

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE  
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE  
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE  
30TH DAY OF JUNE 2015**

The members of the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure of the City and County of San Francisco met in a special meeting at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 416, in the City of San Francisco, California, at 1:00 p.m. on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of June 2015, at the place and date duly established for holding of such a meeting.

**REGULAR MEETING AGENDA**

**1. Recognition of a Quorum**

Meeting was called to order at 1:16 p.m. Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Bustos - absent  
Commissioner Mondejar – present  
Commissioner Singh – present  
Chair Rosales – present

Commissioner Bustos was absent; all Commission members were present.

**2. Announcements**

A. The next scheduled Commission meeting will be a regular meeting held on Tuesday, July 7, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. (City Hall, Room 416).

B. Announcement of Prohibition of Sound Producing Electronic Devices during the Meeting

Please be advised that the ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing of or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic device.

C. Announcement of Time Allotment for Public Comments

**3. Report on actions taken at previous Closed Session meeting – None**

**4. Matters of Unfinished Business – None**

**5. Matters of New Business:**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

a) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of May 19, 2015

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Speaker: Ace Washington, Community Activist

Mr. Washington stated he was there under protest and stated he had been physically abused by the Sheriff's Office deputy. He announced he was starting a new TV show called "This Week in City Hall" to report actions in City Hall.

Commissioner Mondejar motioned to move Item 5(a) and Chair Rosales seconded that motion.

Secretary Guerra called for a voice vote on Item 5 (a).

Commissioner Bustos – absent

Commissioner Mondejar – yes

Commissioner Singh – abstained because of absence

Chair Rosales – yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY TWO COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE AND ONE ABSTENTION THAT THE MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF MAY 19, 2015, BE ADOPTED.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

**b) Public hearing on the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for the Golden State Warriors Event Center and Mixed-Use Development at Mission Bay South Blocks 29-32 (Discussion)**

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Sally Oerth, Deputy Director

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Speakers: Ray Nyden, Potrero Hill and South Beach resident and business owner and board member of South Beach Mission Bay Merchants Association; Neal Ushman; Mission Bay (MB) resident; Esther Sterns, Mission Bay resident; Matt Prieshoff, COO, Live Nation, California; Alyssa Kies, SPUR; Anna Fernandez, Pediatric Emergency Department, Mission Bay; Alejandro Madi, research analyst, Unite Here Local 2; Alex Doniach, Mission Bay Alliance; Damion Scott on behalf of Allison Heath; Andrew Battat on behalf of Jay Hairdah, San Francisco resident; Blaise Gisslow, San Francisco resident; Vanessa Aquino, Dogpatch resident and board member of Neighborhood Dogpatch Association (NDA); Annabel Ortiz; Curt Yagi, Executive Director, Real Options for City Kids (ROCK) and Potrero Hill resident; Alexander Gronalski on behalf of Harold Amalgasian; Sebastian Conn, student; Scott Van Horn, Dogpatch resident; Pat Valentino, Vice President, South Beach Mission Bay Merchants Association (SBMBMA); Cathy Searby, Mission Bay resident; D.J. Brookter, Deputy Director, Young Community Developers and Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP) resident; Ace Washington, community activist; Kim Kobasic, Potrero Hill resident, small business owner and co-President, SBMBMA; Tim Paulson, Executive Director, San Francisco Labor Council; John Caine, Partner, East Street Ventures Restaurant; Jon Ballesteros, San Francisco Travel Association; Diane Hartnett, Pacific Union Realtors; Stefano Cassolato, lobbyist; Benjamin Bleiman, founder/owner Tonic Nightlife Group, founder/manager San Francisco Bar Owners Alliance (SFBOA) and Chair, California Music and Culture Association (CMAC); Nick Belloini, Parks advocate; Andrew Greenstein, San Francisco resident and business owner; Kevin

Carroll, Executive Director, San Francisco Hotel Council; Jim Lazarus, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce (CofC); Henry Karnolowitz, President, Council of District Merchants; Abe Evans, student; Elizabeth Kirk, student & Warriors fan; Cheryl Davis, Director of a San Francisco non-profit; Bruce Agid, Transportation representative and board member of the South Bay, Rincon Hill, Mission Bay Neighborhood Association and Mission Bay resident; Celestino Ellington, Sports & Recreation Director, YMCA, BVHP Branch and San Francisco resident; Michael Sesich, native San Francisco and Mission Bay resident; David Siegel, Vice-President, Dogpatch Neighborhood Association and 25-year Dogpatch resident; David MacKenzie, San Francisco high school teacher and founder, Round the Diamond Consulting and Education; Christopher Hrones, San Francisco resident; Jac Taliaferro, owner, La Hitz Digital Media and San Francisco native; John Cornwell, 3<sup>rd</sup> generation San Francisco native and resident; Silvia Johnson, guitar player; Joe Boss, Dogpatch Neighborhood Association; Rudy Corpus, United Playaz; Al Norman, Bayview Merchants Association; John DeCastro, former President, Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association; Oscar James, native BVHP resident; Paul Osmundson, Partner, East Street Ventures Restaurant and former Director for Planning and Development for the Port of San Francisco; Susan Vaughan, Chair, San Francisco Sierra Club; Osha Meserve, Mission Bay Alliance; David Penn, San Francisco resident

