2.12 RECREATION

2.12.1 PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

Comments

In no section of the DEIR do you find mention of Public Open Space and/or its environmental impact, positive or negative.

While we understand that the substantial downturn in the housing market complicates the City’s and the project applicant’s ability to provide improved access during the initial stages of construction, we believe that the DEIR should specifically describe incremental access and phasing of Public Open Space and Facilities. *(William Robberson, President, San Francisco Boardsailing Association)* [27.2]

3) Why does the DEIR not provide specific project scope for Public Open Space and/or its environmental impact, positive or negative? *(William Robberson, President, San Francisco Boardsailing Association)* [27.5]

Response

Public open space and potential environment effects of public open space are discussed in a number of places in the EIR. The public open space on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island proposed for use by residents of San Francisco and the region is discussed under the project sponsors’ objectives in EIR Chapter II, Project Description. As stated on EIR pp. II.5-II.6, the Proposed Project is intended to “provide a comprehensive new regional waterfront system of parks and public open spaces that is programmed with a variety of uses, including recreational, passive open space, arts, cultural, and educational uses, and that establishes the Development Plan Area as a regional destination; provide a high-quality public realm, including a pedestrian and bicycle-friendly environment with high design standards for public open spaces, parks, and streetscape elements; and create an organizational structure that provides for high-quality development, operations and maintenance of parks and open space.” Proposed open space is also discussed on EIR pp. II.22-II.24 and pp. II.29-II.31. The 300 acres of open space included in the Proposed Project are described and analyzed in EIR Section IV.J, Recreation, on pp. IV.J.12-IV.J.16, with more detail provided in Table IV.J.1: Proposed Parks and Open Space, on pp. IV.J.13-IV.J.14, for each of the proposed parks and open spaces identified on Figure IV.J.1: Proposed Open Space, on p. IV.J.15.

Although management and operation of these Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA)-owned recreational resources would not be under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (see EIR pp. IV.J.3 and IV.J.16), the development of 300 acres of recreational areas and open space would be a notable public benefit, as it would augment the recreational facilities and open space currently available in San Francisco and assist in meeting the City’s identified shortfall of athletic fields (see pp. IV.J.8 and IV.J.19).
Information about existing recreational resources on the Islands and potential open space impacts of the Proposed Project is provided in EIR Section IV.J, Recreation. As discussed on EIR pp. IV.J.11-IV.J.26, the Proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts on the physical appearance or structural integrity of existing recreational resources, as well as on access to these resources, both during the construction phases and after buildout when the facilities planned in the Proposed Project are fully operational.

The phasing of the 20-year project is described in EIR Chapter II, Project Description, on pp. II.79-II.82. Important recreation and open space facilities expected to be developed in each phase include the following:

- **Phase 1**: Development of the backbone infrastructure; initiation of the bicycle and pedestrian network; and construction of the Ferry Terminal with the Waterfront Plaza.

- **Phase 2**: Development of the southern portion of Cityside Waterfront Park; construction of the Clipper Cove Promenade along the southern edge of Treasure Island and the Sailing Center improvements; and renovation or reconstruction and reopening of Treasure Island school, including 8 acres of open space (in addition to the 300 acres included in the Proposed Project).

- **Phase 3**: Development of the linear park (Eastside Commons) and portions of Eastern Shoreline Park; renovation of Building 1 open space (Building 1 Plaza and Marina Plaza); development of the regional sports complex on Treasure Island; and development of the stormwater wetlands on Treasure Island.

- **Phase 4**: Development of the remaining open space, including development of the remaining portion of the Cityside Waterfront Park; development of the Great Park on Treasure Island (Northern Shoreline Park, and the Wilds); development of the Cultural Park and museum; development of the Urban Agricultural Park; and development of Pier 1 facilities on Treasure Island; and development of the Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District and landscaping improvements on Yerba Buena Island.

As noted on EIR p.II.79, actual project phasing could vary in response to market conditions and other factors. However, the Schedule of Performance attached to the proposed Disposition and Development Agreement for the Proposed Project would require public open space amenities to become available commensurate with development. This would ensure that even if the phasing changes, the public benefits associated with the Proposed Project, including open space and recreation, would be delivered throughout the Proposed Project’s buildout.

