were anti-Mission Bay Alliance. Many speakers praised the Warriors' diligence in reaching out to San Franciscans, especially residents in Mission Bay, Dogpatch, Bayview and Hunters Point, and for tweaking the project based on concerns.

"Mission Bay is mixed use that needs more activity, open space and championship teams," said John Caine, who owns the Hi-Dive restaurant at Pier 28-1/2, near the San Francisco Giants' AT&T Park, and plans to open Atwater Tavern in the spring on Terry Francois Boulevard, a couple hundred yards from the planned arena.

If all goes as planned for the Warriors, the team could move from Oakland to the arena ahead of the tipoff of the 2018-19 National Basketball Association season.

Those plans, however, could yet get delayed by the Mission Bay Alliance, which has said it wants to kill the project to provide space for UCSF and San Francisco's nascent biotech enclave in Mission Bay to grow. The group has centered its efforts on challenging the EIR on the basis of the traffic and congestion caused by an arena and how that could prevent patients at UCSF's new Mission Bay hospitals from receiving care.

But at Tuesday's hearing, lawyers for group also attacked the arena for what essentially is zoning issue. They said the OCII process and the classification of the arena/events center as allowable under a broadly defined — and, at times, undefined — "secondary use" are wrong. City staff, however, said the "secondary use" for entertainment, recreation and public use is consistent for the OCII, which succeeded the city's redevelopment agency.

Thomas Lippe, an attorney for the Mission Bay Alliance, could legally challenge the arena through the EIR process or on the secondary use allowance. And Bruce Spaulding, a retired UCSF administrator who helped gather together the alliance earlier this year, said there could be other grounds for trying to legally block the Warriors' shot.

"Nobody has decided to sue," said Spaulding, who was instrumental in planning and executing the university's Mission Bay campus.

In the meantime, speakers Tuesday from small-business owners and union members and management to the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition made it clear that they thought the arena would create jobs and a better sense of community in Mission Bay.

The emergence of the Dogpatch neighborhood is "kind of for grown kids, not families," said Bayview/Hunters Point resident Antoinette Mobley, so open space along the waterfront and the plaza at the Warriors development would be "a great amenity."

As far as the transportation plan, which would include four new light-rail vehicles for Muni, as well as service improvements, new track and an expanded platform along the T-Third line, Mobley said that would reduce her commute home, which grows from 15 minutes to an hour during Giants games.

"Honey, you couldn't come up with a better plan," Mobley said.

Some speakers also were critical of the Mission Bay Alliance for what they viewed as obstructionist behavior.

Pat Valentino of the South Beach/Mission Bay Merchants Association, was especially critical of "paid consultants, paid legal advisors" of the Mission Bay Alliance who delivered "binders full of garbage" to the OCII board.

"When someone says they'll sue, they have no case," Valentino said. "What we have here is no case against an incredible amount of community support."

There were concerns, too. Lori Yamauchi, UCSF's associate vice chancellor for campus planning, said the university supports the Warriors project after crafting a complex transportation mitigation plan with the team and the city, but she said UCSF wants the city to strengthen its long-term commitment to off-site parking, fixing traffic problems at the Mariposa Street ramp from Interstate 280 and to solving long-term wastewater capacity issues at Mission Bay.

What's more, Corrine Woods, who leads the Mission Bay Citizens Advisory Committee, said plans are good, but execution would be better in a neighborhood that already seizes up when the Giants play home games less than a half-mile from the arena site.

"It's all about implementation. It's all about making sure we don't get forgotten after everything's gone through," Woods said.

The Warriors still must await approval of the design plans for the two office towers in the development and a vote from a Board of Supervisors committee Nov. 9 on a fund, largely paid for by the Warriors, that would fund transportation improvements along Third Street. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, the Port of San Francisco and the city's entertainment commission all are expected to take up parts of the plan on Nov. 10.



Media Contact

Sam Singer or Alex Donaich

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949; 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

4 November 2015

Warriors' Arena Opponents Call Out Rubber-Stamp Approval Process

OCII jams through 5,000 page Environmental Impact Report on Election day only 10 days after it was released

San Francisco –In an affront to informed decision-making and an accessible public process, a key city committee today certified the final Environmental Impact Report — including over 2,500 pages of just-released new materials — for the proposed Mission Bay Warriors' arena less than two weeks after its release.