Mr. Nyden was in support of the event center and commended the Warriors organization for showing a commitment to community and business input in planning the event center. Mr. Nyden felt another benefit would be the ability to walk to the event area from his home and walk his dogs in the new green area proposed as well as having year-round retail and restaurants for local residents. He thanked OCII for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Mr. Ushman stated how impressed he was with how the Warriors had been working with the community to address community concerns and come up with solutions. However, he addressed the opposition from the Mission Bay Alliance, which was an anonymous group, whose members did not even live close to Mission Bay. He stressed the Alliance was mostly made up of UCSF donors and biotech executives who were against the arena because the land would not be used for biotechnology developments. He pointed out the California Nurses Association (CNA) was against the arena because of concerns about access to UCSF Mission Bay and traffic concerns and, according to the Chronicle, none were familiar with the EIR nor had attended any of the event meetings. Mr. Ushman stated most of the traffic issues had been addressed and the CNA would have known that if they had been involved earlier.

Ms. Sterns stated she had lived in Mission Bay since 2010 and was very excited about the bike and pedestrian access that would be developed as a result of the Warriors Event Center. She stated she was raising three teenage children in Mission Bay and pointed out that resident there had expected new development to happen in the area and considered the Warrior's Arena an unexpected bonus, because it would enhance the neighborhood for families with the new parks, holiday ice arena, and bike paths. Ms. Sterns noted that currently there were 250 new children in their neighborhood and these new developments were very important to the needs of their neighborhood families.

Mr. Prieshoff explained that Live Nation put concerts on around the world and was a major entertainment company. He stated they were strong supporters of the new project because there were no major event centers in San Francisco and that the Warriors and the City of San Francisco deserved one. Mr. Prieshoff stressed this multi-purpose center would attract people for major events from the state and around the world. The center would be located within a transit rich area and felt that they had done a good job studying and resolving the traffic and parking issues in the EIR. Mr. Prieshoff wanted to go on record as being in support of this plan.

Ms. Kies stated SPUR had been involved in the development of Mission Bay for many decades and thought the arena would have a positive effect overall for the neighborhood because it would make Mission Bay a more interesting place. Regarding transportation impacts, Ms. Kies felt the Warriors were doing everything they could do to lessen the impact on the neighborhood and pointed out some people would be able to walk from their homes to the games because of the investments in transportation infrastructure.

Ms. Fernandez cared for very sick children who needed continual monitoring and hands-on care. She was there to convey the concerns of over 900 nurses working at UCSF Mission Bay and the 3,000 members of the CNA. Ms. Fernandez stressed they were not there to protest the Warriors but to advocate for patients and their families. She described the area around the Mission Bay hospital and clinic facilities like a small island with a narrow corridor between the Bay and highways, a very dense community with little public transportation that could easily become congested. The traffic resulting from a major additional project could easily create gridlock that could limit access for patients needing highly specialized care in a timely manner 24/7, including during games, concerts and other special events. Ms. Fernandez inquired about what the City of San Francisco was going to do to ensure health care professionals would be able to get to the hospital in a timely manner. She stressed the congestion affecting public health and safety must be addressed and not just the issues of developers.

Mr. Madi was there to represent 14,000 hospitality workers in the San Francisco hotel and restaurant industry and to express the union's support for the Warriors project. He stated this was the most important development in the City for the last 15 years in terms of creating jobs for hospitality workers. He explained his union represented 800 concession workers at AT&T Park, which were currently only part-time jobs because of the nature of the baseball season. Having a multi-purpose center would offer the possibility of year-round jobs, which would be a game changer for food service workers in San Francisco. Mr. Madi indicated the Warriors had promised to guarantee those jobs at the new arena. He stated this was the kind of development the City should be advancing.

Ms. Doniach was there on behalf of the coalition of UCSF staff, stakeholders and residents, who were not in support of this project. She stated she had spoken to many people in Mission Bay about the significant impact of this project on traffic, parking, access and quality of life. Subsequently, she had launched a petition calling for the city to reject this project and had collected 4,600 signatures in the past few weeks from residents, UCSF health care workers, employees and neighbors concerned about the impact of the 18,500 seat proposed event center, which she submitted to OCII. Ms. Doniach also submitted letters from neighbors concerned about the impact on parking, hospital access, traffic, and air quality and asked the City to consider alternative sites other than Mission Bay for this environmentally damaging project. She reiterated the CNA had recently expressed their concerns about how bad this project would be for the neighborhood, UCSF, access to emergency care, and traffic for the entire east side of the City. Ms. Doniach hoped OCII would take these concerns into consideration when reviewing the project.