As residential units are developed, and neighborhood districts are built on the Islands, these units would have full access to recreation and open spaces completed during preceding phases and the spaces built during concurrent phases as they are completed.

Construction-related impacts associated with the development of the 300 acres of recreational areas and open space would be less than significant. The proposed project’s temporary construction impacts on traffic, noise, air quality, and hazards are evaluated in EIR Section IV.E,
Transportation, on pp. IV.E.67-IV.E.71; in EIR Section IV.F, Noise, on pp. IV.F.14-IV.F.20; in EIR Section IV.G, Air Quality, on pp. IV.G.24-IV.G.38; and in EIR Section IV.P, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, on pp. IV.P.39-IV.P.46, respectively. Also, in each topic section, a management plan, regulatory requirements, or mitigation measures have been identified to minimize the potential impacts, i.e., construction traffic management plan, construction noise and vibration reduction/muffling measures, standard dust control and enhanced combustion emission reduction measures, air quality consultation at each major phase of construction, and soil and groundwater management plans. As part of the last phase of construction, the northern portion of Treasure Island where the majority of the existing residential units are located would be deconstructed and the area would be redeveloped with the Northern Shoreline Park, and the Wilds.

2.12.2 ACCESS

Comments

Section IV, page IV.J.8 - Bay Plan Map No. 4 Policy 23 that encourages “redevelopment of the portion of Yerba Buena Island south of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (“Bay Bridge”) for recreational use when it is no longer owned or controlled by the U.S. Coast Guard,” is mentioned. To be clear the USCG does not have any current or long-term plan to vacate its interests in this area of YBI. (P. M. McMillin, Captain, U. S. Coast Guard) [10.21]

In addition, mandates of the McAteer-Petris Act provide “maximum feasible public access consistent with the project” to apply to all and interim stages of construction as well. Presently, windsurfers, fishermen, walkers, and kayaks use the levee road and launch from the Island. We think that those users should be able to have improved use of the existing facilities, which can be accomplished without any construction, but merely by reopening the parking lot adjacent to the launching ramp. Such options should also be address[ed] in the DEIR. (William Robberson, President, San Francisco Boardsailing Association) [27.3]

4) Why does the DEIR not specifically describe “maximum feasible public access consistent with the project” to apply to all and interim stages of construction, including incremental access and phasing of all Public Open Space and Facilities during project development?

In closing, the DEIR does not include the specific depiction of public access that had been agreed upon in earlier versions of the plan. While that detail is included in the D4D, plans and graphics should be part of the Final EIR. The Final EIR should make it clear that part of the long term plan for the 300 acres of parkland is the specific provision for continued and improved access to the water. (William Robberson, President, San Francisco Boardsailing Association) [27.6]

Response

A discussion of the existing recreational resources on the Islands, a listing of the applicable regulatory controls, and an impact analysis of the Proposed Project on recreational areas and public open space are provided in the EIR in Section IV.J, Recreation. Potential conflicts with applicable statutes, plans, and policies related to environmental issues are identified in EIR.
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Chapter III, Plans and Policies, including the McAteer-Petris Act and the San Francisco Bay Plan (“Bay Plan”).

The portion of Yerba Buena Island under the jurisdiction of the United States Coast Guard (“USCG”) is outside the Project Area. The Bay Plan Map No. 4, Policy 23 is correctly cited on EIR p. III.10, and the USCG’s future plans to remain on Yerba Buena Island are noted. The EIR does not assume that any open space or recreational uses would be developed on USCG property.

