

3.B Transportation and Circulation

3.B.1 Introduction

This section presents the existing transportation and circulation conditions and analyzes the potential project-level and cumulative impacts on transportation and circulation during construction and operation of the project. Transportation and circulation topics consist of walking, bicycling, driving hazards, transit, emergency access, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and loading. Supporting detailed technical information is included in Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) Appendix C, Transportation Supporting Information.

3.B.2 Summary of Comments Received in Response to the Notice of Preparation

The following transportation-related topics were raised in response to the notice of preparation of the SEIR:

- Increased traffic volumes and congestion along Frida Kahlo Way, Ocean Avenue, and Lee Avenue;
- Alternative vehicular access at San Ramon Avenue or at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) open space;
- Pedestrian and bicycle safety along Frida Kahlo Way and Ocean Avenue;
- Effects of transportation network companies (TNCs) and delivery vehicles;
- Parking loss and increased demand for parking in nearby on-street spaces and off-street facilities;
- Increased transit ridership and effect of the proposed project on transit reliability and frequency; and
- Emergency access.

Comments and topics related to the proposed project's physical environmental impacts are addressed in the following sections.

3.B.3 Summary of Balboa Park Station Area Plan PEIR Transportation Section

Balboa Park Station Area Plan PEIR Setting

The transportation and circulation setting section of the Balboa Park Station Area Plan PEIR (area plan PEIR, or PEIR) provided information on the transportation facilities and system serving the plan area. The transportation network includes the system of local streets, ramps and freeways, local and regional bus and rail lines, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and parking and loading areas. The Balboa Park Station Area Plan (area plan) includes a number of projects that would

affect areawide transportation-related conditions, including the street network, transit operations, and parking supply. The PEIR is a program-level EIR that analyzed the impacts of the proposed transportation and land use changes, and a project-level EIR that analyzed development of two individual projects within the plan area: the City College Terminal (formerly Phelan Loop) Site [now 1100 Ocean Avenue] and the Kragen Auto Parts Site [now 1150 Ocean Avenue]. Additionally, the PEIR included analysis of a Lee Avenue Connection to City College of San Francisco (City College) variant that evaluated provision of vehicular access to City College parking facilities through Lee Avenue.

The plan area consists primarily of the parcels surrounding the Balboa Park Station along Geneva, Ocean, and San Jose avenues. The plan area is subdivided into four subareas: (1) Transit Station Neighborhood, which includes the major regional transit facilities of the plan area, as well as Balboa Park; (2) Ocean Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District, which extends along Ocean Avenue from Frida Kahlo Way (formerly Phelan Avenue) west to Manor Drive; (3) the main campus of City College;¹ and (4) Balboa Reservoir site.

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) countywide travel demand was used to develop the travel forecasts for future 2025 Baseline conditions without implementation of the area plan. The SFCTA travel demand model used in the analysis incorporates Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) land use and socio-economic database and growth forecasts for the year 2025 (*Projections 2002*). The San Francisco Planning Department made adjustments to the growth projections to reflect the City's emphasis on housing production, including the Balboa Park Station Area Plan and other Better Neighborhoods planning efforts. The adjusted housing and employment projections were the basis for the travel demand forecasts for the PEIR. The development scenario used in the SFCTA travel demand model for the PEIR concentrated housing growth in the Better Neighborhoods areas, including the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, and therefore provides a conservative estimate of the travel demand and impacts associated with implementation of the area plan.

The 2025 with Area Plan scenario includes both proposed land use and transportation changes that would occur with implementation of the Balboa Park Station Area Plan. For the 2025 with Area Plan scenario, new vehicle and transit trips generated by the development within the plan area were estimated and manually added to the 2025 Baseline traffic volumes at each study intersection and to the 2025 Baseline transit ridership projections.

Balboa Park Station Area Plan PEIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Transportation and circulation impacts assessed in the PEIR included the Balboa Reservoir site as part of numerous other parcels analyzed. The PEIR identified program-level impacts related to implementation of the area plan and project-level impacts related to development of the City College Terminal and Kragen Auto Parts sites.

¹ The City College of San Francisco Ocean campus is included in the boundaries of the plan area, although the college is not under the City and County of San Francisco's jurisdiction. The City College master plan and EIR were approved in June 2004. The updated City College facilities master plan is under development (as of April 2019).

Program-Level Impacts

Traffic

Intersection operating conditions in the plan area were analyzed for 13 study intersections for the weekday p.m. peak hour for two future scenarios: 2025 without the area plan and 2025 with the area plan. The transportation analysis identified significant traffic impacts at five of the 13 study intersections: Ocean Avenue/Junipero Serra Boulevard; Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way; Ocean Avenue/I-280 Northbound (NB) On-Ramp; Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue; Geneva Avenue/I-280 Southbound (SB) and NB Ramps. The PEIR identified mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels at three of the five impacted intersections: Ocean Avenue/Junipero Serra Boulevard; Ocean Avenue/I-280 NB On-Ramp; and Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue. No feasible mitigation measures were identified to address operating conditions at two of the five impacted intersections: Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way; and Geneva Avenue/I-280 NB and SB Ramps. Therefore, the PEIR concluded that implementation of the area plan would result in significant unavoidable cumulative traffic impacts at these intersections. Significant cumulative traffic impacts were specifically identified at the intersections of Ocean Avenue/Junipero Serra Boulevard and Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue intersections.

With the Lee Avenue Connection to City College variant, a portion of City College vehicle traffic would shift from Frida Kahlo Way to Lee Avenue. The transportation analysis of this variant identified a significant traffic impact at the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection. Installation of a dedicated eastbound left turn lane at the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection was identified as a possible mitigation. However, this would require relocation of the light-rail tracks and result in disruptions to San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) service during construction. City College had not committed to paying a fair share and the mitigation was determined to be infeasible. Limiting vehicular movements (specifically allowing westbound right-turns and prohibiting eastbound left-turns) at Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue and extending Lee Avenue to the parking facilities was identified as a possible alternative. However, more detailed analysis would be required to evaluate potential conflicts between right-turning vehicles and pedestrians and impacts on Muni operations. Therefore, it was determined that provision of full access to City College parking facilities from Ocean Avenue would create significant traffic impacts and any future plan to allow access to City College parking facilities from Ocean Avenue would require separate environmental review.

The area plan proposed a single-point interchange that would consolidate the on- and off-ramps at Geneva and Ocean avenues. The proposed reconfiguration would create a significant traffic impact due to queueing onto the I-280 mainline. Therefore, at the program level of analysis conducted for the PEIR, the impacts on the Geneva Avenue/I-280 SB and NB Ramps were identified as significant and unavoidable under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Transit

Transit impacts were also identified under the 2025 with Area Plan scenario on the K Ingleside line and at Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way and the new Geneva Avenue/I-280 NB Off-Ramp and Geneva Avenue/I-280 SB On-Ramp intersections.

- The PEIR concluded that implementation of the area plan would contribute about 6 percent to the future ridership on the K Ingleside line at the maximum load point,² increasing the already exceeded capacity utilization from 100 percent to 106 percent during the p.m. peak period. As such, the area plan was considered to have a significant contribution to adverse transit conditions on the K Ingleside line. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this was identified as a significant, unavoidable impact.
- Transit impacts identified at the Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way intersection are a result of proposed changes to the intersection configuration, including elimination of the channelized westbound and southbound right-turn pockets and restriping of the eastbound and northbound approaches. The intersection reconfiguration was reported to significantly impact intersection operations and result in congestion that could affect operations of the K Ingleside on Ocean Avenue and Muni buses on southbound Frida Kahlo Way. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this was identified as a significant and unavoidable impact.
- Transit impacts identified at the new Geneva Avenue/I-280 NB Off-Ramp and Geneva Avenue/I-280 SB On-Ramp intersection would similarly largely be attributable to the proposed reconfiguration of the intersections and freeway ramps and not to increased vehicle traffic generated by area plan development. Operations would worsen to level of service (LOS) F due to the consolidation of all movements into a single intersection. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this was identified as a significant and unavoidable impact.

Under the Lee Avenue Connection to City College – 2025 with Area Plan scenario, transit impacts were identified at Lee Avenue/Ocean Avenue. The shift in a portion of City College vehicle traffic from Frida Kahlo Way to Lee Avenue would cause the Lee Avenue/Ocean Avenue intersection to degrade from LOS D to LOS F, which would constitute a significant traffic impact. The impact could be mitigated through creation of a dedicated eastbound left-turn lane on the Ocean Avenue approach to Lee Avenue. However, this would require relocation of the light-rail tracks and disruption to Muni service during construction and the mitigation was determined to be infeasible. Therefore, this was identified as a significant and unavoidable impact and any future plan to allow full access to City College parking facilities from the Lee Avenue extension would require separate environmental review.

Parking

The PEIR did not identify impacts related to parking. The PEIR identified Improvement Measure (Parking) to further reduce less-than-significant impacts related to the anticipated parking shortfall by reducing parking demand. Two scenarios were considered for the analysis of parking

² The maximum load point is the point (i.e., a bus stop or boarding location) at which the highest number of passengers are aboard a transit vehicle on a designated bus line and route direction at a specified time or time period.

conditions with implementation of the area plan: (1) no parking provided (as allowed under the proposed planning code changes with the area plan); and (2) current code-required parking provided. If no parking were to be provided as part of development proposals within the plan area, there would be a shortfall of about 3,004 parking spaces during the weekday evening period. If the maximum parking were to be provided under the current planning code requirement, there would be a shortfall of about 929 parking spaces during the weekday evening period. With the new developments proposed in the area plan, and with either current or proposed parking requirements, parking occupancy in the plan area would increase to over 100 percent capacity at full buildout. Due to parking supply constraints and the accessibility to transit and other alternate modes, future parking demand and shortfalls may be lower than estimated.

Pedestrian and Bicycle

The PEIR found the impacts related to pedestrians and bicycle circulation to be less than significant. The PEIR identified Improvement Measure (Walking/Accessibility) to further reduce less-than-significant impacts related to the anticipated increase in the number of people walking. The improvement measure was intended to be undertaken by SFMTA in coordination with sponsors of subsequent development projects to provide pedestrian signals with countdown indicators at all major intersections and at crosswalks that connect to the Muni light-rail stops and Balboa Park BART station. The PEIR identified Improvement Measure (Bicycles) to further reduce less-than-significant impacts related to provision of bicycle parking and amenities.

The proposed bicycle lanes along Ocean Avenue under the area plan would require the elimination of one through-lane in the westbound direction between the I-280 Southbound Off-Ramp and Geneva Avenue. As a result, delay at the westbound approach to the Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way intersection would increase and the proposed bicycle lanes would result in significant impacts on traffic operations at this intersection. No feasible mitigation measures were identified and this was considered a significant and unavoidable impact in the PEIR.

Loading and Construction

The PEIR found the impacts related to loading could not be assessed for future developments in the plan area and that analysis of construction impacts is specific to individual development or transportation projects. The PEIR did not assess specific loading and construction impacts of future development but concluded that construction impacts associated with individual development projects would not be considered significant since they are temporary and short-term in duration. The PEIR identified Improvement Measure (Construction) to further reduce less-than-significant construction-related transportation impacts of individual projects within the plan area intended to be undertaken by sponsors of subsequent development projects.

Project-Level Impacts

City College Terminal

The PEIR determined that project-level impacts related to the development of City College Terminal would be less than significant for traffic, freeway ramp operations, transit, City College Terminal operations, parking and parking garage access, pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, and construction. Although not required to mitigate a significant impact, improvement measures were identified to improve parking conditions, truck loading conditions, bicycle conditions, and minimize effects of construction traffic on vehicle traffic, pedestrians, and transit operations.