Mr. Scott read a statement prepared by Ms. Heath, who expressed serious concerns regarding environmental impacts of this project which were not fully disclosed or analyzed in the draft EIR. Ms. Heath pointed out the draft EIR showed the project would cost severe traffic gridlock, noise and air pollution in Mission Bay right next to the UCSF medical facilities. Yet the draft EIR did not even discuss the land use impacts of the project which were not analyzed in the EIR plan. Additionally, the project would hinder access to other parts of the City and the Bay Bridge to Mission Bay. Even with the proposed improvements, Ms. Heath stated, Mission Bay could not possibly handle up to 18,500 fans and 225 events per year, especially during simultaneous games at both stadiums. While parking space restrictions might be considered a means of traffic management, the practical effect would be more gridlock and unhealthy

air emissions, reduced access for emergency and health care providers and patients and interference of access to hospitals and medical facilities.

Mr. Battat read a statement from Mr. Hairdah, who expressed concern about the negative impact of parking and traffic by the proposed stadium and whose commute to the financial district was doubled during a game due to the influx of fans to the neighborhood. Mr. Hairdah also did not appreciate the trash left in the streets after events which showed how disrespectful fans were of their local community. Adding basketball season to the event calendar would have a negative impact on the traffic and parking in the neighborhood and this would hurt residents and businesses. Mr. Hairdah stressed the stadium would only benefit the developer and preferred having the long-term neighborhood growth that Mission Bay was already invested in.

Mr. Gisslow was not in support of this project. He stated he was familiar with the EIR and he read a quote from a City Official in a SFGate article who stated the traffic and parking impacts from this project would be handled. Mr. Gisslow stated there was no credibility in this statement because traffic had never been handled correctly in San Francisco. The problem with the EIR was that people were uninformed about the costs of this project and especially the resulting proposed transportation improvements. He explained that while this project would be privately funded, other costs would be publicly funded. He gave, as an example, the new Caltrain line originally destined to go through King Station. The Mayor now wanted to change this line to go directly to the new arena, at the cost of \$2.5 billion, which would be publicly funded by taxpayers. Additionally, there was \$40 million in proposed improvement costs and \$6.6 million in annual transportation upkeep fees, not discussed in the EIR and a huge amount of money unaccounted for.

Ms. Aquino was in support of this project. She proudly supported the Warrior mixed-use project because it would serve as a hub for performing arts, retail space, restaurants and community events. Ms. Aquino felt the Warriors had communicated effectively with residents, were privately financing this project and was pleased there would be no new taxes involved. Ms. Aquino believed this project would create new businesses within Mission Bay, Dogpatch and Bayview.

Ms. Ortiz was not in support of this project. She stated she had been interviewing Mission Bay residents, hospital patients and employees and overwhelmingly the response was the community did not want all the subsequent traffic in such a closed area. She pointed out because BART did not go to Mission Bay, more people would be driving which would mean more cars in the community. Ms. Ortiz pointed out the number one concern was traffic congestion: many people expressed concern over the extra time needed to exit the area and up to two hours to reach the freeway during a game. She stressed the infrastructure was not suited to bring in 18,000 fans and was there was general concern coming from medical workers about how emergency vehicles would be ensured access to the hospital at all times. Ms. Ortiz indicated currently there was no plan and if there was, it had not been communicated to residents. This would have a negative impact on quality of life for Mission Bay residents.

Mr. Yagi explained ROCK was a non-profit organization in Visitation Valley serving children and youth for over 20 years. Mr. Yagi was in support of the Warrior project in MB. He stated the team and City had worked very hard to communicate with the community to address the needs and concerns of residents. Mr. Yagi indicated the Warriors always gave back to the community and he had no doubt that they would look out for the community organizations and the community in general.

Mr. Gronalski read a statement from Mr. Amalgasian. Although Mr. Amalgasian was in support of an event center for the Warriors in San Francisco, he felt that the proposed project site in Mission Bay was

not appropriate because of the lack of parking. He felt the proximity to the medical center and AT&T Park would be a recipe for congestion and potential disturbance to the quiet needed at the medical center. Mr. Amalgasian understood there was an alternative site available for consideration which had comparable transportation and infrastructure support and was removed at some distance from the medical center and the ball park.

Mr. Conn was in support of this project. As a San Francisco student, he used his bike as a method of transportation and was very happy about the Warriors moving to Mission Bay because of the abundant proposed bike access as outlined in the EIR. He was pleased there would be over 300 valet spots, over 100 secure bike parking spaces in the office buildings and dozens more around the site as well as new bike lanes on the streets in the area.