The approval by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) came despite the fact the disastrous plan would create traffic gridlock from the Bay Bridge to Bayview during the arena's 225 annual events, and includes a \$60 million transportation ordinance that commits the City to front millions from the City's General Fund to offset the traffic and public safety impacts the arena will create.

The rubber stamp process to approve the report demonstrates how resolute the City is on jamming through this ill-conceived plan with no opportunity for a thorough review.

The Mission Bay Alliance—a group committed to preserving the Mission Bay's vibrant medical and biotech community—offered documentation to the committee that shows the City's transportation remediation plan fails to address the serious traffic issues around the arena and could potentially leave City taxpayers on the hook for millions, among other numerous defects.

An analysis conducted for the Alliance by Jon Haveman of Marin Economic Consulting found that because of an upfront investment of nearly \$60 million, revenues from the arena will fall short of expenses in the early years, leaving the City's taxpayers on the hook to make up the balance. It will be at least four years before revenues are expected to cover expenses, and even then it is not guaranteed.

The analysis also found that an alternative development, one suited to biotechnology, for instance, would bring in nearly \$40 million more in net revenues for the City – and possibly as much as \$150 million – over a 22 year period.

The Mission Bay Alliance is joined in its opposition by parents of sick children at UCSF, the California Nurses Association and a coalition of world-renowned scientists from UCSF and the U.S. National Academy of Sciences who have called the proposed Warriors' Arena a "disaster."

"OCII's certification makes it clear the city isn't interested in holding the Warriors accountable for the problems the arena will cause in the Mission Bay community," says Bruce Spaulding, a consultant for the Mission Bay Alliance and the former Senior Vice Chancellor of advancement and planning at UCSF. "The OCII approval is just one step in a long process. Mission Bay Alliance is not going to back down, and we will continue to raise our concerns about the project with the Board of Supervisors and the courts, if necessary."

Related Coverage



When will Mission Bay Alliance quit? And more Warriors arena questions

Ron Leuty – November 4, 2015

The Golden State Warriors' environmental impact report victory Tuesday may have been the first in a series of approvals the franchise needs to build an arena in San Francisco, but the win had a game-over feeling for the opposing Mission Bay Alliance.

But is it? Yes and no. Or to paraphrase Warriors President Rick Welts: It is San Francisco, so you never know.

Yeah — but is it "game over" for the Mission Bay Alliance?

Not from what I could tell in talking to alliance lawyers and Bruce Spaulding, one of the figurative architects of Mission Bay and a principal in the alliance. Remember, this is a group that longtime political consultant and arena opponent Jack Davis famously said this spring would "sue until the cows come home."

Well, the bovines seem to be lining up across the field (or, more appropriately, the basketball court).

The legal team includes Bay Area folks, such as Tom Lippe and Susan Brandt-Hawley, as well as representatives of the legendary Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP firm in New York. They've got to be costing a pretty penny for the alliance, which is made up of University of California, San Francisco, benefactors, former administrators, professors and some patients and the nurses union at the UCSF Mission Bay hospitals.

To be sure, those attorneys are going to exhaust every possible legal angle.

"Nobody has decided to sue," Spaulding told me.

Then again nobody has decided not to sue, and Spaulding and Lippe said the lawyers are studying several options.

Beyond the environmental impact report that the board of the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, or OCII, approved Tuesday, the alliance's lawyers seemed to be setting up in the lane to stop the Warriors on what essentially amounts to a zoning issue. They contend that the city shouldn't amend the Mission Bay plan to allow the arena/events center as a "secondary use" and that the Warriors should instead seek a variance.

Could this "secondary use" issue come back to hack the Warriors under the basket?

The alliance's lawyers claim the arena/events center isn't a "secondary use" under the definition used by the city and the Warriors; they say the development isn't a nighttime entertainment, not recreation and not a public structure, all of which are allowable secondary uses.

Spaulding should know. When he was a UCSF administrator, he did much of the background work that cleared the way for UCSF's campus and hospitals in Mission Bay — and, he said, "nighttime entertainment" was meant to help a couple of bars that remained in an otherwise deserted area.

But Jim Morales, the OCII's deputy director and the agency's general counsel, smacked down the alliance's lawyers late in the Tuesday's hearing. Morales said OCII was granted broad authority over what are appropriate uses in a project area after Gov. Jerry Brown dissolved redevelopment agencies. The agency isn't bound by state land-use laws and San Francisco's normal planning code.

"This is an exercise of redevelopment authority that has survived dissolution," Morales said.

What's more, Morales said, "nighttime entertainment" was never defined.