The McAteer-Petris Act identifies water-oriented recreation and public assembly as water-oriented land uses along the Bay shoreline that are essential to the public welfare of the Bay Area. It further states that the San Francisco Bay Plan finds that existing public access to the shoreline and waters of the San Francisco Bay is inadequate and that maximum feasible public access, consistent with a proposed project, should be provided. The Act does not specifically include a requirement to provide public access to water-oriented recreation and public assembly through all interim stages of construction. Although access to the northern shoreline for recreational purposes has been restricted at various times during the Navy’s remediation activities, both the Navy and TIDA have worked with interested parties to provide interim access that is not in conflict with the Navy’s remediation activities, and that does not result in disturbances to existing residential tenants. The existing arrangement for interim access to the boardsailing and boat launch facility at the north end of Treasure Island allows for parking in the residential area and pedestrian access to the boat launch area via the green space between residential buildings. This interim access to recreational uses of the Bay would be maintained during project construction if it is feasible to do so. To clarify this issue in the EIR, the following text is added after the fifth sentence of the first full paragraph on p. II.9 of Chapter II, Project Description (new text is underlined):

Although the Navy has temporarily restricted access to portions of the northern shoreline for remediation activities, interim access to the perimeter pedestrian path and the boat launch is allowed for launching recreational watercraft, e.g. boardsailing and kayaks.

Additionally, Mitigation Measure TR-1, Construction Management Plan, is revised to address interim access to recreational uses. Please see the response in Subsection 2.12.1, Public Open Space, above, for this text change.

The McAteer-Petris Act is discussed on EIR pp. III.9-III.11. The proposed recreation and public access features of the Proposed Project were reviewed against the Act and the policies in the Bay Plan prepared by BCDC pursuant to the Act, and no inconsistencies were found. This finding is based on the fact that the Proposed Project would provide continuous public open space along the shoreline and water access via a perimeter pathway on Treasure Island. The perimeter path on Treasure Island would be designed to satisfy the design requirements for the Bay Trail (see EIR Section IV.J, Recreation, p. IV.J.16). This perimeter pathway would link the future Cityside
Waterfront Park, Northern Shoreline Park, Eastern Shoreline Park and Pier 1, and Clipper Cove Promenade. A mixed-use Class I path along the causeway would connect the open spaces on Yerba Buena Island with those on Treasure Island and would also provide controlled public access down to Clipper Cove Beach. The Proposed Project also includes a circulation system that would allow residents, on-site employees, and visitors to access all parts of the Islands’ recreational network via the pedestrian and bicycle networks and public transit. The Proposed Project also includes a fare-free on-island shuttle with stops at major open space destinations, with possible extended routes to more distant open space destinations such as the Wilds and the Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District on both islands on weekends. Parking areas such as the one proposed at the Northern Shoreline Park would be provided at strategic locations to support activities such as kayaking, canoeing, sailboarding, sculling, rowing, or car-top sailing.

The existing recreational access point for boardsailing and other water-oriented recreation is an existing boat ramp at the north end of Treasure Island adjacent to the existing residential area (see EIR p. IV.J.4). Access to the recreational access point and nearby parking as well as the pedestrian pathway along the northern shoreline has been limited by the Navy and TIDA due to remediation activities in the area. This site is currently accessed under a special interim arrangement with the Navy and TIDA. Recreationalists are able to park along North Point Drive or Bayside Drive in the residential complex on the north end of the Treasure Island to access the perimeter pathway, preferably in front of unoccupied residential buildings to minimize disruption to existing tenants.

To help ensure that access to recreation and open space uses would be provided during construction phases, Mitigation Measure M-TR-1, Construction Traffic Management Plan, is revised. The following text is added to the first sentence of the last paragraph on EIR p. IV.E.69, continuing on p. IV.E.70 (new text is underlined):

> The Plan shall disseminate appropriate information to contractors and affected agencies with respect to coordinating construction activities to minimize overall disruptions and ensure that overall circulation on the Islands is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on ensuring pedestrian, transit, and bicycle connectivity and access to the Bay and to recreational uses to the extent feasible.