The PEIR identified Improvement Measure (City College Terminal Site Development – Parking) to reduce the less-than-significant impacts related to parking shortfall that would be associated with the development. PEIR Improvement Measure (City College Terminal Site Development – Truck Loading) was identified to further reduce less-than-significant impacts related to the length of trucks accessing the loading dock. PEIR Improvement Measure (City College Terminal Site Development – Bicycles) was identified to provide bicycle amenities, including showers, lockers, and bicycle parking spaces to encourage people to bike to work, thereby reducing project-generated vehicle traffic and parking demand. The PEIR identified Improvement Measure (City College Terminal Site Development – Construction) to further reduce less-than-significant construction-related transportation impacts by limiting the hours of truck movements to minimize disruption of general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods. The improvement measure also required construction contractors to meet with MTA, the Fire Department and Planning Department to determine feasible measures to reduce traffic congestion, including transit disruption and pedestrian circulation impacts during construction.

Kragen Auto Parts Site (1150 Ocean Avenue)

The PEIR determined that project-level impacts related to the development of the Kragen Auto Parts Site (now 1150 Ocean Avenue) would be less than significant for freeway ramp operations, parking and parking garage access, pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, and construction. Although not required to mitigate a significant impact, improvement measures were identified to improve parking conditions, loading conditions, and minimize effects of construction traffic on traffic and transit operations. The improvement measures are described below and impacts identified for traffic and transit are discussed in the following subsections.

The PEIR identified Improvement Measure (Kragen Auto Parts Site Development – Parking) to reduce the less-than-significant impacts related to parking shortfall that would be associated with the development. PEIR Improvement Measure (Kragen Auto Parts Site Development – Truck Loading) was identified to further reduce less-than-significant impacts related to the length of trucks accessing the loading dock. Additionally, the Planning Commission Motions for the 1150 Ocean Avenue project identified conditions of approval regarding loading that would prohibit truck loading via the truck turnaround/driveway/easement between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m., require station loading dock personnel on Lee Avenue to assist with truck maneuvering and management traffic flow, prohibit staging on Ocean Avenue, and schedule deliveries by 18-wheel trucks to minimize potential for on-street queueing.

PEIR Improvement Measure (Kragen Auto Parts Site Development – Bicycles) was identified to provide bicycle amenities, including showers, lockers, and bicycle parking spaces to encourage people to bike to work, thereby reducing project-generated vehicle traffic and parking demand. The PEIR identified Improvement Measure (Kragen Auto Parts Site Development – Construction) to further reduce less-than-significant construction-related transportation impacts by limiting the hours of truck movements to minimize disruption of general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods. The improvement measure also required construction contractors to meet with MTA, the Fire Department and Planning Department to determine feasible measures to reduce traffic congestion, including transit disruption and pedestrian circulation impacts during construction.

Traffic

Intersection level of service at the intersection of Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue would worsen from LOS C to LOS D, partially due to the volume of traffic making the left turn from eastbound Ocean Avenue into the project site and the increase in traffic conflicting with the westbound movement. These conditions assume that the traffic signal at Ocean Avenue/ Brighton Avenue would be upgraded as part of the project to provide a protected left-turn phase. Without these signal timing modifications, the westbound approach would operate with unacceptable conditions and the project would have a significant traffic impact at Ocean Avenue/ Brighton Avenue. Under existing conditions analyzed in this SEIR, the Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue signal operates without a protected left-turn phase. Eastbound and westbound left turns are permitted, not protected, movements. The Kragen Auto Parts Site is included in existing conditions in this SEIR.

Transit

Transit impacts to the K Ingleside line were identified under the PEIR's project-level review of the Kragen Auto Parts Site development. Specifically, the PEIR concluded that development of the Kragen Auto Parts Site could affect operations of the K Ingleside line that operates along Ocean Avenue. Left turns along this part of Ocean Avenue occur from the left travel lane, shared with the K Ingleside line. At the Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue intersection, the project would add traffic to the eastbound left-turn movement. Therefore, any delays created by traffic entering the project site could also delay Muni light-rail vehicles. Implementation of the permitted-protected signal phase would allow for left-turning traffic to clear the intersection at the end of each signal cycle, and reduce the potential for substantial delays to transit operations. In order to implement this change, it may be necessary to update the traffic signal and/or the signal timing mechanisms. These changes would need to be reviewed and implemented by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA). Without a protected left-turn phase for westbound traffic and, if needed, improvements to the intersection signalization, the project would have a significant traffic impact at the Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue intersection. Under existing conditions analyzed in this SEIR, the Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue signal operates without a protected left-turn phase. Eastbound and westbound left turns are permitted, not protected, movements. The Kragen Auto Parts Site is included in existing conditions in this SEIR.

The PEIR did not identify any ridership or capacity impacts to regional or local transit lines as a result of project-generated transit trips.

3.B.4 Existing Conditions

The project site is a 17.6-acre rectangular parcel and encompasses Assessor's Block 3180/Lot 190 in San Francisco's West of Twin Peaks neighborhood. The project location and site characteristics are described in SEIR Section 2.A, Project Overview, p. 2-1, and Section 2.D.2, Project Site, p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**. The existing land use setting is described in Appendix B, Initial Study, Section E.1, Land Use and Land Use Planning, p. B-12.

The transportation study area includes all aspects of the transportation network within generally two blocks of the project site, generally bounded by Frida Kahlo Way to the east, Miramar Avenue to the west, Holloway Avenue to the south, and Monterey Boulevard to the north. The transportation study area consists of travel corridors and facilities such as transit routes and stations, bicycle routes and amenities, pedestrian sidewalks and crossings, and the overall vehicular roadway network that residents, employees, and visitors would use in traveling to and from the project site. The transportation study area and study intersections are shown in **Figure 3.B-1, Transportation Study Area and Study Intersections**. The 23 study intersections were selected either because they:

- represent access points to the regional highway system (e.g., freeway on- and off-ramps);
- are located along major street corridors serving the project site (e.g., Ocean Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way); or
- are located in the immediate vicinity of the project site (e.g., San Ramon Way/Southwood Drive/Plymouth Avenue).

As a result, they are the intersections most likely to be potentially impacted by vehicle traffic generated by the proposed project. The six study intersections providing access to the regional highway system are located outside of the transportation study area. The following section describes the existing transportation and circulation conditions.

Regional and Local Roadways

The following describes the closest regional roadways to the project site, including freeway on- and off-ramps. In addition, the following describes the existing local roadways in the study area, including their geographic extent; San Francisco General Plan, Better Streets Plan, Key Walking Street, and High Injury Corridor designation, if applicable; speed limit; and number and type of travel lanes and directions. For those existing streets adjacent to the project site, the following also describes the width of the roadway, including travel lanes, and any potentially or observed vehicle to vehicle hazardous conditions. Lastly, the following describes the amount of people driving at study intersections.

Regional Roadways

Regional access to and from the project site is provided by I-280. I-280 extends from the southern portion of downtown San Francisco to U.S. 101 in San Jose. I-280 carries approximately 173,000

vehicles per day south of Geneva Avenue and 181,000 vehicles per day north of Ocean Avenue.³ I-280 merges with U.S. 101 to the east of the project site and merges with Highway 1 to the southwest of the project site. U.S. 101 connects to the East Bay via I-80 and the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and, connecting to the South Bay and North Bay via surface streets and the Golden Gate Bridge. Access to I-280 from the project site is provided by on- and off-ramps at Ocean and Geneva avenues.

³ California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Year 2017 Traffic Volumes on the State Highway System, <http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/census/volumes2017/>, accessed January 10, 2019.

Figure 3.B-1 Transportation Study Area and Study Intersections

Local Roadways

The study area is served by multiple local streets that provide access to the project site. **Table 3.B-1, Roadway Facilities in the Study Area**, lists local roadways in the study area by street name, direction (east–west or north–south), number of travel lanes, the streets’ designation in the San Francisco General Plan (general plan) and on the City’s Vision Zero Network, the streets’ classification in the San Francisco Better Streets Plan (better streets plan), transit routes that use the street (if any), and bicycle facilities provided on the street (if any).

TABLE 3.B-1
ROADWAY FACILITIES IN THE STUDY AREA

Street Name	Direction	Number of Lanes (typical) ^a	General Plan & Vision Zero High Injury Network (HIN) Designations	Better Streets Plan Classification	Transit Routes ^b	Bicycle Facilities (typical) ^c
Ocean Avenue	E-W	2/3 ^d	CMP and MTS Major Arterial, Vision Zero HIN	Commercial and Residential Throughway	29, 49, K	Class II/class III
Geneva Avenue	E-W	2	CMP and MTS Major Arterial, Vision Zero HIN	Residential Throughway	8, 8BX, 29	Class III
Monterey Boulevard	E-W	2	Vision Zero HIN	Residential Throughway	23, 36	Class III
Miramar Avenue	N-S	1	—	Neighborhood Residential	—	—
Brighton Avenue	N-S	1	—	Neighborhood Residential	—	—
Lee Avenue	N-S	1	—	Neighborhood Residential	—	Class II/class III ^e
Frida Kahlo Way	N-S	2	—	Neighborhood Residential	43	Class II
San Jose Avenue	N-S	2 ^d	CMP and MTS Major Arterial, Vision Zero HIN	Neighborhood Residential	J/M	—

SOURCES: Kittelson & Associates, Inc. 2019; San Francisco General Plan; San Francisco Vision Zero High Injury Network; San Francisco Better Streets Plan.

NOTES:

E-W = east–west; N-S = north–south; CMP = congestion management plan; MTS = Metropolitan Transportation System; HIN = High Injury Network

The descriptions associated with each street (General Plan Designation, Vision Zero High Injury Network, Better Streets Plan Classification, Transit Routes, etc.) are those that apply to some portion of the street near the project site and may not apply to the entire length of the street.

^a Number of lanes per direction.

^b Transit routes listed include lines that operate on streets within the study area but do not have stops within the study area (i.e., 36, J).

^c Class I bikeways are bike paths with exclusive right-of-way for use by bicyclists. Class II bikeways are on-street bike lanes striped within the paved areas of roadways. Class III bikeways are signed bike routes. Class IV bikeways are on-street bike lanes that are protected from adjacent vehicular travel lanes by vertical separation such as curbs or soft-hit posts.

^d Two travel lanes in both directions with a center-running Muni light-rail line.

^e Class II bikeway in the uphill (southbound) direction and class III bikeway in the downhill (northbound) direction.

Vehicular Counts

As part of the transportation technical analysis, vehicular turning movement counts were collected at 23 intersections on Wednesday January 31, 2018, and Tuesday August 28, 2018, when City College was in session during the weekday a.m. (7 to 9 a.m.) and weekday p.m. (4 to 6 p.m.) peak periods. The 23 study intersections were selected either because they represent access points to the regional highway system (e.g., freeway on- and off-ramps), are located along major street corridors serving the project site (e.g., Ocean Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way), or are located in the immediate vicinity of the project site (e.g., San Ramon Way/Southwood Drive/Plymouth Avenue), and because they are the intersections most likely to be potentially impacted by vehicle traffic generated by the proposed project. Vehicular counts are summarized in **Table 3.B-2, Vehicular Counts at Study Intersections**.

Walking Conditions

A qualitative evaluation of existing pedestrian conditions was conducted during field visits to the transportation study area in August and September 2018. Counts of people walking⁴ were collected on Wednesday January 31, 2018, and Tuesday August 28, 2018, when City College was in session during the weekday a.m. (7 to 9 a.m.) and weekday p.m. (4 to 6 p.m.) peak periods.

Observations of facilities for people walking included sidewalks, crosswalks, and curb ramps and pedestrian activity within the study area. Observations indicated facilities for people walking were generally complete in the study area, with sidewalks provided continuously on both sides of the streets and crosswalks provided at most intersections. However, access for people walking to and from the project site is limited, particularly in the north, south, and west sides, which lack a direct connection to the project site.

Sidewalks on the east and west side of Lee Avenue between the project site and Ocean Avenue are 11 feet wide and 8 feet wide, respectively, including a 3- to 4-foot-wide planting strip. Sidewalks on the north side of Ocean Avenue between Lee Avenue and Harold Way are approximately 10 feet wide including a 3- to 4-foot-wide planting strip.⁵ There are high visibility marked crossings and pedestrian countdown signals provided at all signalized intersections adjacent to the project block.⁶

⁴ People walking includes people with disabilities that may or may not require assistive mobility devices.