Still, could Spaulding, who was involved in getting the nighttime entertainment allowance, testify in a lawsuit was not the original intent? Hmmmmm.

And that's why the legal eagles are involved.

But what about traffic congestion, parking, noise and all those issues that the Mission Bay Alliance has raised?

The alliance still could challenge the EIR, first by demanding by Nov. 13 an EIR vote by the Board of Supervisors, and, assuming they don't get what they want from supervisors, through the courts. Of course, that EIR challenge can't go on forever because Gov. Brown and state Sen. Mark Leno helped push through legislation limiting EIR litigation.

Opponents of the Warriors' project could argue that the EIR wasn't complete enough in its analysis and/or alternative sites. But the alliance would win, as Welts said Tuesday outside the hearing, "only if they're right."

There are compelling emotional arguments around UCSF hospital patients and families hypothetically being blocked from quick access to emergency services at the Mission Bay hospitals, which are kitty-corner across Third Street from the arena development.

The alliance on Monday introduced to the media a mother of a 5-year-old Mission boy with a congenital heart defect that could cause him to need emergency access to the UCSF children's hospital. He hasn't needed that emergency care yet in Mission Bay, but he did when the hospital was on UCSF's Parnassus Heights campus.

At the same time, it is tough to get past the hyperbole. Submitted for evidence: "People will die," Boies, Schiller & Flexner partner Joshua Schiller told me Tuesday.

Meanwhile, the Warriors, UCSF and the city have worked out an extensive and complex system for keeping an eye on potential traffic problems, and as the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce's Jim Lazarus pointed out at the hearing, the San Francisco Giants' AT&T Park survived doomsday projections made by opponents nearly 20 years ago.

OK — let's talk money. How much will this arena mean for the city?

In all, OCII program manager Adam Van de Water said the event center would net the city \$14.1 million annually, after various tax dollars are captured for Mission Bay purposes such as affordable housing and transportation.

Then there are carve-outs for various dedicated funds and \$6.1 million in annual operating costs earmarked for Muni as well as \$900,000 that is destined for an event fund, which will be tapped for additional peak-traffic services.

In the end, about \$1.5 million a year will be returned to the city's general fund, Van de Water said. It is a privately funded development, so that \$1.5 million is a net figure. There's no debt for the city to pay down and the spinoff economic effects could be huge for restaurants and the like, adding to city tax revenue.

So, what's next?

The Planning Commission must approve the design of the development's two office towers of 513,000 square feet of space. The transportation improvement fund paid for by the Warriors will get an official first-look Nov. 9 from the supervisors' budget and finance committee. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, the Port of San Francisco and the city's entertainment commission are scheduled to vote on aspects of the arena plan Nov. 10.



Media Contact

Sam Singer or Alex Donaich

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949; 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

10 November 2015

Warriors' Arena Leaves Taxpayers on Hook for \$29 Million in Unfunded Costs, City Admits

New City Analyst Report Shows Arena Won't Make Nearly as Much Revenue as Previously Reported, Will Cost \$10 Million Annually

San Francisco – New revenue projections released by the City of San Francisco's Budget and Legislative Analyst shows the proposed Golden State Warriors' Arena would leave taxpayers on the hook for at least \$29 million in unfunded transportation improvements – a budget shortfall that would be financed through the sale of revenue bonds or other taxpayer-funded sources.

The same budget analysis, posted on the City's website a day before the Budget and Finance Committee reviewed a transportation ordinance to support the proposed arena, also revealed that the city would incur \$10.1 million in annual operating expenses related to the arena, which would produce only \$1.5 million in net revenues. These numbers conflict with the City's previous net revenue estimate of \$8 million – a figure that City representatives have widely touted in presentations to neighbors and interest groups for more than six months.

"After months of perpetuating bloated revenue estimates and partial truths, the City is now revealing that this project won't generate much income at all and in fact will force San Francisco taxpayers to go into debt to pay for this ill-conceived arena project," said Bruce Spaulding of the Mission Bay Alliance, a coalition of UCSF stakeholders, healthcare workers and faculty who oppose the proposed Warriors' arena.

The Board of Supervisors is now tasked with considering whether to authorize the City's upfront investment of nearly \$60 million to pay for additional light rail trains and other transit improvements to accommodate an influx of 18,500 visitors to the proposed arena.

While the arena project is expected to generate \$25.4 million to cover some of these costs, City officials are now scrambling to identify ways to cover the \$29.9 million balance.