In recognition of the Bay Plan’s stated objective of reserving high-priority water-oriented land uses, development of the proposed Northern Shoreline Park would include improvements to the existing recreational access point for boardsailing and other small craft and an area for parking and loading (see also the response in Subsection 2.1.4.1, Recreation and Open Space, in Section 2.1, Project Description, of this Comments and Responses document). Additional detail for the Northern Shoreline Park and for each of the proposed park locations is provided in Table IV.J.1: Proposed Parks and Open Space, on EIR pp. IV.J.13-IV.J.14. The location of each of the proposed parks and open spaces is shown on Figure IV.J.1: Proposed Open Space, on EIR p. IV.J.15.
The proposed recreational access point for boardsailing and other water-oriented recreation is described in EIR Chapter II, Project Description, on pp. II.29-II.31, where it is stated that watercraft launch sites, including one at the existing boat launch location, would be among the amenities that would be improved or developed for the Northern Shoreline Park. The construction phasing and the accommodations made for the existing users and residents of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island are discussed in detail on EIR pp. II.79-II.82. Development activities at the existing boat launch site at the north end of Treasure Island would occur near the end of the 20-year construction period as part of the fourth phase. In the interim, access to the existing access point would be managed as part of the Construction Traffic Management Plan identified as Mitigation Measure M-TR-1, and would likely be limited by traffic lane closures that would necessitate rerouting (see EIR pp. IV.E.69-IV.E.71). See also information provided in the response in Subsection 2.2.4, BCDC Regulations, in Section 2.2, Plans and Policies, of this Comments and Responses document.

2.12.3 SAILING CENTER

Comment

Vol. 2, IV.J.4, Recreation: Why is the Treasure Island Sailing Center not listed under TI Rec Facilities? As a non-profit, volunteer-operated multi-use community sailing center, TISC offers sailing and boating safety to under-privileged adults and youth in the region. 1200 + inner-city youths, referred by Glide Memorial, Boys & Girls Club and inner-city agencies partake in the program each year. Why does the EIR fail to evaluate project impact on this social services resource? How is this Community Sailing Center impacted during construction, where is relocated? Please explain why the 2006 EIR for Transfer & Reuse of TI clearly identifies TISC and identifies its continued use in future reuse? Why does the current EIR fail to mention that it exists and also fails to identify its continued use in the future? (see attachment)

Vol. 2, IV.J.8, Recreation: In keeping with SF Bay Plan Recreation Policies IV.1 and IV.3 why does the EIR fail to evaluate diverse and accessible water-oriented recreational facilities, such as marinas, launch ramps, beaches and fishing piers? Why is the existing Clipper Cove Marina (100+ slips) not evaluated as an integral part of the recreational facilities? What are development impacts on this widely-popular marina which is a regional resource? (Kathrin Moore, San Francisco Planning Commission) [20.36]

Response

The analysis of recreational resources is focused on new facilities in the Proposed Project. The Clipper Cove Marina is an existing facility, and its expansion is not part of the Proposed Project. Expansion of the Marina was analyzed in the 2005 Final EIR, as explained in EIR Chapter II, Project Description, on pp. II.9-II.10. The expansion of the Marina is considered in cumulative analyses where appropriate (e.g., transportation – see Note 2 in Table IV.E.4: Person-Trip Generation by Land Use, in EIR Section IV.E, Transportation, p. IV.E.58), but is not part of the recreational facilities proposed to be developed as part of the Proposed Project. Landside
facilities for the Marina, including parking, restrooms, and laundry facilities, are part of the Proposed Project and are described on pp. II.10, II.16, and II.18 (in Table II.1: Proposed Development Plan). Improvements for the Clipper Cove Marina edge would occur during the second phase of construction (see EIR p. II.81). These landside facilities are included in the proposed land uses analyzed in the EIR.

The Treasure Island Sailing Center is also an existing facility; the Proposed Project includes replacement of the landside and waterside facilities for the Sailing Center. The EIR anticipates that about 15,000 sq. ft. of landside facilities would be constructed at the Sailing Center on a developable pad to be provided by Treasure Island Community Development, LLC, under the Disposition and Development Agreement with TIDA; landside facilities would include classrooms, restrooms, and other support facilities. Waterside improvements for the Sailing Center would include a new pier on pilings to accommodate two vessel launch and retrieval cranes, entry landings and gangways, and floating docks. Access to the existing recreational facilities at Clipper Cove Marina would be maintained to the extent feasible throughout the duration of the construction activities; however, public access could be restricted due to traffic lane closures and rerouting that would be developed as part of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (see Mitigation Measure M-TR-1, on EIR pp. IV.E.69-IV.E.71 and the revision to this measure in the response in Section 2.12.2, above).