⁵ The effective clear widths of the sidewalks vary depending on the presence of landscaping, utility poles, parking meters, and other street furniture (e.g., newspaper racks, bike racks, benches). For example, the landscaping along the Ocean Avenue north sidewalk reduces the effective sidewalk width from ten feet to about six feet in most locations.

⁶ Crosswalk markings are classified as basic or high visibility. Basic crosswalk markings consist of two transverse lines. High visibility markings consist of diagonal or longitudinal lines parallel to traffic flow with or without transverse lines. High visibility markings are detected at about twice the distance upstream as basic transverse markings during daytime conditions. National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, Crosswalk Markings, January 2011, https://ceprofs.civil.tamu.edu/ghawkins/MTC-Files/2011-06_Meeting/Marking_No.1.pdf, accessed February 6, 2019.

TABLE 3.B-2
VEHICULAR COUNTS AT STUDY INTERSECTIONS

Number	Intersection	Number of Vehicles ^{a,b}	
		A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour
1	Ocean Avenue/Miramar Avenue	1,833	1,876
2	Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue	1,898	2,021
3	Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue	2,090	2,293
4	Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue	1,376	1,413
5	Ocean Avenue/Plymouth Avenue	1,841	1,866
6	San Ramon Way/Southwood Drive/Plymouth Avenue	422	409
7	Greenwood Avenue/Plymouth Avenue	430	397
8	Geneva Avenue/San Jose Avenue	2,590	2,485
9	Judson Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way	1,030	1,040
10	Judson Avenue/Hazelwood Avenue	437	341
11	Judson Avenue/Genessee Street	851	780
12	Monterey Boulevard/Genessee Street	1,684	1,636
13	Cloud Circle (N)/Frida Kahlo Way	750	923
14	Cloud Circle (S)/Frida Kahlo Way	1,074	1,210
15	City College Upper Reservoir Lot (N)/Frida Kahlo Way	750	923
16	City College Upper Reservoir Lot (S)/Frida Kahlo Way	1,074	1,210
17	I-280 SB Off Ramp/Ocean Avenue	1,505	1,509
18	I-280 SB Ramps/Geneva Avenue	2,463	2,590
19	I-280 NB Ramps/Geneva Avenue	2,653	2,642
20	I-280 NB Ramps/Ocean Avenue	1,101	1,207
21	Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue	1,708	1,846
22	Ocean Avenue/Harold Avenue	1,905	1,981
23	Holloway Avenue/Lee Avenue	440	378

SOURCE: Quality Counts, 2018.

NOTES:

^a Vehicle volume (number of vehicles) reflects the sum of all turning movements at the intersection.

^b The weekday a.m. peak hour is the peak one hour (four consecutive 15-minute intervals) of vehicle traffic occurring between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. The weekday p.m. peak hour is the peak one hour (four consecutive 15-minute intervals) of vehicle traffic occurring between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m.

Based on observations, general impediments to people walking within the study area include the following:

- Heavy vehicle traffic volumes associated with nearby freeway ramps and right-turn movements at the following locations:
 - Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue, westbound right turn
 - Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue, eastbound right turn
 - Ocean Avenue/I-280 SB Off-Ramp free, southbound right turn

- Nonstandard intersection geometry and curvilinear approach at Frida Kahlo Way/Judson Avenue. Drivers heading northbound must use a short left-turn pocket and wait for a gap in traffic before proceeding north on Frida Kahlo Way. Drivers focusing on gaps in opposing traffic flow are not as likely to see people crossing in the marked crosswalk, increasing the risk of conflicts for people walking.
- Long crossing distances and lack of marked crosswalks across some intersection legs:
 - Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue, east leg
 - Ocean Avenue/I-280 NB Ramps, west leg
 - Geneva Avenue/I-280 SB Ramps, east leg and west leg
- Curb ramps are not Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant and lack detectable warnings (i.e., tactile domes) at the following locations:
 - Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue, southeast and southwest corners
 - Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue, southeast and southwest corners
 - Ocean Avenue/Plymouth Avenue, southeast and southwest corners
 - Ocean Avenue/Granada Avenue, all crossings
 - Ocean Avenue/Miramar Avenue, all crossings
- Elevation changes (about 100 feet) and steep grades (up to 15 percent) along Geneva Avenue between the project site and the Balboa Park Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)/Muni Station make conditions for people walking more physically demanding and challenging

Counts of people walking are generally highest along the Ocean Avenue commercial district, near the Balboa Park BART/Muni station, and adjacent to City College. In these locations, the number of people walking peaks during the morning and evening commute periods as people walk to and from nearby transit stops and are also high during the midday when City College is in session.

Observations and counts show the highest number of people walking at the intersection of Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue with a total of 698 crossings at this location during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 866 people crossing during the weekday p.m. peak hour. At the Geneva Avenue/San Jose Avenue intersection, near Balboa Park BART/Muni station, a total of 750 crossings during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 549 crossings during the weekday p.m. peak hour. Other study intersections that experienced a relatively high number of crossings (i.e., within the top 20 percent of intersections based on the number of crossings) include Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue, Ocean Avenue/Plymouth Avenue, Ocean Avenue/I-280 SB Off-Ramp, and Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue. Walking counts are summarized in **Table 3.B-3, Walking Counts at Study Intersections – Weekday A.M. Peak Hour**, and **Table 3.B-4, Walking Counts at Study Intersections – Weekday P.M. Peak Hour**.

TABLE 3.B-3
WALKING COUNTS AT STUDY INTERSECTIONS – WEEKDAY A.M. PEAK HOUR

Number	Intersection	Intersection Leg (Number of Crossings)				
		North	South	East	West	Total
1	Ocean Avenue/Miramar Avenue	81	60	48	36	225
2	Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue	250	147	171	130	698
3	Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue	49	138	7	62	256
4	Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue	100	168	56	133	457
5	Ocean Avenue/Plymouth Avenue	74	97	24	14	209
6	San Ramon Way/Southwood Drive/Plymouth Avenue	0	4	23	25	52
7	Greenwood Avenue/Plymouth Avenue	2	1	6	3	12
8	Geneva Avenue/San Jose Avenue	330	101	106	213	750
9	Judson Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way	16	2	0	63	81
10	Judson Avenue/Hazelwood Avenue	4	4	10	10	28
11	Judson Avenue/Genessee Street	19	26	37	32	114
12	Monterey Boulevard/Genessee Street	12	39	19	29	99
13	Cloud Circle (N)/Frida Kahlo Way	45	21	37	36	139
14	Cloud Circle (S)/Frida Kahlo Way	4	201	34	28	267
15	City College Upper Reservoir Lot (N)/Frida Kahlo Way	29	39	37	72	177
16	City College Upper Reservoir Lot (S)/Frida Kahlo Way	74	43	37	39	193
17	I-280 SB Off Ramp/Ocean Avenue	78	313	73	0	464
18	I-280 SB Ramps/Geneva Avenue	193	126	0	20	339
19	I-280 NB Ramps/Geneva Avenue	12	155	147	5	319
20	I-280 NB Ramps/Ocean Avenue	158	149	53	0	360
21	Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue	161	160	35	24	380
22	Ocean Avenue/Harold Avenue	148	149	5	2	304
23	Holloway Avenue/Lee Avenue	30	17	37	21	105

SOURCE: Quality Counts, 2018.

In 2014, San Francisco adopted the Vision Zero policy. The goal of the Vision Zero policy is to create a culture that prioritizes traffic safety and ensures that mistakes by motorists on roadways do not result in serious injuries or death. In 2015, the City released a pedestrian, cyclist, and vehicle high injury corridor report (the Vision Zero “High Injury Network”) along with a two-year action strategy and new protocols for tracking traffic fatalities and improving the City’s understanding of Vision Zero’s impact. The project site is not located directly on the High Injury Network. However, the following street segments near the project site are identified as part of the 2017 High Injury Network:⁷

- Ocean Avenue between Frida Kahlo Way and Santa Ynez Avenue
- Geneva Avenue between Frida Kahlo Way and Paris Street
- Monterey Boulevard between St. Elmo Way/Plymouth Avenue and Edna Street
- San Jose Avenue between Santa Ynez Avenue to Seneca Avenue and between Geneva Avenue and Wilson Street

Pedestrian collision data from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Reporting System (SWITRS) (2013–2017)⁸ reported five pedestrian-involved collisions, including one severe injury, and no pedestrian fatalities within the study area.⁹

⁷ San Francisco Department of Public Health, Vision Zero High Injury Network: 2017, <http://sfgov.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=fa37f1274b4446f1bddd7bdf9e708ff>, accessed January 10, 2019.

⁸ As of December 2018, when the analysis was conducted, this was the most recent complete set of final SWITRS data available from the California Highway Patrol.

⁹ UC Berkeley, Transportation Injury Mapping System, <https://tims.berkeley.edu/tools/gismap/>, accessed January 10, 2019.

TABLE 3.B-4
WALKING COUNTS AT STUDY INTERSECTIONS – WEEKDAY P.M. PEAK HOUR

Number	Intersection	Intersection Leg (Number of Crossings)				
		North	South	East	West	Total
1	Ocean Avenue/Miramar Avenue	191	131	56	61	439
2	Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue	323	245	175	123	866
3	Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue	88	94	0	88	270
4	Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue	89	81	58	100	328
5	Ocean Avenue/Plymouth Avenue	349	152	78	25	604
6	San Ramon Way/Southwood Drive/Plymouth Avenue	10	6	33	36	85
7	Greenwood Avenue/Plymouth Avenue	3	2	4	9	18
8	Geneva Avenue/San Jose Avenue	268	64	42	175	549
9	Judson Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way	18	0	0	55	73
10	Judson Avenue/Hazelwood Avenue	3	5	1	8	17
11	Judson Avenue/Genessee Street	19	7	28	15	69
12	Monterey Boulevard/Genessee Street	26	45	26	22	119
13	Cloud Circle (N)/Frida Kahlo Way	39	19	28	61	147
14	Cloud Circle (S)/Frida Kahlo Way	2	312	52	80	446
15	City College Upper Reservoir Lot (N)/Frida Kahlo Way	18	52	21	48	139
16	City College Upper Reservoir Lot (S)/Frida Kahlo Way	59	53	61	60	233
17	I-280 SB Off Ramp/Ocean Avenue	58	287	14	0	359
18	I-280 SB Ramps/Geneva Avenue	115	18	0	20	153
19	I-280 NB Ramps/Geneva Avenue	5	135	104	36	280
20	I-280 NB Ramps/Ocean Avenue	87	47	73	1	208
21	Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue	442	278	107	63	890
22	Ocean Avenue/Harold Avenue	183	150	0	3	336
23	Holloway Avenue/Lee Avenue	23	17	23	27	90

SOURCE: Quality Counts, 2018.

Bicycle Facilities and Circulation

A qualitative evaluation of existing bicycle conditions was conducted during field visits to the transportation study area in August and September 2018. Bicycle counts were collected on Wednesday January 31, 2018, and Tuesday August 28, 2018, when City College was in session during the weekday a.m. (7 to 9 a.m.) and weekday p.m. (4 to 6 p.m.) peak periods.

Bicycle facilities are typically classified into four classes, primarily based on the level of separation from vehicular traffic:¹⁰

- **Class I bikeway (bike path)**—This is a dedicated path for bicyclists and/or pedestrians that does not permit motorized travel. No class I bikeways exist in the study area.
- **Class II bikeway (bike lane)**—This is a portion of the roadway network that has been striped and signed for bicycle use. Implementation of class II bicycle facilities requires sufficient right-of-way between the vehicle stream and the curb or curbside parking. Bicycle lanes are typically used along collector or arterial streets with medium to high traffic volumes, providing additional travel space for bicyclists along busy roadway segments.
- **Class III bikeway (bike route)**—This is a bikeway that primarily serves to connect other facilities and destinations in the bikeway network. These routes include signage but do not have roadway markings or striping to indicate reserved space for the bicyclists. Bicyclists traveling on class III facilities must share travel lanes with vehicle traffic.
- **Class IV bikeway (separated bikeway)**—This is a dedicated, separated and protected on-street lane for bicyclists. Separated bike lanes (or protected bike lanes) are typically used along streets with high traffic volumes and high speeds, providing additional protection for bicyclists through the use of vertical separation, such as concrete curb or safe-hit posts. No class IV bikeways exist in the study area.