An analysis conducted for the Alliance by Jon Haveman of Marin Economic Consulting found that an alternative development, one suited to biotechnology, for instance, would bring in anywhere between \$2 million to \$7 million a year in additional revenues and accommodate 2,000 jobs, compared to less than 500 low-paying jobs produced by the arena. This revenue could help the City pay for more affordable housing or improvements to other parts of the Muni system, for example.

“Based on the numbers, it is clear that the proposed arena project would not result in a substantial economic benefit to the City,” Haveman said Wednesday to the Board of Supervisors’ Budget and Finance committee.

The committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed transit improvement plan, but the Board of Supervisors have the final say. The item is scheduled to be discussed during the Supervisor’s Dec. 8, 2015 meeting.

Related Coverage

San Francisco Chronicle

Mission Bay is wrong spot for Warriors arena

Jon Haveman – November 15, 2015

San Francisco is ablaze with development, from soaring office buildings to high-end condos. To the untrained eye, it can all appear random. But in fact every new development represents a choice — an alternative limited by zoning but selected by a developer looking to make the largest profit possible.

In the case of the Warriors’ proposed arena in Mission Bay, the developers are a Warriors ownership team that has decided that a vacant 12-acre parcel across from the new UCSF Benioff Children’s Hospital should be turned into the city’s largest entertainment arena.

But is an 18,000-seat arena in the heart of the city’s booming biotech community really the best use of that property? From the Warriors’ standpoint, the answer is clearly yes. The team bought the land from Salesforce for less than market value and will take full ownership of an arena that will bring in direct sales revenue more than 200 days a year. In basketball parlance, it’s a slam dunk.

But what’s right for the Warriors may not be right for the rest of us. Breaking down the Warriors’ proposal and comparing it with other viable options tied to biotechnology makes it clear the city has far better choices for Mission Bay than an event arena.

City analysts recently admitted that net revenue estimates from the arena should be reduced from a high of \$8 million to a mere \$1.5 million annually. Based on the city’s revisions, Marin Economic Consulting found that a development tied into the biotech community would bring in between \$100 million and \$200 million more in net revenue to the city than would an arena over a 22-year period — depending on how aggressive the developer is in increasing square footage and workplace densities.

The study commissioned by the Mission Bay Alliance went on to find that an alternative development would have much broader impact on the rest of the San Francisco economy than would an arena. By way of comparison, Oracle Arena in Oakland generates fewer than 500 jobs, while a biotech development on the vacant parcel in Mission Bay would bring at least 2,000 jobs to the city. The ancillary benefits of having thousands of well-paid workers spending at local bars and restaurants far exceed those generated by lower-level service jobs.

In fact, pursuing the arena over a more zoning-appropriate use like biotech reduces the net revenues to San Francisco by between \$5 million and \$10 million a year, based on the city's latest revenue admissions. This is on top of an upfront investment by the city of \$55.3 million in transit infrastructure and traffic mitigation — money that would not have to be spent if the land were developed the way planners designed, for biotech. At least \$29 million worth of those transit improvements will have to be footed by taxpayer-supported bonds, according to city analysts.

But this, apparently, is the price the city is willing to pay for having the Warriors in town. Frankly, it is remarkable that the mayor and his supporters would feel the need to subsidize a project that provides very little in the way of economic benefit for the rest of San Francisco. The new transportation ordinance commits the city to using virtually all the taxes and fees generated from arena-related activities to pay for transportation problems caused by the arena itself.

The development choices made today will impact San Francisco for a very long time, so it's important to get them right. On Dec. 8, the Board of Supervisors will weigh in on Mission Bay's future. Before ramming through a high-impact sports arena, the city should consider alternative uses that make far better sense for all of San Francisco.



Media Contact

Sam Singer or Alex Donaich

Office: 415-227-9700

Cell: 415-336-4949; 415-806-8566

Email: singer@singersf.com; alex@singersf.com

For Immediate Release:

16 November 2015

Mission Bay Alliance Appeals City's Rubber-Stamp Approval of Proposed Warriors' Arena

Arena Opponents Cite Serious Project Flaws after City Rushes Certification of 5,000-Page Environmental Impact Report 10 Days after Release

San Francisco – Opponents of the proposed Golden State Warriors' Arena in Mission Bay have appealed city certification of the project's Environmental Impact Report to the Board of Supervisors, citing significant impacts and a rushed approval process that has "frustrated the ability for public comment."