The impacts of constructing these facilities are analyzed in appropriate sections of EIR Chapter IV, Environmental Setting and Impacts (see the response in Subsection 2.1.5, Bay Fill, in Section 2.1, Project Description, of this Comments and Responses document). Impacts of construction on existing facilities on the Islands, including the Marina and Sailing Center, are addressed in each of the topics analyzed in EIR Chapter IV, Environmental Setting and Impacts.

2.12.4 USERS

Comment

The FEIR should clarify whether the area dedicated for parks and open space takes into account the demands of visitors besides residents and employees, e.g., those using the bicycle and pedestrian trails, hotel guests, and retail customers, as well as visitors to the open spaces. (Karen Weiss, Coastal Program Analyst, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission) [17.12]

Response

As identified in EIR Chapter II, Project Description, on p. II.4, one of the project objectives is to improve access to and from the Islands to maximize the opportunities for City and Bay Area residents to use the projected 300 acres of TIDA-owned recreational areas and public open spaces. The Islands are expected to be a future destination for recreational, retail, commercial, and cultural activities. Activities such as the Treasure Island Music Festival, which draws visitors
from throughout the Bay Area, are expected to continue. Additionally, the travel demand analysis shows that the Sports Park and other parks and open spaces would be expected to generate approximately 995 trips by off-island users during the Saturday peak and approximately 355 during the typical weekday PM peak.\(^1\) Thus, the Islands are expected to generate visitors from the City and the Bay Area region. The EIR analysis does not break down recreation and open space users by their residential location; however, as discussed in EIR Section IV.J, Recreation, on EIR pp. IV.J.5-IV.J.6, a parkland-to-population ratio, based on daytime population, is used to measure whether the land set aside for recreational areas and public open space is sufficient to meet the Project demand for recreational resources. This ratio would typically account for a daytime population consisting of future residents of the Islands who remain there during the workday and future employees who would travel from other parts of the City or Bay Area to work on the Islands. The analysis of parks-to-population ratio in this EIR does not estimate how many new residents would work off the Islands and not use the open space during the day or the number of employees who would travel to the Islands for work and could use the open space during the day. Instead, this ratio assumes that all residents who live on the Islands would also work on the Islands, which, based on commute patterns, is not likely. In other words, the proportion of Island residents who would commute to other parts of the City and/or Bay Area for work is the proxy for potential visitors who would come to the Islands during the daytime from other parts of the City and/or Bay Area. Thus, the analysis provides a conservative assessment of the total number of daytime users who could potentially use the proposed parks and open space. As stated on EIR p. IV.J.19, the daytime parks and open space-to-population ratio would be about 14 acres per 1,000 employees and residents, which is 75 percent higher than the current Citywide ratio of about 8 acres of parks and open space per 1,000 residents. Therefore, the Proposed Project would accommodate additional demand from visitors, retail customers, tourists, hotel guests, bicyclists, and pedestrians who come from outside the City.

The demand generated for recreation and open space on the Islands by residents in other parts of the City, as well as reasonably foreseeable park and public open space likely to be constructed in other developing areas in the City, are considered in the evaluation of the cumulative impacts on recreational resources (see EIR pp. IV.J.26-IV.J.27).

Pursuant to CEQA and to the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR’s analysis of impacts on recreational resources is focused on Project-related impacts, e.g., population growth that could lead to the physical deterioration or degradation of existing recreational resources and whether the construction of the proposed new recreational resources would have physical effects on the environment. A variety of types of recreational resources are proposed that would attract regionwide users, e.g., the Sports Park and the Great Park on Treasure Island and the Senior

\(^1\) Fehr & Peers, Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan Transportation Impact Study, July 7, 2010, Table 18- Net Person-Trip Generation by Land Use, p. 72. A copy of the Transportation Impact Study is included as EIR Appendix C.
Officers’ Quarters Historic District and Hilltop Park on Yerba Buena Island, and that would serve on-Island demand from residents and employees, e.g., publicly accessible neighborhood-serving parks. As described on EIR pp. IV.J.18-IV.J.19 and p. IV.J.27, the provision of 300 acres of recreational space and public open space is expected to be sufficient to meet the demand generated by the residents and employees on the Islands and would also benefit residents from other parts of the City and the region by augmenting the amount of available recreational areas and open space.