Mr. Van Horn was in support of this project even though he would be one of the few who would have his view of the Bay Bridge blocked as a result of it. He thought the EIR was very thorough and applauded the City for looking at all the issues and paying close attention to the impact the project would have on the neighborhood. Mr. Van Horn was pleased about the new businesses and parks that would be within walking distance of his home. He indicated the Warriors had listened to feedback from the community and had incorporated community suggestions into the plan and believed they had come up with a project that fit perfectly with the Mission Bay and Dogpatch area. Mr. Van Horn stated the residents he had spoken to were all in favor of this project.

Mr. Valentino and his association were in support of the project. He stated he lived near the proposed center and had studied the draft EIR and the traffic management plan. Mr. Valentino thought this plan was very in-depth and progressive because of the movement toward transit first and more bike access as opposed to prioritizing cars. He pointed out discussions on having direct right of way for hospital workers and emergency vehicles and wanted that to be known. Mr. Valentino felt the event center would be a sense of place which would put housing next to work next to play and create a new destination that would be environmentally sensitive to its surroundings. He pointed out that this project would be a LEED gold certified construction with offers to mitigate 100% of any greenhouse gases.

Ms. Searby was in support of this project. She lived next door to the proposed arena site with her husband and daughter and was very excited about the Warriors coming to their area. Ms. Searby stated this would be an entertainment destination with events like the Globetrotters, Disney on Ice and concerts that the entire family could attend together. She was also pleased about the waterfront park for kids and families and the ability to enjoy the views and have fun in a safe environment. Ms. Searby stated the Warriors had met with the Mission Bay Community Advisory Committee (CAC) and UCSF and residents to address their concerns so all entities and the community could function together productively in Mission Bay.

Mr. Brookter expressed strong support for this project. He was impressed with how green the project was based on the EIR and that it would be LEED gold certified. This would set a standard for sustainable building and design in the City. Mr. Brookter felt that the Warriors would be more than just a basketball team but function as a partner in the community. He indicated that within the past two seasons, they had employed over 200 BVHP residents to work in the Oakland arena and Mr. Brookter was positive they would hire more BVHP residents for the new mixed use event center.

Mr. Washington stated this project was really about dollars, developers and consultants. He stated his organization would come up with a solution for community reform and stressed the people of the City must be a part of the solution. Mr. Washington pointed out that because of Jim Jefferson; the African-American community had been part of the creation of Mission Bay.

Ms. Kobasic was in support of the project. After reviewing the EIR, she was excited about the open pedestrian accessibility to the arena and the walk would be flat, easy and beautiful along the waterfront. Because of proximity to public transit, anyone near a BART, Muni or Caltrain line would be able to arrive at the arena within minutes. Ms. Kobasic was also pleased the new event center would trigger construction of the new bay front park which would allow runners, families and visitors to enjoy the waterfront and Mission Bay, which currently is not possible.

Mr. Paulson stated his Council represented over 100 unions in the City and many members lived in the areas that had been revitalized over the past 30 years. He remembered the different plans which had been considered over the years for the old train yard that inhabited that site. He recalled one of the first actions of the Warriors was to call the Council and plan subsequent meetings and discussions with the unions in the City. He noted that one of their unions, the CNA, still had concerns about traffic and access, but Mr. Paulson was sure those concerns would be mitigated by the Warrior organization. His Council was in support of this project.

Mr. Caine stated he was a small business owner in Mission Bay and was in support of this project. He felt it would have a positive impact on the Mission Bay Community. He stated he had reviewed the EIR and was impressed by the steps the architects had taken to minimize the impact this project would have on the environment.

Mr. Ballesteros was there to express his organization's strong support for this project. He indicated that throughout the EIR process, the City had done a thorough analysis of the project and every conceivable impact it could have on the City and felt the team had maintained complete transparency with their plans since the beginning. Mr. Ballesteros had confidence in the City's assessment of the traffic problems and would be managed. He stressed the benefits of having a multi-purpose center serving San Francisco and all of the Bay Area would far outweigh any potential impacts.

Ms. Hartnett stated she was a South Beach realtor working and specializing in the South Beach/Mission Bay area since 1989 and was in support of the project. She stated she had worked with hundreds of people renting, buying and developing property and most people in the area knew that some kind of change was inevitable. Ms. Hartnett acknowledged change was difficult but stressed most people in the community were in support of responsible growth. She indicated traffic problems were to be expected because there was no place in the City that didn't have traffic congestion. Ms. Hartnett felt if people collaborated, the outcome would be very positive for the entire City and not just Mission Bay. She thanked the Commission for listening to everyone's opinion.

Mr. Cassolato was there on a pro bono basis as a San Francisco resident. He indicated he was 10 years old the last time the Warriors won the championship and was very excited about the Warriors coming to the City. He reminded Commissioners about all the opposition that took place when the Giants wanted to build their stadium with many of the same arguments. Mr. Cassolato felt the EIR was very thorough and was pleased the project sponsor had paid attention to detail, had hired skilled people and was well prepared. He pointed out if San Francisco really wanted to be considered a world-class city, it needed to have a venue for multi-purpose events, more than just for basketball. Mr. Cassolato added that having the arena located in Mission Bay would attract many people to the area.