In a late Friday filing, attorneys for the Mission Bay Alliance, a coalition of UCSF donors, residents, stakeholders, healthcare workers and neighbors, said the project's Nov. 3 approval by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) was granted despite the project's negative impacts.

These include emissions, traffic gridlock during the arena's 225 annual events, and a flawed \$60 million transportation plan that commits the city's General Fund to offset traffic and public safety impacts generated by the arena.

"We are appealing a city committee's rubber-stamp approval of a disastrous project that will gridlock city streets, pollute Mission Bay neighborhoods, cost the taxpayers millions and threaten live-saving emergency care," says Bruce Spaulding, a consultant for the Mission Bay Alliance. "We are asking the Board of Supervisors to give this massive project the scrutiny that residents deserve. We're confident that once Supervisors review this project with objectivity, they will realize the proposed arena in Mission Bay is the wrong decision for San Francisco."

Mission Bay attorneys said the city's rubber-stamp approval demonstrates how resolute the City is on jamming through a doomed plan with no opportunity for a thorough review.

When the city published its Final Environmental Impact Report on Oct. 23, it gave members of the public only 10 days to review 2,500 new pages of information. It also specified that no additional public

comment would be accepted – a decision later changed on Oct. 29 when it quietly announced that public comment would, in fact, be heard at a Nov. 3 public hearing.

It's a change that has "frustrated the ability of the public to comment," wrote Mission Bay Alliance attorney Tom Lippe. "The City and OCII should remedy this misstep by recirculating the final EIR with full disclosure that the public may comment."

Beyond last-minute changes to the process, previously undisclosed revenue projections released by the City of San Francisco's Budget and Legislative Analyst just this week also shows the proposed arena would leave taxpayers on the hook for at least \$29.9 million in unfunded transportation improvements. City officials are now scrambling to identify ways to pay the \$29.9 million balance and are considering sale of revenue bonds or other taxpayer-funded options to cover the shortfall.

The same budget analysis, posted on the City's website a day before the Budget and Finance Committee reviewed a transportation ordinance to support the proposed arena, revealed that the city would incur \$10.1 million in annual operating expenses related to the arena, which would produce only \$1.5 million in net revenues. These numbers conflict with the City's previous net revenue estimate of \$8 million – a figure that City representatives have widely touted in presentations to neighbors and interest groups for more than six months.

"After months of perpetuating bloated revenue estimates and partial truths, the City is now revealing that this project won't generate much income at all and in fact will force San Francisco taxpayers to go into debt to pay for this ill-conceived arena project," Spaulding said.

The Board of Supervisors is now tasked with considering whether to authorize the City's upfront investment of nearly \$60 million to pay for additional light rail trains and other transit improvements to accommodate a constant influx of up to 18,500 visitors to the proposed arena.

An analysis conducted for the Alliance by Jon Haveman of Marin Economic Consulting found that an alternative development, one suited to biotechnology, for instance, would bring in anywhere between \$2 million to \$7 million a year in additional revenues and accommodate 2,000 jobs, compared to less than 500 low-paying jobs produced by the arena. This revenue could help the City pay for more affordable housing or improvements to other parts of the Muni system, for example.

"Based on the numbers, it is clear that the proposed arena project would not result in a substantial economic benefit to the City," Haveman said at a recent Board of Supervisors' Budget and Finance committee meeting.

The committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed transit plan, but the Board of Supervisors have the final say. The item is scheduled to be discussed during the Supervisor's Dec. 8, 2015 meeting, when the Mission Bay Alliance appeal may also be heard.

Related Coverage



Appeal challenges proposed Warriors arena in Mission Bay

Laura Dudnick – November 16, 2015

The Mission Bay Alliance appears to be the undefeated Warriors' toughest opponent this season, at least off the court.

The group, led by former UC San Francisco officials, filed an appeal with The City late Friday challenging the certification of the final environmental impact report for the team's proposed project in Mission Bay, which includes an 18,000-seat arena, offices and open space at an 11-acre site at Third and 16th streets.

The appeal highlights numerous concerns with the project, namely that events at the arena will create traffic gridlock that won't be eased by some \$60 million in transit improvements planned for the area. The project site is located across the street from UCSF's three new hospitals, and just south of AT&T Park and the San Francisco Police Department's new headquarters.