Existing on-street bicycle facilities, as designated by the SFMTA Bike Network Map, are shown in **Figure 3.B-2, Existing Bicycling Network**, and described below:¹¹

- **Ocean Avenue**—A class III facility runs east–west between 19th Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way. A class II facility runs east–west between Frida Kahlo Way and Alemany Boulevard.
- **Geneva Avenue**—A class III facility runs east–west from Frida Kahlo Way to Paris Street where it becomes a class II facility and continues as a class II and class III facility to the Cow Palace.
- **Monterey Boulevard**—A class III facility runs east–west from Santa Clara Avenue to Genessee Street.
- **Plymouth Avenue**—A class III facility runs north–south and extends one block from Holloway Avenue to Ocean Avenue.
- **Lee Avenue**—A class II facility runs in the uphill (southbound) direction and extends one block from Ocean Avenue to Holloway Avenue. A class III facility runs in the downhill (northbound) direction and extends one block from Holloway Avenue to Ocean Avenue.

¹⁰ Caltrans, *Highway Design Manual*, Chapter 1000, Bicycle Transportation Design, December 2015, <http://www.dot.ca.gov/design/manuals/hdm/chp1000.pdf>, accessed February 7, 2018.

¹¹ SFMTA, San Francisco Bike Network Map, July 2016, <https://www.sfmta.com/maps/san-francisco-bike-network-map>, accessed May 25, 2018.

Figure 3.B-2 Existing Bicycling Network

- **Frida Kahlo Way**—A class II facility runs north–south from Ocean Avenue to Judson Avenue and continues on Judson Avenue to Genessee Street.

As shown on Figure 3.B-2, there are dedicated bicycle facilities on the following segments that overlap with the Vision Zero High Injury Network discussed in “Walking Conditions,” p. 3.B-12.

- Ocean Avenue, east of Frida Kahlo Way;
- Geneva Avenue, south of Frida Kahlo Way; and
- Monterey Boulevard, between St Elmo Way/Plymouth Avenue and Genessee Street.

Bicycle collision data from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Reporting System (2013–2017) reported four bicycle-involved collisions, including one severe injury, and no bicyclist fatalities within the study area.¹²

Frida Kahlo Way and segments of Ocean Avenue within the study area are relatively flat with elevation changes north and south of Ocean Avenue. The project site is located close to two major transit hubs (City College Terminal and Balboa Park BART/Muni Station) and bicycle friendly uses, including the City College Ocean Avenue campus and neighborhood-oriented retail. However, general impediments to people bicycling observed within the study area include the following:

- Elevation changes and steep and sustained grades (e.g., on Geneva Avenue);
- Heavy vehicle traffic volumes and high-speed uncontrolled movements at freeway ramp terminals;
- Nonstandard intersection geometry and high vehicle volumes at Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue;
- Muni light-rail trackway along Ocean Avenue creates an uneven surface and bicycle tires can become stuck in rail flanges when in-street tracks are crossed at low angles; and
- Lack of protected or separated bicycle facilities.

Field observations and count data indicate that bicycle use is low, with up to 13 individuals bicycling along Ocean Avenue in the westbound direction and six individuals bicycling in the eastbound direction, and between five and eight people bicycling along Frida Kahlo Way in the northbound and southbound directions during both peak hours. Counts of people biking are generally highest along the Ocean Avenue commercial district and adjacent to City College, where there are designated bicycle facilities. Fewer people bicycling were observed on Geneva Avenue near the freeway ramps and in the Westwood Park neighborhood. Bicycling counts are summarized in **Table 3.B-5, Bicycling Counts at Study Intersections – Weekday A.M. Peak Hour**, and **Table 3.B-6, Bicycling Counts at Study Intersections – Weekday P.M. Peak Hour**.

¹² UC Berkeley, Transportation Injury Mapping System, <https://tims.berkeley.edu/tools/gismap/>, accessed January 10, 2019.

TABLE 3.B-5
BICYCLING COUNTS AT STUDY INTERSECTIONS – WEEKDAY A.M. PEAK HOUR

Number	Intersection	Intersection Approach (Number of People Biking)				
		North	South	East	West	Total
1	Ocean Avenue/Miramar Avenue	0	2	4	1	7
2	Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue	1	0	5	13	19
3	Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue	0	0	2	10	12
4	Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue	5	1	3	3	12
5	Ocean Avenue/Plymouth Avenue	0	0	6	5	11
6	San Ramon Way/Southwood Drive/Plymouth Avenue	0	1	0	0	1
7	Greenwood Avenue/Plymouth Avenue	3	4	0	0	7
8	Geneva Avenue/San Jose Avenue	0	1	2	1	4
9	Judson Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way	4	3	6	0	13
10	Judson Avenue/Hazelwood Avenue	0	3	1	0	4
11	Judson Avenue/Genessee Street	2	0	2	5	9
12	Monterey Boulevard/Genessee Street	0	1	1	7	9
13	Cloud Circle (N)/Frida Kahlo Way	8	6	1	0	15
14	Cloud Circle (S)/Frida Kahlo Way	8	7	0	0	15
15	City College Upper Reservoir Lot (N)/Frida Kahlo Way	6	5	0	1	12
16	City College Upper Reservoir Lot (S)/Frida Kahlo Way	6	4	0	0	10
17	I-280 SB Off Ramp/Ocean Avenue	0	0	7	7	14
18	I-280 SB Ramps/Geneva Avenue	1	0	3	3	7
19	I-280 NB Ramps/Geneva Avenue	0	0	3	3	6
20	I-280 NB Ramps/Ocean Avenue	0	0	2	4	6
21	Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue	0	0	12	5	17
22	Ocean Avenue/Harold Avenue	0	0	13	5	18
23	Holloway Avenue/Lee Avenue	1	2	5	3	11

SOURCE: Quality Counts, 2018.

TABLE 3.B-6
BICYCLING COUNTS AT STUDY INTERSECTIONS – WEEKDAY P.M. PEAK HOUR

Number	Intersection	Intersection Approach (Number of People Biking)				
		North	South	East	West	Total
1	Ocean Avenue/Miramar Avenue	0	1	6	10	17
2	Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue	0	0	3	7	10
3	Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue	2	1	5	5	13
4	Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue	4	1	3	2	10
5	Ocean Avenue/Plymouth Avenue	0	0	6	11	17
6	San Ramon Way/Southwood Drive/Plymouth Avenue	0	1	0	2	3
7	Greenwood Avenue/Plymouth Avenue	0	0	0	0	0
8	Geneva Avenue/San Jose Avenue	4	1	2	1	8
9	Judson Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way	1	1	2	0	4
10	Judson Avenue/Hazelwood Avenue	0	0	1	0	1
11	Judson Avenue/Genessee Street	4	0	0	7	11
12	Monterey Boulevard/Genessee Street	1	2	5	2	10
13	Cloud Circle (N)/Frida Kahlo Way	6	7	3	0	16
14	Cloud Circle (S)/Frida Kahlo Way	2	7	2	0	11
15	City College Upper Reservoir Lot (N)/Frida Kahlo Way	2	7	0	0	9
16	City College Upper Reservoir Lot (S)/Frida Kahlo Way	2	7	0	0	9
17	I-280 SB Off Ramp/Ocean Avenue	0	0	4	4	8
18	I-280 SB Ramps/Geneva Avenue	0	0	5	1	6
19	I-280 NB Ramps/Geneva Avenue	0	0	1	5	6
20	I-280 NB Ramps/Ocean Avenue	0	0	1	0	1
21	Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue	0	0	5	8	13
22	Ocean Avenue/Harold Avenue	3	0	9	8	20
23	Holloway Avenue/Lee Avenue	0	1	9	2	12

SOURCE: Quality Counts, 2018.

Public Transit Conditions

The project site is served by local transit provided by Muni, operated by the SFMTA. Regional transit service is provided to the East Bay and South Bay/Peninsula via the BART station. **Figure 3.B-3, Existing Transit Service Weekday P.M. Peak Headways**, presents the local and regional transit routes in the transportation study area.

Figure 3.B-3 Existing Transit Service Weekday P.M. Peak Headways

Local Transit

Muni

Muni provides transit service within the City and County of San Francisco, including bus (diesel, bio-diesel/electric hybrid, and electric trolley), light-rail (Muni Metro), cable car, and electric streetcar lines. **Table 3.B-7, Local Muni Operations**, summarizes Muni service characteristics for the Muni routes operating within the study area with bus stops located within 0.5 mile of the project site.

Muni provides local transit for destinations within San Francisco, with nearby service along Ocean Avenue, Geneva Avenue, and Frida Kahlo Way. Muni operates eight bus lines and one light-rail line with stops located within about 0.5 mile of the project site.

Major bus routes operating within 0.5 mile of the project site include 8 Bayshore and 8BX California 'B' Express connecting to the Excelsior District, Visitacion Valley, Portola, Downtown, Chinatown, North Beach, and Fisherman's Wharf and the 49 Van Ness/Mission connecting to the Mission District and Van Ness Avenue corridor. Additional crosstown routes serving the site include the 23 Monterey, 28R 19th Avenue Rapid, 29 Sunset, 43 Masonic, and 54 Felton. The K Ingleside line rail line provides service along Ocean Avenue (center-running on the street), connecting to Balboa Park BART/Muni Station at its eastern terminus and traveling west through the Twin Peaks Tunnel and Market Street Subway to downtown San Francisco.

A local transit hub is provided at the City College Terminal located at the northwest corner of Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue. The terminal provides ingress from Ocean Avenue and egress onto Frida Kahlo Way north of the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) Station 15. The City College Terminal provides three boarding bays (two island bays and one curb bay) shared between the 8, 8BX, and 49 routes. Muni egress onto Frida Kahlo Way is facilitated by actuated transit-only signals.¹³

Muni transit operations in the study area were evaluated using transit delay analysis. The transit delay analysis presents the delay associated with traffic congestion, transit reentry,¹⁴ and passenger boarding along the following corridors and Muni lines:

- Frida Kahlo Way from Judson Avenue to Ocean Avenue (Line 43)
- Ocean Avenue from Plymouth Avenue to San Jose Avenue (Lines K, 29, 49)
- Geneva Avenue from City College Terminal to San Jose Avenue (Lines 8, 8BX, 43, 54)

¹³ Actuated signals respond to the traffic present at the intersection so that the pattern of the signal (the length and order of each phase) depends on the real-time traffic volumes and can be different at every cycle.

¹⁴ Transit reentry delay occurs when stopped transit vehicles wait for a gap in the traffic stream or wait for a queue to clear before they are able to reenter the travel lane.