Mr. Bleiman explained the Tonic Nightlife Group had 7 bars in San Francisco and employed over 175 people, the SFBOA was composed of 220 bar owners and the CMAC was a trade group representing bars, nightclubs, music festivals and venues in San Francisco. He pointed out all those groups promoted vibrant

world class nightlife in San Francisco. Mr. Bleiman felt this event center would bring San Francisco to world class status in terms of nightlife not just because of sports events and concerts, but because of all the people these events would draw to the City, who would then stay in the City to eat, spend time and enjoy the area. Mr. Bleiman believed the traffic management plan had been thoughtfully and thoroughly prepared and he had no reason for concern. He wanted to go on record as being in support of the arena.

Mr. Belloini thought it was a wonderful idea to have an event center in San Francisco and was in support of this project. He recalled when the area had been filled with warehouses and after an extensive EIR was conducted, the area became Mission Bay. He explained the first EIR had helped create the hospital and medical centers and the second EIR would bring the Warriors into the City. Mr. Belloini felt the new arena would complement the hospitals and complement the City.

Mr. Greenstein was in support of this project. He indicated he had reviewed the plans and what stood the architects had promised to offset 100% of the arena's greenhouse gas emissions by paying into the state's Karl Moyer Program, which funded the upgrade of vehicles such as dirty school buses and turned them into clean, fuel burning vehicles. Mr. Greenstein stressed the focus on climate change mitigation was the future of responsible building and was proud the Golden State Warriors were leading the way in this effort. He recalled similar concerns when the Giants were building their stadium; however he has witnessed how AT&T Park has revitalized the SOMA area. Mr. Greenstein indicated he looked forward to the same kind of transformation in Mission Bay.

Mr. Carroll stated the Hotel Council represented an industry employing 24,000 people, most of who lived and worked in San Francisco. He was in support of this project. Mr. Carroll felt this project would attract more events and other activities to the City and would help the people participating in and working for those events as well as the entire San Francisco hotel industry. Mr. Carroll indicated that adding the public space would be important to hotel guests because guests spend more money outside the hotel than inside and attracting more people to stay in hotels would only help the supporting industry that relied on visitors coming to explore the City of San Francisco.

Mr. Lazarus stated the San Francisco CofC represented over 1500 business throughout the City and employed over 200,000 people, including the hospitals, the Warriors and businesses in Mission Bay. He felt the traffic congestion issue could be managed and stressed these kinds of issues were handled successfully all the time. Mr. Lazarus reminded Commissioners that hospitals dealt with access issues every day. He recalled when UCSF was a neighbor of Kezar Stadium with 70,000 people going to 49er games and sports events in that facility for decades before it was reduced in size. He had looked at the March 1996 San Francisco voter handbook when voters had been asked to approve the ballpark. A group called "San Franciscans for planning priorities 96" had the ballot argument against the ballpark. They opposed Prop B because they stated that this would bring in millions of additional cars without any parking, would drive jobs and businesses out of China Basin and create gridlock over 200 days a year. Mr. Lazarus pointed out none of that really happened; on the contrary, the ballpark has remained a gem on the waterfront supported by residents ever since. He stated the draft EIR contained a mitigation plan for traffic and congestion management that would work for UCSF, the residents and Mission Bay. He was in support of this project and urged OCII to move forward with it as quickly as possible.

Mr. Karnolowitz stated his Council represented over 2,000 businesses in San Francisco. He was in total support of this project because it would have such a positive impact not only on Mission Bay, but on the entire City itself. Mr. Karnolowitz called this a world class project deserving of a world class city.



Mr. Evans lived in Potrero Hill and was in support of this project because it was very bike-friendly and he was a cyclist. He was pleased the project was in line with the City's bike plan and transit first policies because it would add to the blue greenway and looked forward to being able to stop and take advantage of some of the new shops and cafes along the way.

Ms. Kirk was in support of this project. She had been impressed with the environmental plans with emphasis on landscaping and green space by the incorporation of natural environment, such as trees, grass lawns and green rooftops and felt it would have a big impact on making the City greener.

Ms. Davis expressed gratitude that the Warriors and the City had worked together to address some of the issues. She stated she had brought a group of young people to the meeting to witness how the process developed and they had been discussing the role of science, technology, engineering and math throughout. Ms. Davis stressed the importance of seeing beyond just the sporting events to the vast workforce development opportunities and the potential community development and partnerships. She stated the Warriors had been amazing community partners and believed their participation would only increase over time. She was in support of this project.

Mr. Agid was in support of the arena project and was there on behalf of himself as a Mission Bay resident. He focused his comments on the transportation aspect of the EIR and the associated mitigation plans. He was pleased the EIR clearly indicated a detailed account of the impact on traffic and congestion without any sugar-coating. He indicated he had attended public meetings and had reviewed the mitigation measures, including transit improvements, supplemental service, traffic management plan and bike and pedestrian improvements. Mr. Agid was confident that with coordination, resource availability and effective implementation of the mitigation measures, the traffic issues could be managed effectively.

