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COMMISSIONER SECRETARY: We thank you for your patience during the time that we are trying to get our technical difficulties resolved.

Before I take roll, let me just remind everyone to turn off your pagers, your cell phones, any electronic devices that may sound off during the proceedings. When speaking before the Commission, the joint bodies, please speak directly into the microphone, approximately, three to six inches away, and we ask that you state and spell your last name for the record.

Roll call for the planning commission.

Ron Miguel?

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Here.

COMMISSIONER SECRETARY: Christina Olague.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: Here.

COMMISSIONER SECRETARY: Michael Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Present.

COMMISSIONER SECRETARY: Gwyneth Borden.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Here.

COMMISSIONER SECRETARY: Kathrin Moore.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Here.
Commissioner Secretary: Bill Sugaya.
Commissioner Sugaya: Here.
Commissioner Secretary: And Bill Lee.
Commissioner Lee: Here.
Commissioner Secretary: Thank you. TIHDI, President Owen Stevens.
Commissioner Stevens: Here.
Commissioner Secretary: Claudine Cheng.
Board Member Cheng: Here.
Commissioner Secretary: John Elberling.
Board Member Elberling: Here.
Commissioner Secretary: Helen Nigg.
Commissioner Nigg: Here.
Commissioner Secretary: John Rahaim.
Commission Rahaim: Here.
Commissioner Secretary: John Paul Samaha.
Board Member Samaha: Here.
Commissioner Secretary: Thank you, Commissioners.
Commissioners, the first -- this is a single-subject calendar. The item before the joint body is Case No. 2007.0903E, Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Project. This is a public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.
MR. COOPER: Good morning, Presidents Miguel
and President Stevens, and members of the Commission and
Board. I am Rick Cooper, from the Major Environmental
Analysis Section of the Planning Department.

As you know, this is a hearing to receive
comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for
the proposed Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island
Development Project.

As you have heard in greater detail in
previous presentations, the proposed project, which
would be carried out by the master developer, Treasure
Island Community Development, LLC, would include
development on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island,
following transfer from the Navy of up to 8,000
residential units, up to 140,000 square feet of new
commercial and retail space, up to 100,000 square feet
of new office space, adaptive reuse of three historic
buildings on Treasure Island, with up to 311,000 square
feet of commercial, retail or flex space. About 500
hotel rooms.

Rehabilitation of the historic buildings on
Yerba Buena Island. New or upgraded public and
community facilities, new or upgraded public utilities.
About 300 acres of parks and public open space,
including shoreline access and cultural use, such as a
museum. New and upgraded streets and public ways.
Bicycle, transit, and pedestrian facilities.
Landside and waterside facilities for the
Treasure Island Sailing Center. Landside services for
an expanded marina, and a new ferry terminal and
intramodal hub -- excuse me, transit hub. Construction
and buildout of the proposed Development Plan would be
phased and would be anticipated to occur over an
approximately 15-to-20-year period.

The Draft EIR identifies potentially
significant, unavoidable environmental impacts on
esthetics, historical architectural resources,
transportation, noise, air quality, wind, and biological
resources.

Please note that staff is not here today to
answer comments on the Draft EIR today. All comments
made today will be transcribed and responded to in
writing in the Comments and Responses Document, which
will respond to all verbal and written comments received
and make revisions to the Draft EIR, as appropriate.

I would like to remind all speakers that this
is not a hearing to consider approval or disapproval of
the proposed project. Approval hearings will follow
final EIR certification. Your comments today should be
confined to the adequacy and accuracy of information and
analysis contained in the Draft EIR.

I would also like to request that you speak as slowly and clearly as possible so that the court reporter can produce an accurate transcript of today's hearing. Also, commenters should state their name and address so they can be properly identified, and they can then receive a copy of the Comments and Responses Document when it is completed.

After hearing comments from the general public, we will also receive any comments on the Draft EIR by the members of the Commission and Board.

The public comment period for this project -- for this EIR began on July 12, 2010 and extends until 5:00 p.m. on August 26, 2010.

The Historic Preservation Commission held a hearing on the Draft EIR on August 4th, at which time it determined that it had no comment on the Draft EIR. However, members of the Commission did express their desire for the project to include a monument to those who served on the island during its military period, perhaps employing some materials salvaged from that era, such as the cannon that is now placed at the entrance to Treasure Island. At that hearing, the project sponsor readily agreed to pursue this project element.

This concludes my presentation, unless the
Commission or Board members have any questions, we can open the public hearing.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. The project, staff?

All right.

PANEL SPEAKER: We have no additional comments.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: There are a number of speaker cards. When I call your name, if you would line up in the center aisle, I would appreciate it.


(10 MINUTE-INTERVAL WITHOUT AUDIO)

COMMISSIONER SECRETARY: Mr. Choden, excuse me for interrupting, but the court reporter is having a very difficult time picking you up. Can you speak a little louder?

PANEL SPEAKER: I don't think the microphone is turned on.

COMMISSIONER SECRETARY: Oh, there we go.

NEW SPEAKER CARD MR. CHODEN

MR. CHODEN: That's so much better. All right, I'll repeat. I'm Bernard Choden, and I'm a San
Francisco Tomorrow, representing, in effect, the question of whether due diligence has been exercised regarding title to Treasure Island, that must be cleared in accord with the federal law, the Arkansas Act of 1850 that said that lands below mean high tide, including state Louisiana, Texas -- belong to states of Louisiana, Texas, Florida -- belong to the State of California forever in perpetuity. Clearing that title is for most because the mitigations that will be required to pay for the -- for the environmental defects of the island will not be operable. Also federal laws will either put certain operational constraints that need to be cleared first, then you can do your job.

My second question deals with my background as an architectural engineer, as to whether there's sufficient test regarding compaction of the sand with regard, for example, the Loma Prieta earthquake, that under very mild conditions caused much of the piping on the island to float to liquefaction. In fact, if one has satisfaction, liquefaction, you've got your answer. But in a severe earthquake this, in effect, proposal will not stand. And I thank you, and if you haven't enough copies, there is the various legal correspondence that I had, as a representative of the State regarding the heirity of the title. You can pass that up to them.
PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MR. CHODEN: Thank you for your attention.

NEW SPEAKER CARD MR. COLEN

MR. COLEN: Good morning, I am Tim Colen, executive director of the San Francisco Housing Action Coalition. We've been following this project for a couple of years now, and are very excited about it. I think that this project, as much as any we've seen, is going to push the envelope, really expand what's possible, and where the direction of new housing and new community and design and balance is going to go in the United States.

