

### **Sample letter #1**

One of the reasons that I stay here in the Bay Area is to enjoy the amazing water sports that are available here from March through October each year. As an avid windsurfer, Treasure Island (TI) offers one of the best spots in the country and during the windy season I will visit TI upwards of five times a week. There are scores more like me across the Bay. A toll to access this site is quite simply ridiculous and in violation of many foundational documents.

This is one of the reasons why I want to strongly urge you to vote against the TI toll which will adversely impact the recreational users of the Bay. It is asinine to think that someone from East Bay would be able to afford a \$17 toll charge on a daily basis - particularly when the toll is not providing any benefits to the recreational users of the Bay.

More importantly the toll violates the State Land Grant that gave TI to the city; it violates the FEIR that specifies how TI can be developed; it violates the BCDC permit that clearly stipulates that recreational users have free and unrestricted access to the waters at TI; and it violates AB 981 that requires clear benefits to those that pay the toll.

How this toll was developed is also ethically questionable. There was virtually no outreach to the recreational water sport community, and the virtual events that were held were constantly canceled, rescheduled, or IT issues that prevented people from dialing in or submitting comments.

Therefore I strongly urge you to oppose this toll for TI. It is wrong on so many levels and if it gets approved it will be leading to many legal challenges which would ultimately delay the TI development and affect the project long term financial future.

### **Sample letter #2**

I write to oppose the proposal of the SFCTA seeking final approval of the Treasure Island Toll Traffic mitigation fee.

TIMMA staff has ignored the mandates, rules, regulations, contracts required by the BCDC, State lands commission and the FEIR.

Also I believe the TIMMA staff has not done the required public outreach effectively nor taken public comments into consideration accurately.

Please vote no on any Toll at this time.

### **Sample letter #3**

The Transportation Section of the Final EIR of the Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Case No. 2007.0903E Redevelopment Project specifically states: "Visitors to the Islands, high-occupancy vehicles, and Coast Guard-related vehicles would not be charged a congestion pricing fee." . Page IV.E.45.

This Final EIR is a requirement of CEQA. It is certified by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Effectively dismissing the Final EIR, the proposal in front of the board now claims that "The Final EIR assumed that visitors would be initially exempt from congestion pricing, ...". Attachment 2, page 6.

I urge the board to understand that a Final EIR does not contain assumptions. It is the result of the CEQA process, which keeps the redevelopment project in compliance with the requirements of the law. It is final.

Regardless of what SFCTA claims they are authorized to do, material changes with significant impacts such as the proposed reversal of the specific provision of exempting visitors to the islands from congestion pricing would require the invocation of the CEQA process to maintain the lawful progression of the redevelopment project. And the impacts of the proposal would be significant. The proposal in front of the board completely fails to mention existing recreational uses such as kayaking, windsurfing and dog walking, which could not be served by the proposed ferry and transit system. And this is not an unfortunate circumstance for these visitors. The Final EIR (IV.E.29) determines a significant effect to the environment unless adequate transit could be provided, which would trigger CEQA. This is not new to TIMMA and SFCTA, which to my knowledge have repeatedly been made aware of the shortcomings of the proposal, just to be ignored as is evident in the proposal.

Approval of the proposal by the board would mean that the redevelopment project is at risk of progressing with an environmental review that was invalidated by introducing material changes with significant impact to the environment outside of the CEQA process. We have seen this before. 15 years ago, the City and County's efforts to install bicycle racks on sidewalks was delayed for years because the project team had incorrectly determined that a CEQA environmental review was not required. Let's not repeat the mistakes of the past. While the bike rack project snafu may have been a small bump in the road, damaging the redevelopment project could become a much more substantial issue.

Please send the proposal back to SFCTA and TIMMA staff for revision to accurately capture the impacts and to maintain compliance with the law. Or better yet, maintain the integrity of the redevelopment project by keeping the Final EIR unchanged and invest resources in the successful realization of the redevelopment project.