Mr. Donaldson was in support of this project and was impressed with how bike-friendly this project was and looked forward to more bike lanes to Terry Francois Boulevard and 16<sup>th</sup> street, making it easier to navigate around the area. He was also pleased with the overall emphasis on bikes and the resulting reduction of auto carbon emissions and traffic congestion in the area.

Mr. Ellington stated the YMCA had been a community partners with the Warriors since 2006 outside of basketball, which had allowed their members and families to become familiar with the organization in depth. He stated the Warriors had listened to feedback from the community, addressed concerns and incorporated community suggestions into their plans. As a result, Mr. Ellington felt the project would fit very well into Mission Bay. He was in support of the mixed use event center.

Mr. Sesich lived two blocks away from the proposed site. He was not in support of this project. He described how one night during a game, he got out of the car and walked from 3<sup>rd</sup> Street home and got there before his wife who was driving. Mr. Sesich clarified that he was not opposed to the team moving back to San Francisco or to a new arena in Oakland. He was opposed to the location of the proposed site because of the current traffic situation in that area. He was concerned about a pregnant woman in labor getting stuck in traffic on her way to the hospital. Mr. Sesich believed the Warriors had done a good job in reaching out; however, upon reviewing the EIR, he discovered it was full of phrases like, "provide adequate", "encourage", "should not", "various management strategies", and "commercially reasonable efforts", which he felt were too vague. He recalled when SOMA residents were told that attendees of baseball games at AT&T Park would take public transportation, but now the parking lots were overflowing and they were looking for new lots. Mr. Sesich was greatly concerned about the impact on neighborhood parking and traffic.

Mr. Siegel stated his organization was not opposed to the stadium but the project would have great lasting impact on the Dogpatch neighborhood, which was already impacted by the relentless encroachment of UCSF, housing developers and now the Warriors. He commented on the proposed parking lot at Crane Cove and indicated the association had a number of issues with the lot location. Illinois Street was currently the official route for trucks and bikes as part of the City's transportation plan and this street would be the nearest street to the proposed parking lot. Mr. Siegel added the Port was planning on having the 19<sup>th</sup> Street extension serve as a heavy truck route and Muni was planning a turnaround route in that area. He expressed concern because Crane Cove was a small patch of green space and waterfront that served the community and needed to be protected.

Mr. MacKenzie was in support of the arena. He had attended the May 19 OCII meeting and made a proposal at that time requesting the Warriors and the City include a high school classroom and career development program inside the arena. He stressed what a tremendous influence this program would have for kids at risk and for all students. Mr. MacKenzie stated the Warriors had already done tremendous work in the Bay Area in promoting education with their community foundation.

Mr. Hrones stated he was a new resident of San Francisco and had previously lived in Brooklyn, New York, where he professionally participated in the planning and discussion of the Barclay Center Arena, which involved the relocation of the Nets from New Jersey to Brooklyn. He pointed out there were some interesting parallels in that project to this project: the event center would create an 18,000 seat multi-use arena in an urban infill site accessible by transit which also involved concerns about traffic, parking and emergency vehicle access. Mr. Hrones indicated the fears of negative impact on traffic congestion at the Barclay Center site did not materialize and greatly exceeded the actual impact due to the utilization of public transit. Also off-street parking far exceeded demand so availability was not an issue and emergency vehicle access was accommodated effectively in Brooklyn and there were no significant issues.

Mr. Talia Ferro spoke about the old tradition of building stadiums in the Bay Area, about Robert Taylor who played in the Polo fields at the turn of the last century and about tourism and entertainment in San Francisco. He pointed out that Bobby Webb was in the audience fighting to get Yoshi's back in business. He spoke about the negative experience he had had with the Warriors in connection with his business and this project and stated the Warriors were not being sincere about bringing in black business. Mr. Talia Ferro noted he was the only black businessman to come up to speak at this meeting. He handed the secretary an article he had written on the subject.

Mr. Cornwell stated he hoped his kids would be 4<sup>th</sup> generation residents of San Francisco. He was not in support of this project. He recalled when the Giants were trying to bring in their new stadium; the traffic situation was very different back then. He stated it did not make any sense for an extremely rich organization like the Warriors to put this kind of traffic burden on the community and region. Mr. Cornwell clarified this was not just about the surface streets, but the Bay Bridge as well and pointed out the 3<sup>rd</sup> street corridor was already saturated. The Bay Bridge rush hour currently started at 2:30 and went to 8:30pm and with this project, the morning rush hour would run right into the evening rush hour. Mr. Cornwell stressed the Warriors were not a non-profit organization and should not be exempt from smart urban planning. He felt this was a really bad regional project.