One of the curious features about the island, its relative isolation in terms of its connection to the bridge and the rest is actually, I think, going to turn out to be a huge plus for it, because of the way the project is approaching transportation and minimizing the influence of the CAB.

We love this project, and we hope that it will move forward as quickly as possible. We're heartbroken about the current economic conditions that are holding it back. I think that anything you can do to move it forward quickly is all to the good.

Thanks an awful lot.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.
Manny Flores, Sherry Williams, Paul Currier, Nick Rossi.

NEW SPEAKER CARD MR. FLORES

MR. FLORES: Thank you. My name is Manny Flores, F-L-O-R-E-S, Carpenters Local 22. Obviously, we are here in full support of the project. I mean, it's a no-brainer. We're excited about it, and we'd like to plant the seed now and get going. We currently -- we're already out that as it is. The United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, we have a -- we're in partners with the Job Corp out there, so we currently have a training facility going out there, and bring us some classes there. So we've already landed, we just need -- bring the jobs in and we are currently looking for more women for our program, also. So with that, we will look for your blessing with the project of the Treasure Island. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MS. WILLIAMS

MS. WILLIAMS: Morning, Commissioners. I'm -- for the record, I'm Sherry Williams, executive director of the Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative known as TIHDI. We're very supportive of the redevelopment plan for Treasure Island and are pleased to make some comments today.
As the next milestone, the Draft EIR is before you. The plan represents real opportunities to provide housing and jobs for 4 million homeless and very low income San Franciscans. EIR cites both the housing that will be available for TIHDI and the job opportunities that will be created through redevelopment. We look forward to both expanding the number of formerly homeless people who will now have a place to call home, as well as those who will earn income through the TI Redevelopment.

A key component of this for us is that none of our existing residents will be displaced. All will have an opportunity for replacement housing. In the land-use section of the EIR, it states that TIHDI occupies the fitness center and gymnasium. For the record, we no longer operate the gym. It's operated by the YMCA. However, we do use the former fitness center as a community center, and this is a critical resource for existing residents. It is a site of numerous community meetings and events, a weekly food pantry program, a computer lab and workshops. It provides a venue for residents to come together as a community.

The EIR cites that there is space allocated for community center and redevelopment, and we're very pleased to see this. While we're in an interim phase on
the island now, over the past 13 or so years, we have tried to create and support community by providing, at least, basic services, such as childcare, youth programming, recreational programming, and so on. It's very important to us and we believe the future of the new Treasure Island community to have such services in place and to plan for them.

We're assuming at this point that the 480,500 square feet allocated to the community center and the 30,000 square feet for community services will be used to support everything from youth programming to a wellness center to a general purpose community center, like we have currently. It will be important to keep these basic services in place to support existing residents, as construction occurs, and until their replacements are developed.

So, again, we're very supportive of the project, and we, too, are looking forward to it moving forward and implemented. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MR. ROSSI

MR. ROSSI: Nick Rossi. I represent Ken Masters in co-counsel with Rupert Hanson of Cox, Wootten, Griffin, Hansen and Poulos. I have reviewed the Draft EIR and I have the following comments.
We believe that there's no mechanism for the maintenance of the perimeter berm. It wasn't stated. It's not addressed under the Hazards and Hydrology section. And like other structures, like levies that serve the purpose of flood and storm weather control, berms are regulated to ensure they are maintained.

Future operations and maintenance should -- I am constrained by the three minutes.

We believe that the future operation and maintenance should be included in the project description, and further analysis should be evaluated. In the previous staff reports, and I reference you to the addendum to the Commission meeting for Friday June 2nd, 2012 -- 2009, North Coast District, Item F4A, Local Coastal Program Amendment, No. CRCMAJ-1-09, Costo Norday.

For the SUMI Reliance design purposes, a minimum sea level rate of 3 feet per century is going to be used. You mention in the report that the Tsunami hazards should account for sea levels of 3 to 6 feet per century; however, the project plans are accommodating only 36 inches of sea level rise plus an additional 6 inches of freeboard. You can find this reference in the Hydrology and Water Quality page, section 4, No. 29. However, we believe it won't be adequate for the
life time of the project.

No definitive publication has been produced in
the report that addresses the sea level rise, making it
impossible to determine the appropriate height. It's
conceivable that during the lifetime of the project, the
sea level may increase more than the project design.
Sea level is especially problematic for Treasure Island.

No. 2. We believe that the Coastal
Commission, because this project involves rezoning and
general plan amendments, a discussion of its
requirements should have been included and it was
omitted. Under Government Code Section 65860A, it
requires that the land uses that are authorized by the
ordinances be compatible with the policies, objectives,
programs, in general, and specific uses of the general
plan. And we think the omission of the Coastal
Commission's involvement is a serious violation of that.

And I've mentioned before, Treasure Island,
being located in a Tsunami location, we don't think the
emergency response plan adequately addresses that, nor
does it provide for drills or practical responses.

With respect to the Waste Water Proposal
Discussion, as you may know, the Regional Water Quality
Board will permit a new facility. However, there has
not been a proper discussion of the waste reduction, as
required under the Waste Management Act of 1989. And that plays right into the greenhouse discussion, and we would like to have a further study of how the greenhouse gasses are going to be studied with respect to the waste reduction. May I have one more minute?

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you, Mr. Currier. (sic) As you know the time for -- I'm sorry.

MR. ROSSI: May I have sixty more seconds?

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: You may not. I'm sorry. As you know comments may be received in writing until the 26th of this month. So, certainly, you and anyone else should feel free to submit those. They'll be considered just as oral comments.

MR. ROSSI: I will do that.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MR. ROSSI: And with a parting shot, I will just say that Regional Housing needs allocation --

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MR. ROSSI: -- which has not been properly studied under the --

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MR. CURRIER

MR. CURRIER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Paul Currier. I'm an internet committee organizer, and some of the people that are
going to be watching this video know me nationwide as
one of the Obama organizers, and a candidate for mayor
in San Francisco in 2011. And I'm speaking in the
public house on behalf of the public interest, and I'm a
little shocked.

It's nice to be here in a room that's owned by
the people of the City and County of San Francisco.
It's nice to see you people honor the supervisor's
chambers of the elected representatives, and using this
facility courteously for the planning and development of
Treasure Island.

I'd like to ask a simple question. Are we
going to charge ourselves for what we already own, or
are we going to delegate that to corporations to charge
us rent for the resources that are already ours? Is
that what we're going to do here? Or are we going to
disrespect the fact that this property was already owned
by the federal government, and there's a claim -- a
title claim that one of the other gentlemen has already
spoken to today.