**TABLE 3.B-7
LOCAL MUNI OPERATIONS**

Route	Headways ^a		Hours of Operation	Nearest Stop to the Project Site	Neighborhoods Served
	Weekday A.M. Peak Period (7–9 a.m.)	Weekday P.M. Peak Period (4–6 p.m.)			
8	8	8	5–12:10 a.m.	City College Terminal	Chinatown, Crocker Amazon, Excelsior, Financial District, Nob Hill, North Beach, Ocean View, Outer Mission, Russian Hill, South of Market, Visitacion Valley, West of Twin Peaks
8BX	7	7	6:30–9:30 a.m. (inbound) and 3:30–6:40 p.m. (outbound)	City College Terminal	
23	7	15	5:45 a.m.–11:30 p.m.	Monterey Boulevard/Ridgewood Avenue	Bayview, Bernal Heights, Diamond Heights, Excelsior, Glen Park, Lakeshore, Outer Mission, Parkside, West of Twin Peaks
28R	10	10	7 a.m.–7 p.m.	Geneva Avenue/San Jose Avenue	Crocker Amazon, Golden Gate Park, Inner Richmond, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore, Ocean View, Outer Mission, Outer Richmond, Outer Sunset, Presidio, Presidio Heights, West of Twin Peaks
29	10	12	5:55–12:10 a.m.	Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue	Bayview, Excelsior, Golden Gate Park, Inner Richmond, Lakeshore, Ocean View, Outer Mission, Outer Richmond, Outer Sunset, Parkside, Presidio, Seacliff, Visitacion Valley, West of Twin Peaks, Inner Sunset
43	9	11	5:15–12:30 a.m.	Frida Kahlo Way/Judson Avenue & Frida Kahlo Way/City College Terminal	Crocker Amazon, Excelsior, Golden Gate Park, Inner Richmond, Marina, Ocean View, Outer Mission, Pacific Heights, Presidio, Presidio Heights, Twin Peaks, Visitacion Valley, West of Twin Peaks, Western Addition, Inner Sunset
49	8	9	5:40 a.m.–12:10 a.m.	City College Terminal	Bernal Heights, Downtown/Civic Center, Excelsior, Glen Park, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, Noe Valley, Ocean View, Outer Mission, Pacific Heights, Russian Hill, South of Market, West of Twin Peaks, Western Addition
54	8	9	5:40 a.m.–12:10 a.m.	City College Terminal	Bayview, Crocker Amazon, Excelsior, Lakeshore, Ocean View, Outer Mission, Visitacion Valley, West of Twin Peaks
K	8	9	4:40 a.m.–12:20 a.m.	Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue	Bayview, Castro/Upper Market, Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Financial District, Lakeshore, Mission, Noe Valley, Ocean View, Outer Mission, Parkside, Potrero Hill, South of Market, Twin Peaks, Visitacion Valley, West of Twin Peaks, Western Addition

SOURCE: Muni, 2019. <https://www.sfmta.com/getting-around/muni/routes-stops>.

NOTES:

Transit routes shown have a bus stop within 0.5 mile of the project site.

^a Headway refers to scheduled time between buses, presented in minutes. Headways shown are an average headway for the corresponding weekday a.m. (7 to 9 a.m.) and weekday p.m. (4 to 6 p.m.) peak-hour headway schedule.

The results of the transit delay analysis are summarized in **Table 3.B-8, Existing Transit Delay**, and provided in Attachment C, Corridor Delay Analysis Synchro Worksheets, and Attachment D, Transit Reentry and Passenger Boarding Delay Analysis Calculations, of SEIR Appendix C2, Transit Assessment Memorandum. Transit ridership and capacity analysis are provided in Attachment F (transit ridership and capacity analysis) of SEIR Appendix C2 for informational purposes.

**TABLE 3.B-8
EXISTING TRANSIT DELAY**

Corridor	Weekday a.m. Peak Hour (seconds of delay)		Weekday p.m. Peak Hour (seconds of delay)	
	Northbound/ Eastbound	Southbound/ Westbound	Northbound/ Eastbound	Southbound/ Westbound
Frida Kahlo Way	3	12	3	25
Ocean Avenue	110	132	113	133
Geneva Avenue	70	48	66	41

SOURCE: Kittelson & Associates Inc., 2018.

NOTES:

Transit delay includes corridor delay, transit reentry delay, and passenger boarding delay.

As shown in Table 3.B-8, the highest transit delays are experienced along Ocean Avenue between Plymouth Avenue and Judson Avenue. This is primarily caused by the Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue intersection, which operates with an average intersection delay above 100 seconds. Additionally, as a result of the high vehicle traffic volumes in the curbside travel lane on Ocean Avenue (between 900 and 930 vehicles per hour) transit vehicles in this corridor typically experience transit reentry delays of around 11 seconds.

Regional Transit

Regional transit service to and from the East Bay is provided via BART commuter rail service, Alameda-Contra Costa Transit (AC Transit) buses, and Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) ferries. Transit service to and from the North Bay is provided via Golden Gate Transit (GGT) buses and ferries. Transit service to and from the Peninsula/South Bay is provided via Caltrain, BART, and San Mateo County Transit (SamTrans) buses. BART is located within walking distance of the project site and many Muni routes connect to the Balboa Park BART/Muni Station. Other regional transit services can be reached by bicycle or from various Muni or BART lines (some requiring a transfer). Regional transit providers and service are described below.

BART

BART provides regional commuter rail service between San Francisco and the East Bay (Antioch, Richmond, Dublin/Pleasanton and Warm Springs/South Fremont), as well as between San Francisco and San Mateo County (Daly City, SFO Airport, and Millbrae). Weekday hours of operation are between 4 a.m. and midnight. During the weekday p.m. peak period, headways are 5 to 15 minutes along each line. Within San Francisco, BART operates underground along Market

Street to Civic Center Station where it turns south through the Mission District towards Daly City, running partially aboveground between Glen Park and Daly City stations. The BART stations nearest to the project study area is the Balboa Park BART/Muni Station at San Jose Avenue between Ocean Avenue and Geneva Avenue, about 0.5 mile away from the project site.

Caltrain

Caltrain provides passenger rail service on the Peninsula between San Francisco and Downtown San Jose with several stops in San Mateo County and Santa Clara County. Some service is also available south of San Jose. Caltrain operates either local or express trains between 4:30 a.m. and midnight inbound (northbound) and 5 a.m. to midnight outbound (southbound). Caltrain service headways for Limited-Stop and Express ("Baby Bullet") trains during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak periods are 10 to 40 minutes, depending on the type of train. The peak direction of service is southbound during the weekday a.m. peak period (7 a.m. to 9 a.m.) and northbound during the weekday p.m. peak period (4 to 6 p.m.). Local service is not provided during peak periods.

Caltrain provides service to the Bayshore Station and the 22nd Street Station. The Bayshore Station, located on Tunnel Avenue between Beatty Avenue and Recycle Road is about 3.5 miles east of the project site, a 40-minute ride from Balboa Park BART/Muni Station on the Brisbane/Crocker BART Shuttle. The 22nd Street Station, located between Indiana Street and Pennsylvania Avenue is approximately 4.3 miles away, a 20-minute bus ride on the 8 Bayshore line.

AC Transit

AC Transit provides local bus service in western Alameda and Contra Costa Counties and has routes to San Francisco and San Mateo counties. The majority of AC Transit Transbay routes terminate at the Transbay Transit Center located at First and Natoma streets, approximately 5.8 miles northeast of the project site. This station can be reached by three BART lines (Antioch, Richmond, Dublin/Pleasanton and Warm Springs/South Fremont) that arrive/depart from the Balboa Park BART/Muni Station and by the K Ingleside.

Most Transbay bus lines are for peak period and peak direction (to San Francisco during the weekday a.m. peak period and from San Francisco during the weekday p.m. peak period), with headways of 15 to 30 minutes per route. The peak direction of service is into San Francisco during the weekday a.m. peak period and out of San Francisco during the weekday p.m. peak period.

WETA

WETA is a regional public transit agency that operates ferry services on San Francisco Bay and coordinates the water transit response to regional emergencies. The San Francisco Ferry Terminal is located about 6.3 miles northeast of the project site and can be reached by K Ingleside and BART. WETA services operate from terminals in Alameda (Main Street and Harbor Bay), Oakland, San Francisco, South San Francisco, Richmond, and Vallejo/Mare Island. Ferry routes operate with 30- to 60-minute headways, depending on time and day of the week.

SamTrans

SamTrans provides bus service between San Mateo County and San Francisco. SamTrans operates three bus lines that serve downtown San Francisco. The closest SamTrans bus stops to the project site are located at the Transbay Transit Center (at First Street and Natoma Street). This station can be reached by three BART lines (Antioch, Richmond, Dublin/Pleasanton and Warm Springs/South Fremont) that arrive/depart from the Balboa Park BART/Muni Station and by the K Ingleside. SamTrans Route KX operates as a peak-only express route, Route 292 provides service throughout the day, and Route 397 operates as a late-night route. Headways during the weekday p.m. peak period are approximately 60 minutes for Route KX and 20 to 30 minutes for Route 292.

Golden Gate Transit

GGT, operated by the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway Transportation District, provides bus service between the North Bay (Marin and Sonoma counties) and San Francisco. It operates 22 commuter bus routes, 9 basic bus routes, and 16 ferry feeder bus routes (ferry feeder bus routes do not operate in San Francisco). Most bus routes serve either the Civic Center (via Van Ness Avenue and Mission Street) or the Financial District (via Battery and Sansome streets). Basic bus routes operate with 15- to 90-minute headways, depending on the time and day of the week. Commute and ferry feeder bus routes operate at intervals that are more frequent in the mornings and evenings. GGT stops are accessible with transfer from BART and K Ingleside.

Emergency Access Conditions

The following describes the closest emergency access facilities to the project site. In addition, the follow identifies any observed delays to emergency access operators adjacent to the project site.

There are five fire stations located within a less than 2-mile radius of the project site. The closest fire station (SFFD Station 15) is located at 1000 Ocean Avenue, at the corner of Ocean Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way, less than one block from the project site. Vehicles enter and exit the fire station from Ocean Avenue, west of Frida Kahlo Way. SFFD Station 39 is located about 1.3 miles north of the project site at 1091 Portola Drive. SFFD Station 33 is located about 1.3 miles southwest of the project site at 8 Capital Avenue. SFFD Station 43 is located about 1.5 miles southeast of the project site at 720 Moscow Street. SFFD Station 19 is located about 1.5 miles west of the project site at 390 Buckingham Way.

The closest police station (Ingleside Police Station) is located at 1 Sergeant John V Young Lane, 1.3 miles east of the project site. The project site is located about 2.5 miles southwest of Sutter Pacific Medical Foundation at 3620 Cesar Chavez and 3.5 miles south of the UCSF Medical Center at 505 Parnassus Avenue.

Emergency vehicle access to the project site is currently provided from Lee Avenue and the City College parking lot access road. All streets providing direct access to the site are wide enough to provide adequate access for emergency vehicles. Vehicle traffic along Ocean Avenue currently impedes emergency vehicles exiting SFFD Station 15. During peak periods, vehicle queues extending back from the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection were observed to occasionally

partially block the fire station driveway. Driveway blockages were observed approximately five times during the weekday p.m. peak hour and each occurrence lasted for between 10 and 20 seconds. No emergency vehicles were observed trying to exit the driveway during these times. Three of these events occurred when a vehicle was stopped behind a bus that was waiting for pedestrians to clear the crosswalk before turning into the City College Terminal. Two events occurred as a result of westbound queues extending back from the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection and the queue cleared when the signal turned green. Generally, arterial roadways in the study area, such as Ocean Avenue, Geneva Avenue, and Frida Kahlo Way, provide enough clearance space to permit other vehicles to maneuver out of the path and yield right-of-way to the emergency vehicle.

Vehicle Miles Traveled

The PEIR included an evaluation of automobile delay (vehicle level of service) and does not include an evaluation of VMT. The San Francisco Planning Commission replaced automobile delay (vehicle level of service) with the VMT significance criteria (resolution 19579) in March 2016 (refer to Regulatory Framework for more discussion). Accordingly, this analysis does not contain a discussion of automobile delay impacts. Instead, the analysis assesses VMT and induced automobile travel impacts.

VMT per person (or per capita) is a measurement of the amount and distance that a resident, employee, or visitor drives, accounting for the number of passengers within a vehicle. Many interdependent factors affect the amount and distance a person might drive. In particular, the built environment affects how many places a person can access within a given distance, time, and cost, using different ways of travels (e.g., private vehicle, public transit, bicycling, walking, etc.). Typically, low-density development located at great distances from other land uses and in areas with few options for ways of travel provides less access than a location with high density, mix of land uses, and numerous ways of travel. Therefore, low-density development typically generates more VMT compared to a similarly sized development located in urban areas.