Ms. Johnson stated the City needed more parking and more BART access stops behind the mountains where she lived and would help solve the problems with the Warriors.

Mr. Boss stated he had been a San Francisco resident for 32 years. He was not for or against the Warriors and would love to have them in the City, just not at the proposed location. He felt they were doing an adequate job with the EIR. Mr. Boss indicated if the City really wanted to get something done, they could make the Warriors work together with the Giants immediately on Lot A and B, but right now there was no solution for the traffic problems that would take place as a result of this project. Mr. Boss felt this was a really bad idea for his neighborhood.

Mr. Corpus was born and raised in District 6 and ran a summer youth program with over 150 kids. He was in support of this project because it would create lots of work opportunities for the South of Market community, which was a very poor area and would be good for the entire Bay Area economy.

Mr. Norman was there representing his association in support of this project. He stated the City should go ahead and establish relationships with the Warriors because they would benefit everyone associated with the project and urged the Commission to move forward with it. Mr. Norman felt the Warriors would be a jewel of an anchor tenant in the area.

Mr. DeCastro stated he had lived in Potrero Hill for 37 years and was not in support of this project. He referred to Item 6.2 of the EIR which described “significant unavoidable impacts, specifically transportation and transit”. He pointed out that traffic in the area was a mess now and suggested that Commissioners visit the 280 and Mariposa, Mariposa & Pennsylvania, and 16<sup>th</sup> & 7<sup>th</sup> street interchanges between 4 and 6 pm and witness what a disaster it was 4 out of 5 nights, and especially Thursday night. Mr. DeCastro described the situation during a Giants day game, when the traffic started backing up at 2:00pm and never stopped. He referred to Point 6.5, which discussed the Transportation Management Plan and stated that he did not trust the City or MUNI to follow through with this plan. Mr. DeCastro stated that currently the traffic was backed up every night around 280 without a game. He stressed the transit system did not work today and they needed better traffic plans in that area if the Warriors were going to come to Mission Bay. He stated that trying to reroute emergency vehicles through the Minnesota Street area and Dogpatch neighborhood to get access to the hospitals was not an acceptable alternative and he agreed with the CNA on this point.

Mr. James was a former Model Cities Commissioner. He pointed out this entire area came under the Model Cities original agreement of 1971, which contained a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that all development in the area must hire 50% community residents and 35% community and minority contractors. He thanked the Warriors for hiring people from BVHP and hoped that they would follow the MOU, which had grandfather clauses for BVHP and hire minority contractors from BVHP. Mr. James also urged UCSF to offer scholarships for their community members after getting land for free to train people in the community for health professional careers. Mr. James recalled attending Warriors games at Kezar stadium at one time and welcomed them back to San Francisco. He was in support of this project.

Mr. Osmundson stated he and his partner, John Caine, owned a restaurant located at 295 Terry Francois Blvd. As the former Director of the San Francisco Port, he had worked with the San Francisco Giants and the Mayor’s Office on AT&T ballpark and the traffic plan. Mr. Osmundson indicated he had reviewed the EIR and was sure when the City and the MTA made commitments to manage the traffic to and from the waterfront during special events venues, they would follow through with those commitments. He pointed out the transportation plan had worked for every single one of the 81 home games that have taken place at AT&T Park. Mr. Osmundson stated Mission Bay was envisioned as a mixed use development project and that this use fit into the City’s plan for this area. Despite the unavoidable impacts, this would be a great use for this location. He urged OCII to certify the EIR and move forward with this project and not miss out on the opportunity to have the Warriors organization make this tremendous investment into San Francisco.

Ms. Vaughan was speaking for herself and was concerned that state legislation, AB 900, was extended purely to get this project expedited through the approval process to avoid additional public hearings. Regarding greenhouse gas emissions, it was her understanding the project sponsors intended to purchase carbon offsets; however, they did not know what those offsets were and they needed to be described in the EIR. Ms. Vaughan pointed out that no greenhouse gas comparison had been done between this project and the Oakland stadium and most of the people who worked for the Warriors in Oakland did not live in San Francisco and she was concerned about the impact to BART and to those people traveling across the Bay. Ms. Vaughan stressed they didn't care about more parking but rather about more public transit enhancements, which had to materialize.

Ms. Meserve was not in support of this project. She stated the Alliance believed the proposed entertainment center would not work for the site and did not warrant the massive public investment plan by the City. In particular, members of the Alliance were concerned about the compatibility of the project with the existing health and research facilities in Mission Bay. She explained that while health and related biosciences were planned to expand under the Mission Bay redevelopment plan, this project would take this area to a new and incompatible direction. In their review of the draft EIR, the Alliance found the traffic and parking and associated health impacts would be even more devastating than disclosed in the EIR and was inadequate mitigation of this outcome. Also, the project was being misrepresented as greenhouse gas neutral; however, purchasing unverified assets of 4,000 tons per year of CO<sub>2</sub> from a broker was not mitigation and would do nothing to help the localized air pollution that would worsen under the gridlock conditions. Ms. Meserve indicated the fast-tracking of the EIR process precluded any meaningful public participation and added that this EIR was not thorough because there were important issues that were relegated to older documents which the public had not been able to review, including land use, geology, soils, recreation and hazardous materials. Ms. Meserve stated the Alliance had requested an extension of the public review period to better study the complexity of this project.