We're going to disregard the people of the
City and the State of California and the claims of the
Coastal Commission to regulate the coastal properties
and waters of the State of California. We going to do
that? That's what we're going to do? I caution us to
pay attention to what's going on here. I want to speak about three simple concepts. One is them is called secrecy. The next one is called craft. Another one is called corruption. Maybe some of you have profited from this, maybe not. How come there's no inspector general function in any of this?

We're privatizing 150 acres in the City and County of San Francisco. There's money at stake here. This is public property. Where's the cops? Where's the oversight? Secrecy. I went into the Planning Commission. Actually went down there yesterday, and they sent me to another department, and I was actually able to get two volumes. I just brought one here so everybody could see, this is one. It references two more, called the Planning Guide or the Design for Development. And those other two documents, that means four, they're not available online.

Why call for sunshine? How come they're not available online? How come I can't go online and look at the pictures of the high-rises of the Financial District that you guys are proposing to build in the middle of the Bay? How come the people from Berkeley and Alameda and Sacramento and Stockton and Tracy can't look at what the Bay Bridge will look like when we lose the view of the Golden Gate when they drive into San
Francisco? How come people can't see that? How come the secrecy? Maybe it's because there's a lot of money in those high-rise developments; right?

I want to close with a concept. It appears that we have an organized theft of public property going on with a process of methodology, where incrementally we meet and we take this, we take that, we take this, we take that, and then 30 to 50 years, what's going to be left? Treasure Island's a gem. It belongs to the people of the Bay Area as much as it -- it has concerns for supervisor of District 6. Hopefully the next supervisor will speak up to this. I'm surprised Chris Daily hasn't been more vocal.

I actually don't think that the Environmental Impact Report should be approved until it's been open to the sunshine and people in the City and County of San Francisco and the people of the State of California can look at what you guys are doing. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

Richard Wellers, Ken Masters, Tony Gantner, Karen Weiss.

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MR. WELLER

MR. WELLER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Richard Wellers. I represent the Pile Drivers, Local 34 in Northern California, all 46
counties. We have a long history of developments since the Gold Rush to the war docks and so on, to heavy foundation for all the buildings in San Francisco. I'm not here to pontificate to the negative or to the positive, but to the facts that the jobs that are needed in the entire California. It's a known fact that for every construction worker employed it creates many residual jobs in the process. The engineering feeds in this era and day, if they can put people on the moon and drive trains under the Bay, I am sure we can support Treasure Island to the fact of -- to be a positive addition to the San Francisco area.

A bit of trivia. I worked on the dock on the west side of Treasure Island in the mid '80s that was supposed to dock the Missouri. In that dock is the longest one-piece continuous prestressed piling in the world at that time. I am very confident of the engineering abilities of this area in the world. We can support Treasure Island with many new jobs. It would also create jobs, full-time jobs, other than construction work. I thank you very much for your time.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MS. WEISS

MS. WEISS: Hi, my name is Karen Weiss, W-E-I-S-S, and I am speaking on behalf of the Bay...
Conservation and Development Commission. And I just wanted to draw attention to a letter that was written by our executive director, Will Travis, in support of the project and in support of the work that TIHDI has done with us on sea level rise. And also the letter written by the governor in support of the project, as well.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MS. WEISS: Oh, and also that we will be providing further comments written, written comments before the time period ends.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you very much.

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MR. MASTERS

MR. MASTERS: I am Ken Masters, M-A-S-T-E-R-S. I hope you enjoyed Nick's three minutes. I probably paid about $2,000 for getting him down here and stating that. You know, time and time again, the voice of the residents of the island have been shut down. My opposition to this plan really starts with the contradiction in the Mission Statement, which is, includes to create community and identity, when actually this is going to destroy the community and identity that exists on Yerba Buena Island today.

And also the precedence that this creates, further empowers certain developers and politicians, and
weakens the individuals and communities in San Francisco. Just as an example, I had to call -- I called 15 law firms before I found an attorney. All of them had conflicts. All of them. How does an individual get access to justice if every law firm doesn't want to take a case, either because they're already employed by the developers or the city, or because they just think it's bad for business.

Furthermore, there's a council member, I can't remember who it was, but stated what I hope will be a career limiting opinion, that there are no "Nimbies" on Treasure Island. It's insulting to a ten-year resident and to the community created and supported by the residents of YBI. We have no representation on the council. Where is Chris Daily? Chris Daily has been absent for how long?

Furthermore, the Relocation Plan, as it stands today, will tear us apart. It will scatter us out onto Treasure Island indefinitely, not keep us together as a group, and then make it so onerous that we have no interest in staying. For example, I'm expected to move from a three-bedroom apartment with my wife to a one-bedroom on Treasure Island. And then after, that prices out of YBI after development. Why not designate land on Yerba Buena Island that will accommodate the
residents who live there today? If we know we have
somewhere to come back to, we can take care of ourselves
during the redevelopment. We'll be fine.

Furthermore, the CAB has failed us. The CAB
ignored us and shut us out. Each time I attended a CAB,
after listening to hours and hours of, you know, no
representation, watching the one resident on Yerba Buena
Island, who is on the council -- or the board, who
joined just, what, six months ago, condescending, kind
of like expressions and, you know, eye rolling every
time he speaks about our concerns. And then finally
residential --

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MR. MASTERS: Thank you.

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MR. GANTNER

MR. GANTNER: Commissioners, good morning.

Tony Gantner. For many, it is startling to see the
nearly 600-foot One Rincon loam next to the Bay Bridge
approach. What would it like to see, a series of
towers, including one higher than One Rincon -- Treasure
Island. Are we not comfortable with the historic scale
of the buildings currently on the island? Is this not
something to be maintained? Do we really want to alter
the island profile with towers jetting up from the Bay,
including a central tower exceeding the height of the
Bay Bridge?

And we should not forget the impact of the Loma Prieta earthquake on the island. The Army Corp of Engineers dredged several hundred million cubic yards of material, most of it sand, from the bottom of the Bay to build the island. During the Loma Prieta earthquake, there were unmistakable signs of soil liquefaction and numerous gas, sewage and water line breaks. Round motion was among the strongest recorded in the Bay Area, despite being 60 miles from the epicenter.

This may pale in comparison to what could happen during a similar if not more powerful quake along either the San Andreas or Hayward Faults with an epicenter closer than Loma Prieta.