Given these travel behavior factors, on average, persons living or working in San Francisco result in lower amounts of VMT per person than persons living or working elsewhere in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area region. On a more granular level persons living or working in some areas of San Francisco result in lower amounts of VMT per person on average, than persons living or working elsewhere in San Francisco. The city displays different amounts of VMT per capita geographically through transportation analysis zones (TAZs).¹⁵

SFCTA uses the San Francisco Chained Activity Modeling Process (SF-CHAMP) to estimate VMT by private automobiles and taxis for different TAZs. The transportation authority calibrates travel behavior in the model based on observed behavior from the California Household Travel Survey 2010–2012, census data regarding automobile ownership rates and county-to-county worker

¹⁵ Planners use these zones as part of transportation planning models for transportation analyses and other planning purposes. The zones vary in size from single city blocks in the downtown core, multiple blocks in outer neighborhoods, to even larger zones in historically industrial areas such as the Hunters Point Shipyard area.

flows, and observed vehicle counts and transit boardings. The model uses a synthetic population, which is a set of individual actors that represents the Bay Area's actual population, who make simulated travel decisions for a complete day.

The model estimates daily VMT for residential, office, and retail land use types. For residential and office uses, the transportation authority uses tour-based analysis. A tour-based analysis examines the entire chain of trips over the course of a day, not just trips to and from a site. For retail uses, the transportation authority uses trip-based analysis. A trip-based analysis counts VMT from individual trips to and from a site (as opposed to entire chain of trips). A trip-based approach, as opposed to a tour-based approach, is necessary for retail sites because a tour is likely to consist of trips stopping in multiple locations, and the summarizing of tour VMT to each location would over-estimate VMT.^{16,17,18}

Table 3.B-9, Existing Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled per Capita, presents the existing average daily VMT per capita for residents, employees, and visitors for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area and for TAZ 915, the TAZ in which the project site is located. The boundaries of TAZ 915 are generally Miramar Avenue, Wildwood Way, Greenwood Avenue, Frida Kahlo Way, and Ocean Avenue. As shown in Table 3.B-9, the current existing average daily VMT per capita for the various land uses at the project site is less than the regional Bay Area averages.

**TABLE 3.B-9
EXISTING DAILY VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED PER CAPITA**

Land Use	Bay Area Regional Average	Project TAZ (TAZ 915)
Residential	17.2	11.7
Childcare	19.1	13.0
Retail	14.9	1.9

SOURCE: San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Information Map, <http://sfplanninggis.org/TIM/>.

NOTE:

Childcare is an "other land use", meaning a land use other than residential, retail, and office. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research has not provided proposed screening criteria or thresholds of significance for other types of land uses, other than those that meet the definition of a small project. Consistent with San Francisco Planning Department's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, 2019 (p. L-16), childcare is treated as an "office use" for purposes of screening and analysis. The rationale being that travel characteristics associated with childcare facilities are most similar to the office land use.

¹⁶ To state another way: a tour-based assessment of VMT at a retail site would consider the VMT for all trips in the tour, for any tour with a stop at the retail site. If a single tour stops at two retail locations, for example, a coffee shop on the way to work and a restaurant on the way back home, then both retail locations would be allotted the total tour VMT. A trip-based approach allows us to apportion all retail-related VMT to retail sites without double-counting.

¹⁷ Retail travel is not explicitly captured in San Francisco chained activity modeling process, rather, there is a generic "Other" purpose which includes retail shopping, medical appointments, visiting friends or family, and all other nonwork, non-school tours. The retail efficiency metric captures all of the "Other" purpose travel generated by Bay Area households. The denominator of employment (including retail; cultural, institutional, and educational; and medical employment; school enrollment, and number of households) represents the size, or attraction, of the zone for this type of "Other" purpose travel.

¹⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, *Executive Summary: Resolution Modifying Transportation Impact Analysis, Appendix F, Attachment A*, March 3, 2016.

Loading Conditions

The following describes the absence, discontinuity, or presence of features related to loading in the study area. The description includes an assessment of commercial and passenger on- and off-street spaces, hour restrictions, and usage. In addition, the following identifies any potentially or observed hazardous conditions or delays to public transit due to loading activities.

Freight Loading

There are no existing designated freight loading spaces on the project site. Existing on-street freight loading zones (yellow zones) are located on Ocean Avenue (three metered spaces east of Brighton Avenue and four metered spaces west of Brighton Avenue) and Frida Kahlo Way (about 70 linear feet located north of City College Terminal). On-street commercial loading zones are in effect Monday through Saturday, 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. A loading dock and off-street freight loading area serving Whole Foods is located off the Lee Avenue extension north of Ocean Avenue. Despite being signed as a no-stopping zone, curbside loading/unloading activities were observed to occur on both sides of Lee Avenue. Information on delivery vehicle and loading activity was obtained from Whole Foods at 1150 Ocean Avenue and supplemental observations were conducted along Lee Avenue north of Ocean Avenue, including at the Whole Foods off-street loading dock and surface lot/auxiliary loading dock. This information is summarized in this section.

1150 Ocean Avenue Whole Foods Loading Survey

The Whole Foods store receives about 25 to 30 deliveries on Monday through Saturday with about 8 to 12 deliveries on Sunday.¹⁹ Loading occurs within the off-street surface lot/auxiliary loading dock, off-street loading facility, and along both sides of Lee Avenue. Deliveries occur between 6:30 a.m. and 3 p.m. and from 5 to 10:30 p.m. Evening delivery is limited to three larger delivery trucks measuring about 53 feet in length. The off-street loading dock is occupied continuously from 7 a.m. to 1 p.m. Vehicles accessing the loading dock pull head first into the off-street loading facility/truck turnaround and reverse across Lee Avenue into the loading dock. Trash and waste/recycling bins are stored at the end of Lee Avenue and loading occurs from Lee Avenue. Garbage trucks come on a daily basis. Delivery vehicle types range from single-unit box trucks and delivery vans to semi-trucks. To utilize the loading dock, semi-trucks pull head first into the off-street surface lot and reverse across Lee Avenue into the loading dock. During the month of November there are two 53-foot-long storage units along Lee Avenue that contain holiday meals.

Lee Avenue Loading Data

Loading data was collected on Tuesday March 26, 2019, when City College was in session, and is provided in Appendix C3, Freight Loading Data. Loading data was collected continuously between 5 a.m. and 10 p.m. and included loading activity within the Whole Foods off-street loading dock/truck turnaround, and both sides of Lee Avenue north of Ocean Avenue. Data was

¹⁹ Information provided by Whole Foods 1150 Ocean Avenue Store Manager on February 5, 2019 and April 3, 2019.

collected by video camera and was manually reviewed to record the location, vehicle type,²⁰ time in, time out, duration of stay, and whether the delivery was for Whole Foods or another location.

There were 76 total loading events observed over the 17-hour time period, including 52 (or 68 percent) related to Whole Foods. The following discussion pertains to Whole Foods-related deliveries only.

- **Duration of Stay:** Vehicles were stopped for an average duration of 23 minutes and 35 seconds and a median duration of 13 minutes. One vehicle was stopped for over 5 hours and 35 minutes²¹ and the minimum length of time a vehicle was stopped was observed to be 3 minutes and 55 seconds.
- **Time Period of Activity:** A total of 43 (83 percent) of the loading activity occurred within the five-hour time period between 7 a.m. and 12 p.m. Three events occurred prior to 7 a.m. and the remaining six events occurred between 1 p.m. and 9 p.m.
- **Peak Activity Levels:** The peak hour of loading arrivals occurred at 11 a.m. (10 arrivals). There were nine arrivals at 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. There was a maximum of six vehicles conducting loading at one time, including one vehicle within the off-street loading dock, two vehicles within the surface lot/auxiliary loading dock, and three vehicles on the west side of Lee Avenue. This peak occurred at 11:07 a.m.
- **Location:** The majority of delivery vehicles conducted curbside loading from Lee Avenue (see Exhibit 2). There were 31 vehicles (58 percent) stopped on Lee Avenue while 12 vehicles (23 percent) utilized the surface lot/auxiliary loading dock and the remaining nine vehicles (17 percent) utilized the off-street loading dock.
- **Vehicle Type:** A variety of vehicle types were observed conducting loading activity. The majority of delivery vehicles were single unit trucks (FHWA class 3 and FHWA class 5) and measured about 30 feet in length. The largest vehicles observed were five axle single trailer trucks (FHWA class 9). These vehicles typically measure about 55 feet in length.

This level of existing loading demand along Lee Avenue, equates to a need for approximately 160 feet of curbside loading, or spaces for five delivery/service vehicles of approximately 32 feet in length.

Passenger Loading

Passenger loading includes pick-up and drop-off conducted in private vehicles and TNCs and taxis. There are no existing designated passenger loading spaces on the project site. One existing accessible on-street passenger loading (white curb) zone is located on Ocean Avenue at Plymouth Avenue outside of the Ingleside Branch Library. No passenger loading/unloading activity was

²⁰ The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) 13-category classification rule set, which is currently used for most federal reporting requirements and serves as the basis for most state vehicle classification counting efforts, was used to classify the vehicles. FHWA Vehicle classification definitions are available online: <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/infrastructure/pavements/ltp/13091/002.cfm>, accessed April 4, 2019.

²¹ One vehicle was present at the beginning of the data collection period (5 a.m.) and departed at 10:34 a.m. This vehicle was stopped on Lee Avenue for a duration of over 5.5 hours. However, this length of stay does not represent typical turnover during hours of operation and is therefore excluded from the calculation of typical average and maximum duration.

observed to occur within the designated on-street passenger loading zones. However, passenger loading activity was observed to occur in available on-street parking spaces along Ocean Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way and within the off-street surface lot at the end of the Lee Avenue extension that serves Whole Foods delivery vehicles. During the two-hour observation period, two drivers in TNC vehicles stopped in the surface lot/auxiliary loading dock to drop off passengers and one driver in a private vehicle waited to pick-up a passenger. Based on the additional loading data collected on Tuesday March 26, 2019, during the 17-hour observation period between 5 a.m. and 10 p.m., a total of five passenger vehicles were observed loading/unloading passengers along Lee Avenue north of Ocean Avenue and one passenger vehicle was observed loading/unloading passengers within the surface lot/auxiliary loading dock.

According to citywide data reported in the TNCs Today Data Explorer, the peak weekday of TNC activity occurs on a Thursday.^{22,23} A total of 292 daily pick-ups and drop-offs occurred within the project's TAZ (TAZ 915) on a Thursday and the peak hours of TNC activity occurred between 9 a.m. and 10 a.m. (17 pick-ups and 16 drop-offs) and between 11 a.m. and 12 p.m. (16 pick-ups and 16 drop-offs) and steadily declined through the afternoon hours.

Parking Conditions

California Senate Bill (SB) 743 amended CEQA by adding California Public Resources Code (PRC) section 21099 regarding the analysis of parking impacts for certain urban infill projects in transit priority areas.²⁴ PRC section 21099(d), effective January 1, 2014, provides that "... parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site located within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment." Accordingly, parking is no longer to be considered in determining if a project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects for projects that meet all three criteria established in the statute.

The proposed project meets all of the criteria, and thus the transportation impact analysis does not consider the adequacy of parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA. Parking is not discussed further in this SEIR.

3.B.5 Regulatory Framework

This section provides a summary of the plans and policies of the City and County of San Francisco, and regional, state, and federal agencies that have policy and regulatory control over the project site. No federal regulations, plans, or policies are relevant to the project.

²² SFCTA, TNCs Today Data Explorer, <http://tncstoday.sfcta.org/>, accessed February 8, 2019.

²³ The TNCs Today Data Explorer provides an estimate of the number of TNC (Uber and Lyft) pickups and drop-offs in San Francisco by location and by time of day. Uber and Lyft trips are combined and only rides that occur within the city limits are counted. Data is averaged from several weeks in fall 2016.

²⁴ A "transit priority area" is defined as an area within 0.5 mile of an existing or planned major transit stop. A "major transit stop" is defined in California Public Resources Code section 21064.3 as a rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods. A map of San Francisco's Transit Priority Areas is available online at <http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/Map%20of%20San%20Francisco%20Transit%20Priority%20Areas.pdf>, accessed May 28, 2015.