2.12.5 IMPACTS

2.12.5.1 Impacts on Yerba Buena Island and Clipper Cove Beach

Comment

At the first DRB review of this project, the Board raised a concerned regarding the potential impact on the 0.5-acre beach adjacent to Clipper Cove on YBI. Section IV.J Impact RE-2 states that there will be a less than significant impact on existing recreational facilities on the whole. However, an additional 18,640 residences, plus employee and visitors, may have a significant impact on the 0.5-acre beach and surrounding areas, including access and parking to the beach. The FEIR should address specific impacts to the 0.5-acre beach, as well as any improvements in the area to create safe access to and from the beach. (Karen Weiss, Coastal Program Analyst, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission) [17.13]

Response

The projected increase in the daytime population (employees and residents) on the Islands, identified in EIR Section IV.J, Recreation, on pp. IV.J.19 under Impact RE-2, would result in increased use of recreational areas and open spaces on the Islands including the Clipper Cove Beach Park. Improvements to Clipper Cove Beach Park would be minimal and subject to the Yerba Buena Island Habitat Management Plan, which is aimed at preservation, restoration, and continued stewardship of the ecological resources on Yerba Buena Island (see EIR Chapter II, Project Description, pp. II.31-II.32). The draft Design for Development indicates that a parking lot would be located southeast of the Clipper Cove Beach Park and a shoreline trail would link the Beach Park to the Hilltop Park and to Treasure Island.

As discussed on EIR pp. IV.J.5-IV.J.6, a parkland-to-population ratio is used to assess whether the land set aside for recreational areas and public open space would be sufficient to meet demand. The population figure in this ratio is the daytime population, which consists of residents and employees (and assumes that all residents work on the Islands, which is not likely and thus presents a conservative assessment). As noted on EIR p. IV.J.6, the Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan recognizes that geographic limits make it difficult to achieve the National Parks and Recreation Association’s parkland-to-population standard of 10 acres per 1,000 persons within the City limits. The existing and future parkland-to-population ratios on the Islands are identified on EIR pp. IV.J.5 and IV.J.19, respectively. The future ratio (upon
completion of the Proposed Project in 2030) of parkland to population is expected to be about 14 acres of parkland for each 1,000 persons. The future parkland-to-population ratio would exceed the existing and recommended Citywide parkland-to-population ratio (8 acres per 1,000 persons [see EIR p. IV.J.5]). Therefore, as the EIR concludes, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant impact due to overuse of or deterioration of open space. Water-oriented recreation areas are included in the Proposed Project in addition to the small beach along the south edge of Clipper Cove. The Proposed Project includes improvements such as parking areas and a warming hut near the existing boat launch facility at the north end of Treasure Island, and a second water-oriented recreation area at the northwest corner of that island. These new or improved water recreation areas would help to reduce the burden on the Yerba Buena Island beach.

As described on EIR pp. IV.J.26-IV.J.27, when the proposed 300 acres of recreational areas and open space become available and are included with existing and future City, State, and Federal recreational areas and open space, the existing and future residents of San Francisco and the Bay Area (including those on the Islands) would be expected to have an increased amount and increased diversity of recreational resources available for use. Nonetheless, the recreational activities of future residents and employees would be distributed among the diverse City-serving, district-serving, neighborhood-serving, or sub-neighborhood-serving recreational opportunities that would be available, e.g., trail hiking in the Wilds or along the perimeter of Treasure Island, safe access points along the Northern Shoreline Park for water-related recreation, athletic fields, playgrounds for active recreation, and open spaces for passive recreation. Thus, as discussed on EIR pp. IV.J.17 and IV.J.27, there would be sufficient acreage of recreational areas and open spaces on the Islands, in the City, and in the region to accommodate demand, including the demand for use of the Clipper Cove Beach Park. As a result, the deterioration and degradation of recreational resources such as the 0.5-acre Clipper Cove Beach Park would not be expected to occur. TIDA as Trustee has statutory obligations to protect Trust lands and would actively manage Clipper Cove Beach to minimize impacts through education, stewardship programs, and controlled access (e.g. signage and wildlife fencing) in certain areas as appropriate to protect sensitive areas. TIDA would also be responsible for ensuring that the beach is managed in a manner that is consistent with the proposed Yerba Buena Island Habitat Management Plan (see EIR Chapter II, Project Description, pp. II.31-II.32).