As the 1990 report compiled for the Navy warned, such a quake could cause substantially more severe shaking on the island, and that liquefaction could be expected to be widespread. Be wary of terms like geotechnological stabilization, when the forces of nature are so great in an artificial island so weak. A liveable, sustainable and safe Treasure Island does not need high-rises. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

Melanie (sic) Williams, Michael Lynes, Kate Kelley, Holli Bert.
MS. WILLIAMS: Good morning. Hi, my name is Melanie Williams. I live at 1215 Bayside Drive on Treasure Island. I have been a resident since 1999, and I am just here to speak on behalf of that. I really appreciate all what you all are doing to fix up the island because when we first came out there I was pregnant with my son and it wasn't nothing. And I really want to see something really nice. I want to see the bridge. I want to see other families, like me, because I have been there for a long time, for my son to go places, to go on a ferry.

So I just really appreciate what you all are doing, and I just want to make sure that everybody could come together on the island, because it's a beautiful place. There's some schools. You know, we have community meetings. The programs are out there. And where I come from is a better place for me to be. So I am glad that you all could get together, put the work together, and make it a happy home for the families.

Thank you so much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MR. LYNES: Hello, my name is Mike Lynes. I am the conservation director with the Golden Gate
Audubon Society, and I'm here to present some oral comments on behalf of the society. Written comments will follow. One of the things I want to start with -- we're going to hear a lot of comments throughout this process about overall support for the project, and I would ask the commissioners and the redevelopment agency to always, at this point, just remember that we need a good Environmental Impact Report. And concerns about the EIR do not reflect our opposition, necessarily, to the project.

But I also don't want to see what's happened in some of the other projects that have been before the City recently, where the push for jobs and the push for redevelopment, while justified, have outweighed the environmental concerns and the creation of an adequate EIR. If an adequate EIR is produced right now, then we can get to creating those jobs and improving housing quicker. But if you compromise and produce inadequate EIR, then it's going to lead to additional conflicts and delays that aren't necessary.

So I would ask you to take a hard look and not just be pushed by the politics and the money, to push through an EIR that's inadequate at this point. San Francisco has made some recent positive gains for the environment, particularly, the mayor's recent proposed
legislation to improve energy efficiency on buildings, and Supervisor McCready's proposal to ban plastic bags in the City. These are both good benefits for San Francisco, and continue, I think, a history of trying to attend to environmental matters.

But one constant that has been missing in this City has been protection of wildlife and habitats. It's always a secondary or tertiary consideration in any of these. And the EIR should address those. The EIR is adequate in saying that the habitat, particularly on Yerba Buena Island, has been compromised, but there are still very valuable habitat types out there. Coastal scrub, coastal riparian, the near intertidal zones, offshore eel grass, and each of these will be -- will suffer impacts because of the proposed project. The EIR concedes these, but says that each of them is less than significant.

We would ask that the drafters of the EIR look at the written comments that are proposed and also really ask itself whether these, the mitigations that are proposed, really do reduce it to a less-than-significant impact. We understand that if it were to find that there were significant impact that has economic impacts for the project overall, but, again, we're talking about the sufficiency of the EIR and the
sufficiency of the review. And we ask the Planning
Department, the Commission, ultimately, not be
compromised by pushes to push the project through and
result in inadequate descriptions of impact and
inadequate mitigations.

A particular concern to the Audubon Society
are the impacts, the unavoidable impacts to birds. The
first and easiest one to identify is the massive
increase in population on the island, itself. There is
no doubt by increasing the population overall --

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MR. LYNES: Thank you for your time.

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MS. KELLEY

MS. KELLEY: Good morning. My name is Kate
Kelley, K-E-L-L-E-Y, and I represent Sierra Club. I'm
the chapter director for the local chapter of the Sierra
Club. First of all, I want to say that we support
development on Treasure Island. We are not opposed to
development on the island, but we want to make sure that
the development is the proper development, and it's so
important.

We have some serious concerns about the
transportation plan, about the habitat preservation, air
quality issues, and impact on climate change, as well as
many other issues. Our request today, and I'll be very
brief, is that you please consider and we respectfully request a two-week extension on the public comment period for the Draft EIR.

It's a very long and complicated document, and we, along with many other organizations who have an interest in this development, are not a staff-driven organization. We don't have large staffs the way that the City and the developers do. We rely on our volunteers, and our volunteers have jobs. They have families, they have other commitments, travel commitments. And the short duration of this public comment period is inadequate for all of the issues that need to be addressed to be adequately addressed. So we respectfully request a two-week extension on the public comment period.

Thank you very much for your time.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MS. BERT

MS. BERT: Hi, my name is Holli Bert. I am an organizer with the local Bay Chapter of the Sierra Club, and I also want to encourage the planning commission to extend the time for public comment.

You know, this is -- it's vital that the San Francisco community have adequate time to address their concerns and ask questions of you about the project.
You know, looking back at the Hunter's Point Candlestick Redevelopment Project, it received two months' worth of public comment. And I think it's important that a project of this magnitude also gets the same amount of time for public comment. You know, I think with the lessons learned from that project, we really need to be able to give it the time it deserves. And, you know, it is important that the project move forward, with the best project that it can be, one that benefits the community as a whole.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

Pat Huniacke.

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MR. HUNIACKE

MR. HUNIACKE: Good morning, Commissioners.

My name is Patrick Huniacke with GAA Athletic Association. And we're in full support of this project because of the many positive aspects to it. Community housing, open space, jobs, et cetera. However, what we like about this development is the very favorable ratio of open space to development. Out of the 420 acres, I believe 300 acres are designated as open space. Wetlands, urban farm, flatland, and 40 acres of athletic fields.

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 TIHDI 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. In view of the enormous voluntary, human and
financial, investment, we have made on behalf of our
kids and the young adults in the Bay Area, and because
of the regional nature of our fields, we request that
our usage of the existing athletic fields be interpreted
as being compliant with the requirements of the
Tidelands Trust.

It is also our wish that when these, the
40-acre fields are complete, that the proposed 40-acre
fields are complete, that provision be made or
legislation drafted, to keep amateur and voluntary and
community-based organizations, such as ourselves, be a
permanent part of the proposed athletic fields. We are,
having said all of that, we are in full support of the
EIR.

Thank you very, very much for your time.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

Is there additional public comment?

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MR. KOPPEL

MR. KOPPEL: Hi. Good morning, Commissioners,
President Miguel, President Stevens. My name is Joel
Koppel, K-O-P-P-E-L. Let me first give you a personal
opinion as a District 4 homeowner and musician. I
really look forward to going to the Treasure Island
Music Festival every year, and the island has
surprisingly good acoustics. And I think it's very
healthy for the social environment out there on the island.