State

CEQA Section 21099(b)(1) (SB 743)

CEQA section 21099(b)(1) requires that the State Office of Planning and Research develop revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects that “promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.” CEQA section 21099(b)(2) states that upon certification of the revised guidelines for determining transportation impacts pursuant to CEQA section 21099(b)(1), automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion, shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA.

In January 2016, the Office of Planning and Research published for public review and comment a *Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* recommending that transportation impacts for projects be measured using a VMT metric.²⁵ On March 3, 2016, based on compelling evidence in that document and on the department’s independent review of the literature on level of service and VMT, the San Francisco Planning Commission adopted the Office of Planning and Research’s recommendation to use the VMT metric instead of automobile delay to evaluate the transportation impacts of projects (resolution 19579). In December 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency certified and adopted the CEQA Guidelines update package, including the section implementing SB 743 (section 15064.3). The Office of Planning and Research developed a *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*, which contains OPR’s technical recommendations regarding assessment of VMT, thresholds of significance, and mitigation measures.²⁶

Regional

Plan Bay Area

Plan Bay Area 2040 is a state-mandated, integrated long-range transportation and land use plan. As required by SB 375, all metropolitan regions in California must complete a Sustainable Communities Strategy as part of a Regional Transportation Plan. This strategy integrates transportation, land use and housing to meet greenhouse gas reduction targets set by the California Air Resources Board. The plan meets those requirements. In addition, the plan sets a roadmap for future transportation investments and identifies what it would take to accommodate expected growth. The plan neither funds specific transportation projects nor changes local land use policies.

²⁵ California Office of Planning and Research, *Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, Implementing Senate Bill 743* (Steinberg, 2013), January 20, 2016.

²⁶ California Office of Planning and Research, *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*, December 18, 2018, http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf, accessed February 7, 2019.

In the Bay Area, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments adopted the latest plan in 2017. To meet the greenhouse gas reduction targets, the plan identifies priority development areas. The agencies estimate approximately 77 percent of housing and 55 percent of job growth will occur in the Priority Development Area between 2010 and 2040. The project is located in the Balboa Park Priority Development Area.

Local

Transit First Policy

In 1973, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors declared that public transit be given priority over other vehicles on San Francisco streets. In 1998, the San Francisco voters amended the City Charter (charter article 8A, section 8A.115) to include a transit first policy. The San Francisco General Plan incorporates the policy and the policy requires all city boards, commissions, and departments to implement principles that, among others, encourage the use of public rights-of-way by people walking, bicycling, and riding public transit above the use of the personal automobile.

Vision Zero Policy

In 2014, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution to implement an action plan to reduce traffic fatalities to zero by 2024 through engineering, education, and enforcement (resolution 91-14). Numerous San Francisco agencies responsible for the aforementioned aspects of the action plans adopted similar resolutions. In 2017, the Board of Supervisors amended the Transportation and Urban Design elements of the General Plan to implement Vision Zero (ordinance 175-17).

San Francisco General Plan

The Transportation Element of the San Francisco General Plan is composed of objectives and policies that relate to the nine aspects of the citywide transportation system: General, Regional Transportation, Congestion Management, Vehicle Circulation, Transit, Pedestrian, Bicycles, Citywide Parking, and Goods Management. The Transportation Element references San Francisco's Transit First Policy in its introduction and contains objectives and policies that are directly pertinent to consideration of the project, including objectives related to prioritizing sustainable modes of travel, integrating and connecting land use development and transportation investments, and designing streets for walking, biking, and public transit.

Balboa Park Station Area Plan

The area plan was adopted in 2009 and is informed by three key principles: improve the area's public realm, make the transit experience safer and more enjoyable, and improve the economic vitality of the Ocean Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District. It supports developing the Balboa Reservoir site for housing and includes policies designed to increase affordable housing for a variety of incomes; create open space; knit together isolated areas of the neighborhood;

integrate diverse land uses with the area's commercial and transit corridors; design streets for walking, biking and public transit; and otherwise strengthen the Balboa Park area.

Better Streets Plan, Policy, and Requirements

In 2006, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted the Better Streets Policy. Since then, the board has amended the policy several times, including in 2010 to reference the Better Streets Plan. The Better Streets Plan creates a unified set of standards, guidelines, and implementation strategies to govern how San Francisco designs, builds, and maintains its pedestrian environment. The planning code requires certain new development projects to make changes to the public right-of-way, such that it is consistent with the Better Streets Plan (section 138.1). The planning code requires most projects to plant and maintain street trees and some, larger projects to submit a streetscape plan that may require elements such as sidewalk widening, transit boarding islands, and medians.

San Francisco Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets (Blue Book)

The San Francisco Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets (the blue book) contains regulations that are prepared and regularly updated by the SFMTA, under the authority derived from the San Francisco Transportation Code, to serve as a guide for contractors working in San Francisco streets. The manual establishes rules and guidance so that work can be done safely and with the least possible interference with pedestrians, bicycle, transit and vehicular traffic. The manual also contains relevant general information, contact information, and procedures related to working in the public right-of-way when it is controlled by agencies other than the SFMTA.

In addition to the regulations presented in the manual, all traffic control, warning and guidance devices must conform to the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Furthermore, contractors are responsible for complying with all applicable city, state, and federal codes, rules and regulations. The party responsible for setting up traffic controls during construction is responsible if such controls do not meet the guidance and requirements established by this manual and any applicable state requirements.

Transportation Sustainability Fee

The planning code requires certain new development projects to pay an updated fee, based on the size of the development, to the city (section 411A). The fee offsets a portion of the development projects impacts on the transportation system. The city may only use the fee towards specific programs consisting of transit capital maintenance, local and regional transit service expansion and reliability, complete streets, and program administration.

Transportation Demand Management Program

The planning code requires certain new development projects to incorporate “design features, incentives, and tools” intended to reduce VMT (section 169). Development projects must choose measures from a menu of options to develop an overall transportation demand management (TDM) plan. Some options in the menu overlap with requirements elsewhere in the planning

code (e.g., bicycle parking, car-share parking). Each development project's TDM plan require routine monitoring and reporting to the planning department to demonstrate compliance.

Off-Street Loading

The planning code requires certain new development projects to include off-street freight loading spaces (section 152.1). The planning code requirements for spaces, depends on the size of the development projects. The planning requires certain dimensions of the spaces and allows for substituted service vehicle spaces (section 154(b)).

3.B.6 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Appendix G Questions and Significance Criteria

San Francisco Administrative Code chapter 31 directs the department to identify environmental effects of a project using as its base the environmental checklist form set forth in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. As it relates to transportation and circulation, Appendix G asks whether the project would:

- Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities;
- Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3(b), which pertains to vehicle miles traveled;
- Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); and
- Result in inadequate emergency access.

The department uses significance criteria to facilitate the transportation analysis and address the Appendix G checklist. The department separates the significance criteria into construction and operation.

Construction

Construction of the project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would require a substantially extended duration or intense activity; and the effects would create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving, or public transit operations; or interfere with accessibility for people walking or bicycling or substantially delay public transit.

Operation

The operational impact analysis addresses the following five significance criteria. A project would have a significant effect if it would:

- Create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving or public transit operations;

- Interfere with accessibility of people walking or bicycling to and from the project site, and adjoining areas, or results in inadequate emergency access;
- Substantially delay public transit;
- Cause substantial additional VMT or substantially inducing additional automobile travel by increasing physical roadway capacity in congested areas (i.e., by adding new mixed-flow travel lanes) or by adding new roadways to the network; and
- Result in a loading deficit and the secondary effects would create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving; or substantially delay public transit.

Approach to Analysis

Project Options

For purposes of the transportation analysis, two project options were analyzed to capture the range of potential impacts related to possible development on the project site. Transportation-related impacts associated with each project option are evaluated and presented. The project options are described in detail in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description, and summarized below.

- **Developer's Proposed Option**—The Developer's Proposed Option would consist of 1,100 dwelling units, approximately 10,000 gross square feet (gsf) of community space (childcare and a community room for public use), and approximately 7,500 gsf of retail. Up to 550 residential parking spaces and 750 public parking spaces would be constructed.
- **Additional Housing Option**—The Additional Housing Option would consist of 1,550 dwelling units, approximately 10,000 gsf of community space (childcare and a community room for public use), and approximately 7,500 gsf of retail. Up to 650 residential parking spaces and no public parking spaces would be constructed.

Project Features

The following describes transportation-related features of the project not described in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description. These features would apply to both project options, except as noted.

Construction Features

The proposed project is anticipated to be constructed in three phases over the course of six years. The three development phases are Phase 0 (grading and site infrastructure, 1 year), Phase 1 (town homes and inner blocks, 2.5 years), and Phase 2 (Blocks A, B, G, and H, 2.5 years). No parking lane or sidewalk closures would be required during construction.

The proposed project would minimize the need for exporting materials by recycling on-site during Phase 0. The number of construction-related truck trips would range from an average of 0 daily round-trips (during Phase 0 for both project options) to a maximum of 320 daily round-trips (during Phase 1 for the Additional Housing Option) for material delivery and removal. The primary haul routes for construction truck traffic would be:

- Entering the site: I-280 and Ocean Avenue westbound, continue northbound on Frida Kahlo Way to access the site at North Access Road
- Exiting the site: Turn right onto Frida Kahlo Way at Cloud Circle (S), continue southbound on Frida Kahlo Way and turn left onto Ocean Avenue eastbound

The number of construction workers accessing the site would range from an average of 33 workers per day (during Phase 0 for both project options) to a maximum of 460 workers per day (during Phase 1 for the Additional Housing Option). On-site parking would be provided for construction worker vehicles throughout the construction period.

The preliminary construction schedule and phasing is described in more detail in SEIR Section 2.G, Project Construction Overview and Schedule, p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**, and under Impact TR-1, pp. 3.B-68.

Roadway Network Features

Circulation changes implemented by the proposed project include the extension of Lee Avenue along the eastern border of the project site to connect to proposed interior street network. The proposed interior streets include the Lee Avenue extension, and new internal streets: North, South, and West streets. Proposed street sections are illustrated in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description, Figures 2-13 to 2-15, pp. **Error! Bookmark not defined.** to **Error! Bookmark not defined.**. The proposed project would not eliminate or relocate existing curb cuts.

Walking Network Features

The proposed project would be integrated with the existing street grid. Pedestrian paseos (12 feet wide) would be developed to align with Brighton Avenue to the south and San Ramon Way to the west to provide access for people walking. The north-south Brighton Avenue extension and the east-west San Ramon Way extension to the project site would be closed to vehicular traffic. Other access for people walking to the site would be provided from a shared public way at Plymouth Avenue and from Unity Plaza. The proposed street type plan and representative sections are illustrated in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description, Figure 2-12, p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**, and Figure 2-17, p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**, respectively.

On interior streets, the proposed project would provide sidewalks with a 6-foot-wide planting/furnishing strip and parking lane (aka courtesy strip) on both sides. Sidewalks on Lee Avenue would be approximately 6.5 feet wide and sidewalks on North, South, and West streets would be approximately 6 feet wide. Raised crosswalks would be installed at the Lee Avenue/SFPUC Open Space intersection and at the West Street/San Ramon Way extension/Central Park open space entry point. Raised crosswalks extend the sidewalk across the road and bring motor vehicles to the same level as people walking. Raised crosswalks improve accessibility by enabling people to cross at a nearly constant grade without the need for a curb

ramp and make the people crossing more visible to approaching motorists. Raised crosswalks have a trapezoid-shaped cross-section that slows motorists at the crossing. Proposed street sections are illustrated in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description, Figures 2-13 to 2-15, pp. Error! Bookmark not defined. to Error! Bookmark not defined..