Mr. Penn stated he lived in an SRO, was on SSI disability and represented people who had no voice. He spoke about hard times in the City for many people and about his dream to create a non-profit to create paid jobs for people coming out of hardship, which was comprised of opening a café eatery and meeting spaces for conferences, study groups, etc. Mr. Penn felt that making the café a non-profit would allow people to re-integrate into the workforce and wanted to propose this to the Warriors. He stated he had received positive feedback from community businesses and had met with Jane Kim, District 6 supervisor. Mr. Penn was in support of the Warriors project and left a written proposal with the secretary.

Handwritten comment from Todd Simpson, Radiance (Mission Bay Project): "All northbound traffic after arena events will end up on a one-way, one lane residential street (Mission Bay Blvd. North) as all other connectors to 3<sup>rd</sup> Street from Terry A. Francois are blocked or closed (due to Giants and/or PSB). This is unacceptable."

Chair Rosales thanked the public for their comments. She had expressed her own concerns in the past about the traffic and neighborhood impacts stemming from this project and today they had heard the same concern from the public as well. Ms. Rosales stated she would make sure that the comments regarding impacts and mitigation measures were carefully studied to the extent of exploring potential funding mechanisms that OCII could recommend to guarantee that the mitigations were met and the impacts were mitigated. She announced this matter would return to OCII later in the fall.

Ms. Oerth announced if people wanted to submit written comments, they could send them via email to warriors@sfgov.org or to the Planning Department. Contact information for the Planning Department was on page 2-9 of the EIR.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired what the future process would be regarding all the public spoken and written comments received during the meeting; inquired about whether all the comments would be made public.

Ms. Oerth responded all the spoken and written comments gathered that day would be responded to in a document called "The Response to Comments". Staff would review the comments, provide responses to each comment and the document would be brought back before OCII later in the fall. Ms. Oerth also announced that they would look at any adjustments that might be needed to be made in the draft EIR. Ms. Oerth responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Mondejar stated that she hoped that all the comments would be considered carefully and also requested more information about one public comment referring to the purchase of carbon offsets. She looked forward to disclosure of all the issues and concerns as well as the responses to the public.

Chair Rosales closed this item and stated that it would come back to the Commission later in the year.

Chair Rosales announced they would take a short break.

**6. Public Comment on Non-agenda Items - None**

**7. Report of the Chair – None**

**8. Report of the Executive Director**

As part of commission packets we provided two informational memorandums. These items are included at the request of the Commission as part of our housing workshop which took place on June 16, 2015. There is new citywide legislation that has been proposed for neighborhood preferences; a copy of this legislation is included in your folders for your review. There is a process the City goes through to review new legislation. There is review by the Planning Commission and a report Planning prepares that applies to citywide projects. Should the Commission want to adopt a similar policy, the Commission can do so. The Board of Supervisor's policy would not automatically apply unless the Commission adopted it. In a parallel path, OCII staff is reviewing the legislation to see how this would impact our projects. In the interest of giving you the draft legislation that you have requested, it's in your packets and available to all the members of the public as well as online.

At our June 16, 2015 Commission Meeting, Jeff White, OCII's Housing Program Manager, mentioned a Seifel Report that was being used by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) and the state of the housing market in San Francisco. The report from Seifel is also included in your packets for your review.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about whether they would get a briefing on the legislation.

Executive Director Bohee responded in the affirmative after staff had reviewed and analyzed the legislation themselves, reviewed its applicability with fair housing to see how the preferences that already existed would fit in with the Certificate of Preference, rent burden, etc. They wanted to understand how

the legislation would harmonize; impact and what effects it should on OCII should the Commission choose to adopt it.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about when it would be heard by the Board.

Executive Director Bohee responded the legislation would be heard in the fall at the earliest. There was a 90-day review process and they would like to see comments from other City agencies and then present the totality of the information to Commissioners.

### **9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters**

Commissioner Singh stated Chair Rosales had done a very good job.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about why the City & County of San Francisco (CCSF) logo was removed from Commissioners' business cards.

Executive Director Bohee responded the successor agency, OCII, was a state-authorized entity, legal and separate from the CCSF with its own policies and procedures. She explained that during 2012, AB 1484 had clarified the separate legal status of OCII, so therefore it would not be appropriate for OCII to use the CCSF seal because OCII was not part of CCSF.

Mr. Bryan added that OCII was considered to be a special district like BART.

### **10. Closed Session - None**

### **11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Rosales at 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Claudia Guerra  
Commission Secretary