Also, I do represent the San Francisco Electrical Construction Industry. I have been intimately involved in discussions about this project through the mayor's office, with attendance in the Solar Power Task Force and the Wind Power Task force, and we're often addressing issues for Treasure Island and its importance. Like Bay View Hunter's Point and Park Merced, we're dealing with a very sizeable plot, which we don't usually encounter with projects in San Francisco. So we're really looking to utilize the land for wind power technology, and other renewable clean sources of energy, like solar power and energy storage.

So really, really thrilled just to be part of the project and really looking forward to building and installing our new Treasure Island.

Thanks.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MR. BLOOM

MR. BLOOM: Commissioners, nice to see you again. My name is Sal Bloom. I am the executive director of archeology. I was an original member of the Treasure Island Reuse Authority way back when, and one of the founding members of the Treasure Island
Restoration Advisory Board. Eve Boch had been our staff person assigned to this project up until he got -- this year, so I am filling in, somewhat inadequately, for the major role that she played.

Our lawsuit against the Navy helped ensure that this island is put on a proper track for the clean-up and is well remediated. And our campaign to correct the location of the Ferry Building -- the Ferry Terminal at the site, help lead to its current location. So we've been involved in this for some time. We are speaking to you today -- I'm speaking to you today to ask for a two-week extension of the review period.

We have just concluded a very intensive review of the assembly complicated environmental impact report, administrative process for the Candlestick Point Treasure Island Project, and equally sized complicated project, and we need the additional time in order to focus our attention on this project now.

The EIR received the Hunter's Point, the Candlestick Point -- the EIR received 60 days for public review. The project was far less complicated, from a transit and traffic issue point of view, than this one is. We have multiple points of entry, whereas here we have only three. And so we really need the time to look at the changes in definition of form, the structures,
impacts on bridge traffic, environmental effects, the actual benefits of the sustainability plan, scoping comments call for density, but did it call for this level of density? We don't think so. We have concerns about this level of density.

A primary principle of sustainability is carrying capacity. And this plan appears to exceed the island's carrying capacity. We have been engaged in the island's impact on the environment since the Navy controlled it, and we have been watching it grow. Been very excited about it. We have invested tens of thousands of dollars in review and assistance on this project, and we would love to see it succeed. We want to see jobs. We want to see the new vision for Treasure Island be implemented, but we want to see it properly sized for the carrying capacity of the island, so we can make this project as successful as possible.

And so we are asking for an additional two weeks so we can do the review of the EIR necessary to make that happen. And as you know, we do these things during Christmas and Thanksgiving and the summer vacation. I just cut mine short to be here today. I would very much appreciate more time to be able to go ahead and review this. All we're asking for is two weeks.
Thank you very much, Commissioners.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MS. MASTERS

MS. MASTERS: Good morning. My name is Rosie Masters and I'm a resident of YBI, and I'm on the board of directors for the YBI Mutual Benefit Corporation and Mutual Development Corporation. I, too, would like to request a two-week extension for review of the EIR. In addition, I would like to read a statement.

Although economic impacts are not evaluated in an EIR, the project should include an analysis of funding sources to determine if the project can remain revenue neutral. The analysis should review the relocation of residents if they would not be able to afford the rates. Prior to decision making, it is important to know if San Francisco residents will be burdened by the costs, and if affordable rules can be guaranteed for Treasure Island residents.

The rate structure may limit the ability for middle-to-low-income residents to remain on Treasure Island. Once the rates are established, an analysis could be conducted for population and housing. Until then, it is unknown if the rates are acceptable and support middle-to-low-income residents.

As we discussed today, the traffic analysis
mitigation focuses on transit options, not providing the services on Treasure Island that would reduce transportation. Since public transportation is voluntary, it is difficult to determine the amount of traffic that would be reduced, but the majority of impacts are deemed significant and unavoidable.

Regional housing needs allocation should be specifically reviewed to determine the personal affordable units and income levels, with the subset analysis on costs to those qualified for affordable housing application.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Is there additional public comment? If you'll just line up in the center aisle, I would appreciate it.

On the mike.

NEXT SPEAKER CARD MR. PILRAM

MR. PILRAM: My name is Atler Pilram, P-I-L-R-A-M. I am a resident of YBI, as well as a member of the Citizen Advisory Board, and also a member of Yerba Buena Island Mutual Residents. One of the concerns that came up in one of our sessions at CAP was the removal of nonindigenous plants. And I notice that also some of the costs of removal and continued costs of maintaining removal of the nonindigenous plants are kind
of brought up to the residents or added to the resident's costs. We brought up that concern, that 50 percent of the lands right now are going to be owned by Coast Guards.

We'd like to incorporate some of the costs to be shared also by the federal government, because this removal of this plant is going to be continuously asked of us. And if half of the plant is also going to be located on the other side of the land, we need to incorporate some kind of considerations as far as the cost so it won't be burdened on the residents continuously.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Is there additional public comment? If not, public comment is closed. I need the Board of Commissioners to bring -- nothing is coming up.

Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Oh, thank you. Thank you for the presentation. I thought it was extremely thorough, and in particular, very instructive in regards to the Tidelands Trust issue, which is something that we haven't had occasion to deal with in the past very often, because it deals with submerged lands. And I
think it was very important that it mentions discretion over recreational uses, which I think is an important feature subject to, of course, the authority of the Attorney General or the State, California States Land Commission, and also the fact that recreational uses should be regional in their scope, and this is certainly a factor. So I think those are interesting things to look at.

Because certainly there are many, many good things about this project, and one of them is the fact that it creates a lot of public open space, and particularly recreation uses, which is something that we are in great need of in San Francisco. So I thought the analysis was very thorough. Oh, was my mike not on? It says "mike on." Couldn't hear me? Should I repeat because --

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Yeah, I think so,
because --

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: I'm sorry.
PRESIDENT MIGUEL: I don't think it is on.
COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Let's try it.
PRESIDENT MIGUEL: This is a different system than we're used to.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Okay, is it on now?
PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Okay. Let me just try to summarize this in a shorter time the second time around. I just -- I thought it was particularly instructive of the Tidelands Trust information in there. Because it's an issue regarding previously submerged lands that we don't have occasion to deal with as often. And I thought it was very important that it talked about the discretion that the Tidelands Trust has overuses, particularly recreational ones, which are very important. And that there was an emphasis on recreational uses that had a regional aspect to them.