"We are appealing a city committee's rubber-stamp approval of a disastrous project that will gridlock city streets, pollute Mission Bay neighborhoods, cost the taxpayers millions and threaten live-saving emergency care," Bruce Spaulding, a consultant for the Mission Bay Alliance, said in a statement.

City agencies have signed off on numerous stages of the project this month, including the certification of its final EIR by the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure, the Planning Commission's approval for the two six- to 11-story office buildings and 546 parking spaces also planned for the site, and the Board of Supervisors' Budget and Finance Committee that unanimously supported sending the project to the full board next month.

"This report was as rigorous and comprehensive a study on any project The City has seen. And, it's now supported by UCSF, the biotech community, the Mission Bay Citizens Advisory Committee, and others," Christine Falvey, a spokeswoman for Mayor Ed Lee, wrote in an email to the San Francisco Examiner. "He looks forward to the Board hearing and moving the project forward, which has already had significant public input."

Any appeals to the project must go before the Board of Supervisors at a public meeting, and city officials expect to have a response to the Mission Bay Alliance's appeal by Dec. 8, when the arena is already slated to go before the board, said Adam Van de Water, project manager for The City's office of economic and workforce development.

The myth of 'no public funding' for new Raiders, Warriors projects

Ron Leuty – November 17, 2015

When a sports team or politician pledges that no public money will be used on a new sports facility, politely nod, step back and call "bull."

Cases in point: the Golden State Warriors' and Oakland Raiders' planned billion-dollar palaces.

To some extent, public money always is involved — and needed, for example, to upgrade infrastructure that helps a broader development beyond ballparks, stadiums and arenas. But the extent to which taxpayers and future generations are on the hook depends on how creative — or disingenuous — politicians and teams are with the real-world implications of their "no public money" pledges.

Do they mean no taxpayer dollars will be spent on new stadiums at all, or just the construction of the structures? In the best-case scenario, how will an (insert realistic dollar amount here) investment of public dollars actually benefit the public? In a worst-case scenario, how much of a new-stadium bill would taxpayers foot if teams wiggle out of a city's legal grasp?

At the core, we really should ask why it's assumed to be a city's responsibility to come up with a facility plan for multimillion-dollar businesses with unicorn-like valuations of more than \$1 billion. But let's not tackle that deeper philosophical question now.

Instead, let's look at how the different approaches San Francisco and Oakland are taking on two vastly different projects.

In San Francisco, the use of public funds connected to the Warriors' planned arena is much more defined (transportation upgrades), involves less money (\$55.3 million) and, potentially, has a safeguard built in for the city. Still, the privately financed project has a potential public overhang of \$30 million.

In Oakland, Mayor Libby Schaaf's oath to not use public funds is couched in caveats, such as no direct public investment in construction of a new Raiders stadium, and the squishiness of the city's still-developing plan. It's a much larger stadium, a larger overall development and a much lower upfront pay-in by the Raiders.

It should be clear: Oakland has no plan at this point — only ideas of the funding tools it might use — and Schaaf has said the city is continuing to analyze how and where to use those tools.

"I think that it would be appropriate to pledge money that is created by the Raiders for the Raiders so long as it can be done without every putting the taxpayers at risk," Schaaf said in a statement Friday. But it increasingly looks like taxpayers ultimately could be on the hook for tens of millions (conservatively) in new lease revenue bonds while continuing to make payments on ghost bonds that 20

years ago paid for the reconfiguration of O.co Coliseum. That's the nature of most public bonds: a municipality's full faith and credit is the ultimate backstop for bond investors.

Schaaf said in a statement Friday that the city's "fundamental requirement" of using lease revenue bonds is that "it would not pose any risk for the city's general fund." That could translate into private investors securing the Raiders' payments for servicing the bonds.

The Raiders case is intriguing, given that the city was so wide left on its estimate of seat license and ticket tax revenue to pay off \$200 million in bonds that led to construction of the infamous Mount Davis. That project was key to bringing the Raiders back from Los Angeles, but Mount Davis now is covered in tarps, generating no revenue.

Now, with the Raiders threatening to team up with the San Diego Chargers on a new stadium in the Los Angeles suburb of Carson, Oakland risks falling into the bond hole again.

Schaaf has talked about "defeating" the current debt — essentially using Alameda County's stronger financial resources to shift the debt from the public markets to a trustee. Because the Coliseum serves as collateral for those bonds — and the bonds themselves would be eliminated — the city then could move forward with demolishing the Coliseum and accelerating redevelopment (a new Raiders stadium) there.