In terms of safe access and parking for residents and employees of the Islands, the formation of the Treasure Island Transportation Management Agency and the implementation of transportation demand management measures as the primary means to encourage transit and other modes, discourage automobile use, and manage parking on the Islands are discussed in EIR Chapter II, Project Description, on p. II.5, and in EIR Section IV.E, Transportation, on p. IV.E.45. Improved bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access would be developed to ensure that residents and on-site
employees, as well as City and regionwide residents, have improved accessibility to all the Islands’ destinations, including recreational areas and open spaces.

2.12.6 FUTURE ATHLETIC FIELD OPERATORS

Comment

And it is from that perspective that I speak from the 40 acres of athletic sports fields. Our organization have and represent thousands of kids in San Francisco and the Bay Area, through our own organization, the Boys and Girl Club, Rhythm and Moves, CYO, YMCA, et cetera. I want -- the kids in San Francisco are literally crying out for quality playing fields.

Two years ago our own organization was at a crossroads. We were on the verge of dying. So we took an enormous leap of faith and developed 15 acres of derelict land that was a blight on the island of Treasure Island, and converted it into 15 acres of pristine athletic fields at zero cost to the City of San Francisco, where it was an estimated cost to our own organization of $5 million. These fields have been an enormous benefit to the kids of San Francisco and the Bay Area, and indeed the disadvantaged kids of the island.

In collaboration with TIDI and the City of San Francisco, we also built a 10,000-square-foot playing structure for the kids on the island. The fields have been the site for several local regional international tournaments, which has resulted in millions of dollars of revenue to the City of San Francisco. (Patrick Huniacke, GAA Athletic Association) [TR.14.2]

Response

The existing recreational resources on Treasure Island, including the regular and youth rugby fields recently developed by San Francisco Gaelic Athletic Association, are identified in EIR Section IV.J, Recreation, on EIR p. IV.J.4. The proposed regional sports complex of 25 to 40 acres, identified in Table IV.J.1: Proposed Parks and Open Space, on EIR p. IV.J.13 and discussed on EIR p. IV.J.17, would provide tournament-level facilities to replace and expand upon the existing fields. Additionally, the provision of these facilities, including soccer pitches, baseball diamonds, and other athletic fields, would assist the City in meeting the existing unmet demand for 35 additional soccer fields and 30 additional sports and athletic fields identified in the Recreation Assessment report prepared by the Recreation and Park Department. The majority of the existing recreational resources on Treasure Island would be affected during the latter stages of construction (see the response in Subsection 2.12.1, Public Open Space, above). To the extent feasible, TIDA will continue to work with existing recreational users to provide access and maintain operations of these facilities during buildout of the Proposed Project. TIDA will also work with existing recreational users to identify potential opportunities for them to participate in the development, programming, and operations of the proposed recreational program contemplated by the Proposed Project. This comment does not address the adequacy or accuracy of the EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
2.12.7 RECREATIONAL USES

Comment

And I certainly want to put an emphasis on recreational uses, which we are sadly lacking in acreage for. (Michael Antonini, Planning Commission) [TR.19.2]

Response

As described in EIR Section IV.J, Recreation, on pp. IV.J.26-IV.J.27, the diverse array of TIDA-owned recreational areas and public open space that would occupy approximately 300 acres of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island would help to address the shortage of sufficient recreational space in the City. The comment does not address the adequacy or accuracy of the EIR; therefore, no further response is required.