So I think these are important things, and I'm glad that that was thoroughly analyzed, as was the other parts of the report. So I wanted to bring that up, in particular, because I think it's an area that we may not have been as familiar with as some of the other uses that are historically analyzed in environmental impact reports. And I certainly want to put an emphasis on recreational uses, which we are sadly lacking in acreage for.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

Commissioner Moore.

COMMISSIONER MOORE

COMMISSIONER MOORE: For the record, I'd like
to disclose, I also sit on the Treasure Island CAB in the beginning. And when I was appointed to the planning commission, the City Attorney deemed that there was no conflict. And I do speak without conflict, and have been in strong support of the project, have watched it closely grow, and my comments today really are solely directed towards the EIR, the Draft EIR in front of us. Let me first say that I am very appreciative of the table of the broad range of comments. For me, it resonates quite well to ask for an additional two weeks of comment, because the issues are quite complicated.

And I do think, while the two projects are not quite comparable, the extent of issues which do rise to the surface require more time. So I would support public comment in that direction. I will actually submit my own comments in writing. I have a number, but the one thing I would like to put on the public record today is the fact that the Sequel required environmental superior alternative is really not enclosed in this document. And I'm actually surprised.

The project is very strong, and I think it should have dared to indeed address the environmentally superior alternative. Throughout the years of creating this project, there has been a strong emphasis on green, on the first truly green neighborhood of San Francisco.
And the record shows that during the scoping process, scoping documents pointed out that the superior alternative would be one that would plan for enough density to support a robust public transit system, and basic neighborhood serving retail would minimize cars. I can quote our former director of San Francisco Environmental, Art Bloomfield, who very eloquently, in his scoping comments, indicates that the EIR should include a minimum impact alternative instead of a less intensive development alternative. What really the challenges are here is, to balance high density with a decrease in cars, and not use parking as an argument for economic feasibility. I regret that, and I strongly urge that the EIR indeed, looks at, with the challenges it poses.

I think if we want to be truly a green neighborhood, we need to be able to at least go through the motions and examine how we can do that with an emphasis on a robust transportation network. I want to leave it, I think, with that. And I am in support of the number of comments which were made by people in the audience.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.
Commissioner Olague.

// //
COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: Yeah. I just -- I also
want to support a two-week extension on the comment
period. I would even support going beyond that, because
we're many people who are -- this isn't the only issue
that's out there where -- this isn't the only EIR that
people are currently reviewing. We're also in the
middle of the draft housing element review, which we
extended to the end of the month. So I think it would
only be fair to extend the comment period on this
project also to allow for -- to meet the Commission, as
well as the public to look at it some more. And I'll
submit most of my comments in writing.

The only thing that sort of struck me would be
an alternative, I feel should be provided. And kind of
along the lines of a commission, and more said. But I'm
focused on the parking piece that would look at an
alternative to what we have here, which would see a
reduction in parking, a project alternative with a
reduction in parking. So I would like to see something
like that provided in the future.

There is some much rhetoric around
sustainability. We have AB32 and SB375. Mandates that
are coming from the federal government, as well as state
government, that is directing, I think, local planning
efforts to consider reduction in carbon emissions. And it seems to me that, given that focus or that -- we should be looking at an alternative that would provide at least a .5 or something, some reduction in parking. So, again, I'll submit most of my comments in writing and I do support an extension in the comment period of time.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

Board Member Cheng.

BOARD MEMBER CHENG

BOARD MEMBER CHENG: Thank you. I would like to thank the members of the public for sharing their important thoughts today, and I also want to thank members of the Environment, Division of the Planning Staff for preparing the report. I will be submitting written comments, but I want to bring two subjects that drum up in my mind as I went through the EIR.

The first one is on transportation. It appears that out of all the topics and all the impact being analyzed, I think the area of transportation really suffers the most impact. Out of the 60-some impacts stated in the report, over 35 or up to 38 are considered significant and unavoidable. And the mitigation measure suggested -- the one mitigation measure that was suggested for this significant and
unavoidable impact, or 38 of them, happens to be to expand transit service, NTR-2.

And the report also stated that funding for extended transit service are not identified and secured, and therefore, its implementation must be considered uncertain at this time. I think we all understand that, given the budget of the City and the budget of Muni. It's understandable.

But I wish, because of the totality of the impact, and so many of them, I just wish that planning staff would consider adding more information, as far as alternatives as to how we can or possibilities of how we can -- the transit service can be extended. Will it be a function of the soon to be newly created Treasure Island Transportation Management Agency, which is supposed to be appointed by the board of supervisors? Will it be one of the responsibilities of the transportation management agency to oversee and guide us in the future in developing policies, mitigation measures, and how we can afford it.

Maybe we can also consider giving some options, so that we, as well as members of the public, can look into, can understand what other possibilities, because the impacts are quite immense. And I would really like to see some alternatives being suggested or
options into how these mitigation measures can be funded.

The second area that I would like to bring up is public -- is the public service section. Over the years, I've always been keen about asking about emergency services, because of the unique location of the island. And the study, of course, stated, and all of us know that the Bay Bridge is the only emergency access to and from San Francisco as well as the East Bay. I feel that there could be a little bit more adequate information in terms of how we mitigate the measures, because certainly the increase in population over tenfold from what it is to date between now and built out, fully built out other projects will increase the amount in public services. I am, specifically, referring to under the analysis for fire department.

We are looking at national -- natural disasters, emergency medical services. The EIR talked about the new joined police and fire station. I think that's definitely something that needs to be done, but I would like to have more adequate information in terms of mitigation measures, because I think, purely because of the population increase, the impact is not insignificant or less significant.

And members of the public have mentioned that,
you know, we are within the earthquake zone, and I think that many natural disasters can happen, as well as just because of the pure population increase, and I would like to see mitigation measures being suggested in terms of how we would deal with these situations.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER CHENG: Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Board Member Elberling.

BOARD MEMBER ELBERLING

BOARD MEMBER ELBERLING: Thank you. First, I do agree that a two-week extension of comment period would make sense. This clearly is a very complex technical document, and if the organizations that are most able to provide expert comment on it feel they need an additional two weeks to do that, I really think that we would all benefit from that input.

On the document, reading it reminds me of when, back in the late '80s, an organization that I was a member of, that had sued the City on a downtown plan, settled with them, and one of the settlement provisions was that EIR should be easy to understand for laypeople. And as I was reading this document I got the distinct impression that that vision has been lost. It's -- it's very much a document written by consultants and experts and engineers for other consultants, experts, and
engineers.