But even if there is no longer a "bond," the cost doesn't go away. The county, Schaaf explained last week, would make payments to the trustee on the city's behalf, using city tax revenue that the county already collects.

What may be even more concerning is the language Schaaf had before and after she exited last week's meetings with National Football League owners: A new stadium must be driven by the Raiders. If that means the Raiders (and, by extension, the NFL) dictates lease terms, that doesn't bode well for the city.

As it stands, the Raiders would pay less than a quarter of the cost of a \$900 million new stadium (\$250 million), with the NFL contributing another \$250 million via a loan.

That's not even talking about the low-ball \$900 million figure, which came from the Raiders. Consider the Carson project and the St. Louis Rams' proposed facility in another Los Angeles suburb, both of which carry price tags of about \$1.8 billion. At the same time, the Warriors' planned arena in Mission Bay would be north of \$1 billion, CEO Joe Lacob has said — just for the arena and land.

Whatever kind of magic the Raiders possess that allows the cost of a new stadium in Oakland to be half the cost of other stadiums has implications for Oakland's books. While the city continues to quietly pay on the old Coliseum debt, new bonds could be based on incorrect assumptions.

To Schaaf's credit, she noted that the city is continuing its analysis of lease revenue bonds, defeating the current bonds and a tax-capturing infrastructure improvement district. The flip side is, time is running out; NFL owners could decide in March whether the Rams, Chargers and/or Raiders can move to L.A.

In San Francisco, the numbers are much smaller and the development is privately financed on private land. But transportation improvements are needed, especially with an influx of Warriors fans, and that costs money.

Of the estimated \$55.3 million cost of four new light-rail vehicles and creating two parking overflow parking areas south of the arena, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency anticipates fare and parking revenue will cover \$25.4 million. That leaves a \$29.9 million shortfall that the agency says could be financed through sales of revenue bonds, with taxes and other revenue generated by the project paying off the bonds.

What constitutes revenue generated from the Warriors' proposed \$1 billion, 18,064-seat arena in Mission Bay is an open question. Do you, for example, count hotel tax that probably would be generated anyway in San Francisco's tight hotel market?

In the end, the city's fiscal feasibility analysis took a conservative approach, said Adam van de Water, a program manager for the city's Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure. The city study, for example, didn't count gross receipts from the hotel tax, revenue generated by tenants of the two office towers that are part of the broader Warriors project and retail revenue generated outside the arena itself.

"We wanted to make sure we weren't counting someone already in San Francisco who happens to go to an event" at the arena, van de Water told a Board of Supervisors committee earlier this month. At the suggestion of the city's independent budget analyst, Harvey Rose, the transit funding plan was amended to put the Warriors, not the city's general fund, on the hook if revenue from the arena doesn't cover the bonds.

(The Warriors also will pay at least \$10 million annually into a transportation improvement fund to cover additional ways to solve traffic and congestion problems that develop through the life of the arena.)

The Mission Bay Alliance, a group of University of California, San Francisco, faculty, benefactors and former administrators, seized on those figures, and an analysis by its consultant, Jon Haveman of Marin Economic Consulting, that says biotech companies, not an arena, would generate more revenue for the city. The transportation bond, Haveman said, is "a form of subsidy" and a press release from the alliance riffs on the theme, saying the arena "leaves taxpayers on hook for \$29 million in unfunded costs."

Unfunded? Maybe not. Subsidy? Yes, even if for the short term.



Broke-Ass Stuart

TV Host. Travel Writer. Poet. Motherfucking Hustler.

Why Moving the Warriors is Bad for the Team and San Francisco The Golden State Warriors Are Better Than Ever... So Why Does Management Want To Move?

Alex Doniach – November 17, 2015

There's nothing Bay Area sports fans hate more than winning. That's the only explanation for why we keep screwing around with our winners. First came the Niners, who won a gazillion championships playing at Candlestick and were on their way to another championship run under Jim Harbaugh. So what does the team do? Fire Harbaugh and move to hot and sweaty Santa Clara, where nosebleeds cost \$200 in a stadium nobody – and we mean nobody – likes. They've been losers ever since.

Now it's the Golden State Warriors' turn. They are now officially the best team in the NBA, thanks in large part to the crazy fans at the Oracle – “Roaracle” – arena in Oakland, who have a well-deserved national reputation as being the loudest, most zealous fans in the league. So what do the new owners want to do? Screw it up, of course, by building a behemoth arena down the street from AT&T Park and directly across the street from a brand new children's hospital in the heart of the city's biotech district in Mission Bay.