Our hope had been that the summary would really embody the essence of the story about the project. And I don't find that essence of the story here. This project, of course, is creating a whole new neighborhood, actually the size of a small city, in a uniquely physically isolated location, in the Bay, in the City of San Francisco. That makes it very different than the other similarly-scaled projects at Mission Bay and Hunter's Point Shipyard, where there are adjacent neighborhoods right next to them, literally, physically, to support them. And in my mind, that's a critical thing that really is crucial when considering the environmental consequences of what we're doing.

I looked to find out the tails of the population of this future new small city we're building in the Bay, and I could find a number of 18,000 and some in the Public Services section, but I really couldn't find anything else about who they might be in that location. Looking around, you could find a school-age population, but I couldn't find a preschool population. I couldn't find a senior population. I didn't see estimates for how many would be lower income households for affordable housing. I just really couldn't get a handle on who is going to live there.
I also could not find, although it probably exists in some appendix, where they would work. I was really curious how many would be working in the East Bay, for example. You know, one of the major things about Mission Bay we've learned is that many Mission Bay residents work in the South Bay. That was not foreseen in any EIR, believe me, when it was done 15 years ago. And I'm curious to what extent many of the TI residents may, in fact, be working in the East Bay, which is very consequential for the EIR. There is probably an estimate. I just couldn't find it.

But out of that, I think there is a crucial missing overarching mitigation for the whole project that really needs to be stated as a mitigation, and it's an important one to guide its long-term development over the next 20 to 30 years. Which is that, the project should minimize the necessity for residents to travel off island for their everyday needs and lives. We have to, in other words, include on the island, as much of the facilities and services as feasible that residents routinely need. Because otherwise, they will have to go to -- onto the bridge or onto the ferry or onto something to come to the mainland.

I am using an example, which is noted in a document but not quantified, is childcare. All working
parents are going to have arrangements for childcare. If it's not on the island, they are going to have to go off the island to do that, and they will almost certainly drive a car to do that. That's an obvious example of something that we have to be sure that there is the most adequate childcare we've ever seen in a Master Plan San Francisco neighborhood. And that concept is not in this document, although clearly it has an environmental impact.

In looking at other such everyday necessities, it's really hard to project now, you know, looking at years down the road, how those 18,000 people and what they will need. Obviously, projects adapt. We can't figure it all out in advance now, and the program that's specified here in terms of square footages of this and that may be adequate or it may not. But there is always the opportunity for big course corrections.

These massive projects almost always have major amendments and new environmental work done 10 to 15 years down the road. And I'm sure that whoever is in charge of the project at that time can take this into account, if we have laid that initial groundwork that tells them, Be sure to minimize the needs of residents to travel off the island.

The one particular detail that I couldn't find
in a document at all and I can't find in a program is public assembly. There are all kinds of reasons that residents need to assemble in groups in order to do things. There is nothing in our program, and I asked, we don't have any such facilities, specifically, in our development program today. I think that's a glaring omission. It's needed.

I wanted, though, to focus on one everyday thing that particularly stands out in my mind, which is communities of faith need places to gather on Fridays, Saturdays, or Sundays, and various holy days, respectively, throughout the year, to share their faith. And when I asked, where can there be -- could there be a church on Treasure Island? Where would congregations of any description gather, there is no provision for this. It just hasn't been included. I asked if some organization could buy a piece of land and build a church, and, basically, the answer was no. And I really -- and I'm a secular person, but I understand clearly that communities of faith are really vital parts of building real cities and real neighborhoods. And to exclude that almost -- well, I'm not saying it's conscious, but to exclude it de facto, it's something I really think is very inappropriate.

In an environmental sense, of course, if we do
not accommodate them on the island, they will be driving
on Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays to various places
elsewhere. And -- but even beyond that, we will lose
the resource of their good energies to building our
neighborhood, and I don't think it's right. There is,
of course, a church on the island now. It's a Christian
church, but it's a church.

When I looked at the historic section, I
couldn't find a church in the IR. I couldn't find a
single mention of a Treasure Island Church, and I tried
to understand this. The historic methodology was, the
document relies on the Navy's evaluation of historic
resources for everything built before 1947, and just
kind of includes that as if it's a done deal. But as it
notes, the Navy's methodology is not the same as the
City's, that the City practices under our planning, you
know, requirements and so on. And -- but it only
applied those new standards to buildings built after
1947. So neatly, the Treasure Island Church, because it
existed before 1947, just doesn't get considered. It's
like it doesn't exist. That the Navy did not identify
it as a historic resource.

And in looking at all these issues, and public
assembly and so on, I was really struck with the fact
that that church, obviously, played an important role in
the history of the island all through the era of World War II, the Korean war, the Vietnam war, when it was a very central focus of community for the military personnel, who are certainly a part of the history of Treasure Island in San Francisco. And I really find its submission inexplicable in my mind.

So I just wanted it noted, that the Navy's assessment cannot be relied on as satisfactory for our local approval process. We have our own standards and they should be applied to the pre-1947 buildings as well as the post-1947 buildings. And perhaps that can help solve, at least, part of the problem that I referred to earlier.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

Commissioner Sugaya -- oh, you're sharing a mike.

COMMISSIONER LEE

COMMISSIONER LEE: You want to go first, Commissioner? No, okay.

Okay, I guess the main issue that I look at Treasure Island, frankly, is going to be the transportation issue. But taking a step back, I think many people need to understand that this is an environmental document, and the role of the "SEQUA"
document here is looking at alternatives in impacts in mitigation. If you just look at the transportation area, which I think is the No. 1 issue with Treasure Island, there's 141 pages of Section 4E.

If you review this section and compare this to other "SEQUA" documents that we have produced as a City, this is the most comprehensive look for getting on and off the island, whether it's through water taxis or hydrofoil or mass transit for the future. And I think if we take a step back and look at this document, that it's been very well-prepared when it comes to the transportation era, which actually surprised me.

In addition to that, we have a unique opportunity where it is an island. If you look at Hong Kong Island and you look at Venice, both of those islands, how do you get on and off? Venice is one area where you look at the future of the environment, where you work, look at Venice during parts of the year and the tide, the high tide and low tide, it floods St. Mark's Square in those areas. But I think we also look at the document here. Someone brought the issue about global warming and the issues of global warming and tides. In the next hundred years or so, how many feet will it go up? Or if you look at a hundred-year-flood area, I think the document addresses that adequately.
Another gentleman brought up the issue again about the seismic issue. If you look at the density of the north part of Treasure Island, it has the least development on the north side regarding density. I think you are going to have some sort of soccer, some field there. I think we need to focus.