Sick children and their families are going to love it. Total gridlock, ambulances stuck in traffic. An emergency room only 1,000 feet from the brand-new arena with plans to host 225 Warriors' games, concerts, conventions and more a year. What's not to like? That great East Bay fan base is sure to wither away once they get a whiff of the new ticket prices. And let's see whether the transplanted techies in SF stick by the team, even after today's star players get older and move on. Soon enough the Warriors will be back to the Cow Palace days, playing in front of a big empty room.

Teams aside, it's just not a good idea to plunk a huge arena down in the middle of Mission Bay. The city likes to brag about the taxpayers not being on the hook for any arena costs. But the city's own budget analyst proved that storyline wrong last week, saying that of the \$60 million in transportation improvements needed to support the project, the arena would generate tax revenues to cover only half, leaving a gaping \$29.9 million budget deficit funded by taxpayers. In total, it's now estimated the arena will bring in a paltry \$1.5 million in net annual income, barely enough money to fix all the problems the arena creates in the neighborhood.

What's worse, the city is rubber-stamping this project through a record-fast approval process, and not giving the public an opportunity to learn the facts and weigh in. San Francisco residents should question their Supervisor in advance of a Dec. 8 board meeting when city leaders will have a chance to vote on the project. The public deserves to know where the money is flowing – and fans deserve to know why their team is moving. A Mission Bay arena will certainly make more money for Warriors' owners Joe Lacob and Peter Guber, but it will destroy the Mission Bay neighborhood and price out the team's amazing fanbase in the process. That's a lot to lose for a team that knows how to win.



Arena will be nightmare for child patients

By Jennifer Wade and Sarah Bennett – November 23, 2015

As the mothers of children who receive treatment for severe congenital heart defects at UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital, we were dismayed to read Quentin Kopp's misguided and factually inaccurate op-ed supporting construction of a new arena for the Golden State Warriors less than 1,000 feet from the hospital's emergency entrance.

Kopp states that the arena would be constructed "without taxpayer financing." But in fact, according to The City's Budget and Legislative Analyst, the arena traffic management plan would create a \$29.9 million shortfall that city taxpayers would have to fund, most likely through bonds. In exchange for this large up-front investment of city money, the arena is projected to only contribute \$1.5 million per year to The City in net tax revenues.

However, our biggest concern is not the fiscal irresponsibility of this proposal but rather how such an arena would affect our children's safety. As parents of children with rare diseases that require specialized treatment, we are dependent on access to the specialists at UCSF hospital, particularly in a medical emergency. And unfortunately for our children, it is only a question of when, and not if, such an emergency will arise.

Despite the traffic management plan's exorbitant cost, the plan is laughably inadequate and would not mitigate traffic from 18,000 people arriving at the arena within a small window of time, particularly on days when there is also a game at nearby AT&T Park. It is projected that the arena would host approximately 225 events per year, meaning that emergency access to the hospital would be compromised on a majority of days and evenings throughout the year.

In addition, we are very concerned about the impact of arena noise and crowds on the quality of life of patients and their families. When a child is seriously ill in the hospital, parents are a critical component of the medical team and are at their children's bedsides night and day. The hospital essentially becomes the family's home, often for weeks or months at a time. Having a critically ill child is difficult and stressful enough without having the added burden of having to deal with noise, pollution and traffic from stadium crowds.

We are incredibly fortunate to have a world-class children's hospital here in our city. We know families who travel thousands of miles from their homes to receive the specialized treatment available at UCSF. But we are concerned that an arena in the neighborhood could jeopardize the quality of care at the hospital.

Night nurses begin their shifts at 7 p.m., close to the 7:30 p.m. start time for basketball games. If nurses are late due to traffic, it could interfere with the transition between care teams, requiring day nurses to work overtime until their replacements arrive and raising the risk of medical errors due to fatigue.

Furthermore, many of the physicians who work at UCSF are leaders in their fields who would be welcomed at any children's hospital in the world. If the arena negatively affects working conditions at the hospital, UCSF would have a difficult time finding replacement physicians of such high caliber.

So is this arena plan a good deal, as Quentin Kopp says? Certainly it is for the Warriors' millionaire owners, who stand to make a fortune from concession sales. But there is no compelling argument to justify the traffic, noise and pollution this project would bring to the Mission Bay area and the threat it would pose to our children's lives.