People say, Well, this is a very tough document. Well, part of the issue of a tough document is our planning code is the most comprehensive planning code in the world at this time, because the people have voted it in and the board of supervisors have added certain sections. You can't make it any simpler than it is now because the way the rules and regulations are set up.

Because if you look at the adequacy, and I want to turn, specifically, to the comments about, Is this considered adequate? Does it address all the alternatives? I didn't hear any public comment at this time that leads me to believe that we have not addressed the alternatives or the adequacy of this.

For disclosure, I served under the Restoration Advisory Board back in, I think, '86 to about '89. Diane Feinstein appointed me to that RAB to serve under the Navy, I guess, in the City, along Hunter's Point, also the Presidio. The environmental issues here with
hazardous waste, I am not worried about, the underground
tanks have been removed. We have the oversight of the
Water Resources Control Board and state toxics along
BCDC also control the tide, the hundred feet where it
comes in and out.

Now, I think the question for us to look at
here, if you want to add another two weeks for public
comment, what is different with this EIR versus other
EIRs that we have done the same? And I didn't hear any
public testimony that led me to believe that we need
additional information. Whether or not Board Member
Elberling is right or not about the 47 -- 1947 with the
church issue there, I think this is an environmental
document. Assembly could be one issue, but I don't
remember any time that we have to address assembly
issues in any other EIRs.

I don't disagree that maybe we should look at
faith-base facilities being there, but that's -- the
Treasure Island plan, itself, they can negotiate some
sort of rental there -- that's a separate document. So
regarding the EIR with the transportation and the
environment and some of the alternatives, again, I am
going back to the role of the EIR, how we look at the
alternatives, how we look at -- and I think we have
adequately looked at the alternatives. We know we have
-- there is mitigation issues, but going back again, the
can public should understand, this is a document to look --
how we look at all the alternatives.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: A couple of things. One --
oh, I'm sorry. I forgot you were sharing a mike there.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Yeah, this always
happen. And I also got the shortest seat, you know.
Anyway, I am a little taller than I really am here. In
any case, I'd like to support the two-week extension,
and I would make a motion to do that. I can't remember
how we do this, but --

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: I was about to say that
it's one of the few prerogatives of the chair. I have
discussed it with Board Chair Owen, and we have two
weeks additional until, if my check of the calendar is
correct, September 8th.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Thank you. I have
additional comments that I'll just submit in writing and
not take up any more time. I thank Mr. Elberling for
his observation with respect to the Navy's valuation,
and since my area of expertise happens to be in that
direction, some of my comments will be focused on that
as well as perhaps transportation of the land use.

So thank you.
PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. The other comments I was going to make, although I will probably submit it in writing as well, and one of the reasons that I felt and agreed with a number of the speakers, including commissioners and board members regarding a two-week extension, is the fact that, although this has different situations than what we just went into with Hunter's Point, it has very serious implications for the City, and certainly an additional two weeks or 60 days is not out of line.

Here, rather than being a superfund site, which was one of the major situations at Hunter's Point, we have a totally different area, not connected to the land, other than by very attenuous transportation roads. What I'm concerned about is the density of the project as it's proposed. Density transportation services are intimately linked.

I'm not positive in my mind that that linkage has been properly explored or considered, SB375, all of the other environmental acts, as far as cutting down on greenhouse gas emissions. Everything else involved in that area of the environment I know has been looked at, but I think they will become, at least in my mind, more serious when we get to this 15 or 20 or longer build-out of the project itself. And I'm not totally convinced of
The density, as currently proposed, should be as high as it is. Because of the transportation, which is very, very difficult. I have a long history with the island, what is now called "Building Two" was in the '50s called "Hangar Two," and that's where I used to go constantly for naval reserve meetings back when the Navy had it.

Many of the items that were mentioned today will be handled in a development agreement itself. They do not necessarily belong in the EIR. And that development agreement should be very, very carefully studied to cover those items particular to what it will be like on the island.

But I do believe that the density and transportation issues need further examination. In my mind, they have not been linked successfully.

Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Thank you. And I am, too, okay with the two-week extension that's been proposed, the motion on the floor. And I want to thank Mr. Elberling for bringing up the concerns about jobs on the island, particularly, those that deal with neighborhood serving, and I think it is well analyzed in
the EIR that there are, I believe, a total of around
451,000 square feet, between the commercial, retail,
square footage on there, and maybe a little bit more,
when we consider the hotels and perhaps even some of the
recreational uses. But I think it is important that the
residents, as it is analyzed, be able to find those uses
that they use on a daily basis to be present on the
island. And I think that's good.

And while this isn't a subject for discussion
today, it's a future subject for -- by other bodies,
that being, BART and regional transportation agencies.
But we know there will be a time when they look for
redundancy to their present tube, and if there is ever a
possibility to that linking up to Yerba Buena and
Treasure Island, it makes a lot of sense to me. As an
additional alternative, to allow people to travel into
San Francisco, particularly, easily and quickly, even
though the analysis of the Ferry Terminal and those
things are quite well analyzed to address the
transportation needs.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Board Member Samaha.

BOARD MEMBER SAMAHA

BOARD MEMBER SAMAHA: Well, first of all, I do
want to thank our staff and consultants for a document
that I think is very thorough. I'm not surprised that a
project of this magnitude has had such little 
controversy. And I'm really quite surprised that we 
have not had more controversial comments to this 
document. But I do support a two-week extension. I 
think it is a reasonable request for a project of this 
magnitude.

I do want to echo Commissioner Elberling's 
comments about the East Bay, the link to the East Bay 
and those jobs. I think that had not been adequately 
addressed in this document. And then the comment that 
we heard today, which are new to me, about the athletic 
fields and the Tidelands Trust interpretation. I do 
want that to be looked at by staff, and hopefully when 
we revisit this in September we can look at that 
further.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Just a correction, if I 
may. I was looking incorrectly at my calendar. A 
two-week extension would bring it to September 9th. 
That is a Jewish holiday. I don't think we should 
include that. So arbitrarily I'm going to make it 
September 10th. Just so everyone understands, you have 
until September 10th to submit your written comments, 
until close of business on September 10th, to be 
official about it. Thank you.
Anything else from the Commissioners or the Board? Anything further? All right. With that, this public hearing to take comments on Treasure Island is closed. I thank everyone and ask them to please submit as in the normal manner their comments to the Board.

(Whereupon, hearing concluded.)
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