Bicycle Network Features

The proposed project would provide a class II (bike lanes) or class IV (separated bikeway) facility on Lee Avenue and class III facilities (bike route, or shared lanes) would be provided on interior streets, North, South, and West streets and the Access Road at the north end of the site. Shared access for people walking and biking would be provided at the shared public way Plymouth Avenue/SFPUC Open Space. The proposed bicycle circulation is illustrated in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description, Figure 2-16, p. Error! Bookmark not defined..

Both project options would provide class 1 bicycle parking on the ground floor or in the first below-grade level of each buildings. Class 2 bicycle parking spaces would be located within public right-of-way adjacent to each building entrance or in the publicly accessible open space. The Developer's Proposed Option would provide at least 936 class 1 and 75 class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The Additional Housing Option would provide at least 1,100 class 1 and 80 class 2 bicycle parking spaces.

Transit Network Features

The proposed project does not include any transit network features, such as modifications to transit service, operations, or amenities.

Loading Features

[Note to Reviewer: This note has been added at the direction of EP. Off-street loading is being discussed by the project sponsor and Planning. Planning and SFMTA review of loading will be included with ADSEIR-2 comments.] The Developer's Proposed Option would include six on-street freight loading areas and eight passenger loading areas along the internal streets.

The Additional Housing Option would include six on-street freight loading areas and eight passenger loading areas along the internal streets.

Potential locations of on-street parking and loading areas are shown in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description, Figure 2-11, p. Error! Bookmark not defined.. Passenger loading/unloading zones would be located in proximity to building entrances.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan

[Note to Reviewer: These measures are preliminary and may be modified in subsequent drafts.]

San Francisco Planning Code section 169 identifies the applicability of the transportation demand management (TDM) Program and establishes the TDM Program Standards for new development. Based on these requirements, the project is subject to the TDM Program and must submit a TDM

Plan. The proposed project would include a TDM plan that would implement some or all of the following measures to reduce vehicle trips and encourage sustainable modes of transportation.

- Improve walking conditions by providing wide sidewalks and incorporating streetscape elements that encourage active transportation;
- Provide secure bike parking above code requirements;
- Provide a bike repair station in each building;
- Provide car share memberships and car share parking spaces;
- Provide delivery supportive amenities including a temporary storage location for deliveries;
- Include family TDM amenities including storage units, cargo bikes and cargo bike parking spaces, and collapsible shopping carts;
- Childcare facility provided onsite;
- Install multimodal wayfinding signage located internally and externally directing people to transit, bicycle parking and amenities, car share parking, and shuttle/carpool pick-up/drop-off locations;
- Install Real-time transportation information displays in building lobbies at each major entrance/exit showing transit lines, walk time to transit stops, availability of on-site car-share vehicles;
- Include on-site affordable housing;
- Provide reduced parking supply in comparison with the neighborhood average parking rate;
- Unbundle parking;
- Provide one bikeshare membership per dwelling unit; and
- Provide tailored transportation marketing.

Consistent with requirements outlined in San Francisco Planning Code section 169, the project sponsor commits to monitoring, reporting, and compliance throughout the life of the project to ensure the TDM Plan is being implemented correctly, on an ongoing basis.

Approach to Impact Analysis Methodology

The following summarizes the methodology for analyzing transportation impacts and information considered in developing travel demand estimates for the Developer's Proposed Option and the Additional Housing Option. In addition, the following summarizes the methodology for analyzing and any quantitative thresholds of significance for determining transportation impacts under existing plus project conditions. The travel demand and impact analysis methodology uses the data and guidance within the planning department's *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines* (2019).²⁷ If the methodology differs than that in the guidelines, the following summarizes such differences.

²⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review – Update, http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/TIA_Guidelines.pdf, accessed February 18, 2019.

Analysis Periods and Geographic Scope

The geographic scope of potential transportation impacts encompasses the transportation study area and study intersections. The transportation study area includes all aspects of the transportation network within generally two blocks of the project site, bounded by Frida Kahlo Way to the east, Miramar Avenue to the west, Holloway Avenue to the south, and Monterey Boulevard to the north. The transportation study area and study intersections are shown in Figure 3.B-1, p. 3.B-10.

The analysis of the proposed project was conducted for existing plus project and 2040 cumulative conditions. The existing plus project conditions assess the near-term impacts of the proposed project, while 2040 cumulative conditions assess the near-term and long-term impacts of the proposed project in combination with cumulative development. Cumulative transportation impacts are assessed based on a review of the foreseeable future projects (a list-based approach) that are located within the project's study area (see SEIR Section 3.A.6, Approach to Cumulative Impact Analysis, p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**, for a detailed description of these projects).

In San Francisco, the weekday extended p.m. peak period (3 to 7 p.m.) is typically the period when the most overall travel happens. The analysis conducted in this SEIR focuses on a two-hour p.m. period between 4 and 6 p.m. Given the size and the proposed uses of the project, as well as travel characteristics of City College, the methodology and analysis also considers the a.m. peak period (7 a.m. to 9 a.m.). Although a substantial amount of travel occurs throughout the day and impacts from projects would typically be less during other periods, for most topics, the methodology focuses on the a.m. and p.m. peak periods. The travel demand presents daily and peak a.m. and p.m. person trip and vehicle trip generation. In addition, for loading, the methodology uses the 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. period to assess commercial vehicle loading demand and 4 to 6 p.m. period to assess passenger vehicle loading demand.

Project Travel Demand Methodology and Results

Project travel demand refers to the number, type, and common destinations of new trips that people would take to and from the project. The memorandum containing the detailed methodology and results for the project travel demand is included in SEIR Appendix C1, Travel Demand Memorandum. This section summarizes the travel demand memorandum.

Existing Site Trips

Current driveway counts are shown in **Figure 3.B-4, Existing Vehicle Trips at Site Driveways**, and summarized in **Table 3.B-10, Existing Site Driveway Counts**, were collected at the entrances to the City College Lot during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak periods on Thursday December 7, 2017, when City College was in session.

TABLE 3.B-10
EXISTING SITE DRIVEWAY COUNTS

City College Parking Lot Entrance	Weekday A.M. Peak Hour ^a			Weekday P.M. Peak Hour ^b		
	Inbound	Outbound	Total	Inbound	Outbound	Total
North	141	144	285	83	130	213
South	194	20	214	121	153	274
Total	335	164	499	204	283	487

SOURCE: Quality Counts, 2017.

NOTES:

^a The weekday a.m. peak hour of vehicle activity occurred between 7:35 a.m. and 8:35 a.m.

^b The weekday p.m. peak hour of vehicle activity occurred between 5 p.m. and 6 p.m.

As shown in Table 3.B-10, there were a total of 499 vehicles (335 inbound, 164 outbound) and 487 vehicles (204 inbound, 283 outbound) observed entering the City College parking lot during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively. The existing site driveways serve the parking lot in both the west basin (the project site, also known as the “lower basin”) and the east basin (also known as the “upper basin”). As such, a portion of the vehicle trips counted at the site driveways would be destined for the project site and the remaining vehicle trips would be destined for the east basin. The number of vehicle trips traveling to/from the project site was estimated using parking occupancy and accumulation data collected at the east and west basins and the vehicle turning movement counts collected at the existing site driveways. Overall, it was estimated that a total of 97 vehicle trips (48 inbound, 49 outbound) and 72 vehicle trips (28 inbound, 44 outbound) were traveling to/from the project site.

Figure 3.B-4 Existing Vehicle Trips at Site Driveways

Project Trips

The travel demand forecast methodology consists of four steps: (1) trip generation, (2) ways people travel, (3) common destinations, and (4) assignment. The following summarizes each of these steps.

Step 1. Trip Generation

Trip generation refers to the number of estimated trips people would take to and from the project, regardless of the way they travel (see step 2 below). The following refers to these trips as person trips. The following applies person trip rates, accounting for the size and type of land use, to estimate the number of project person trips. **Table 3.B-11, Person-Trip Generation Estimates by Land Use**, presents the estimates of the number of daily, a.m. peak period, and p.m. peak period project person trips by land use for both the Developer's Proposed Option and the Additional Housing Option.

TABLE 3.B-11
PERSON-TRIP GENERATION ESTIMATES BY LAND USE

Land Use	Developer's Proposed Option			Additional Housing Option		
	Daily	A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour	Daily	A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour
Residential	9,386	635	834	13,226	895	1,176
Retail	1,123	77	101	1,123	77	101
Daycare	476	116	117	476	116	117
Total	10,985	828	1,052	14,825	1,088	1,394

SOURCE: SF Guidelines, 2019. ITE, 10th Edition, 2017.

Step 2. Ways People Travel

Ways people travel, also known as mode split, refers to the estimated way or method people travel (e.g., walking, bicycling, transit, etc.). **Table 3.B-12, Mode Split by Land Use**, provides the estimated percentage of a.m. and p.m. peak period project trips by different ways of travel. The percentages account for the geographic location of the project site and apply to both the Developer's Proposed Option and the Additional Housing Option.

Table 3.B-13, Person-Trip Generation Estimates by Mode and Land Use, provides the estimated number of a.m. and p.m. peak period project trips by different ways of travel. The "auto" person trip row consists of persons traveling by private auto, carpool, and for-hire vehicle (e.g., taxi or TNC). The vehicle trip row is less than the auto trip row because it accounts for carpooling or the number of people in a vehicle, also known as average vehicle occupancy. The "transit" column consists of public local and regional transit. **Table 3.B-14, Vehicle Trip Estimates by Land Use**, provides the estimated number of daily, a.m. and p.m. peak hour project vehicle trips.

TABLE 3.B-12
MODE SPLIT BY LAND USE

Mode	Residential	Retail	Daycare
Auto	40%	54%	42%
Taxi/TNC	4%	1%	3%
Transit	19%	16%	19%
Walk	33%	28%	32%
Bike	4%	1%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%

SOURCE: SF Guidelines, 2019; ITE, 10th Edition, 2017.

NOTES:

TNC = Transportation Network Company

The mode split applies to both the Developer's Proposed Option and the Additional Housing Option.

TABLE 3.B-13
PERSON-TRIP GENERATION ESTIMATES BY MODE AND LAND USE

Mode	Weekday A.M. Peak Hour				Weekday P.M. Peak Hour			
	Retail	Daycare	Residential	Total	Retail	Daycare	Residential	Total
Developer's Proposed Option								
Auto	42	48	254	344	55	49	333	437
Taxi/TNC	1	4	22	27	1	4	29	34
Transit	12	21	120	153	16	22	157	195
Walk	21	39	215	275	28	38	283	349
Bike	1	4	24	29	1	4	32	37
Total Person Trips	77	116	635	828	101	117	834	935
<i>Vehicle Trips</i>	24	30	195	249	31	30	257	318
Additional Housing Option								
Auto	42	48	358	448	55	49	470	574
Taxi/TNC	1	4	31	36	1	4	41	46
Transit	12	21	169	202	16	22	221	259
Walk	21	39	303	363	28	38	399	465
Bike	1	4	34	39	1	4	45	50
Total Person Trips	77	116	895	1,088	101	117	1,176	1,394
<i>Vehicle Trips</i>	24	30	275	329	31	30	362	423

SOURCE: SF Guidelines, 2019. ITE, 10th Edition, 2017.

NOTES:

Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

TNC = Transportation Network Company

TABLE 3.B-14
VEHICLE TRIP ESTIMATES BY LAND USE

Land Use	Daily	Weekday A.M. Peak Hour ^a			Weekday P.M. Peak Hour		
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Developer's Proposed Option							
Residential	2,842	63	132	195	175	82	257
Retail	192	13	11	24	14	17	31
Daycare	134	16	14	30	14	16	30
Total Vehicle Trips	3,168	92	157	249	203	115	318
Additional Housing Option							
Residential	4,116	88	187	275	246	116	362
Retail	192	13	11	24	14	17	31
Daycare	134	16	14	30	14	16	30
Total Vehicle Trips	4,442	117	212	329	274	149	423

SOURCE: SF Guidelines, 2019; ITE, 10th Edition, 2017.

NOTES:

Totals may not sum due to rounding.

a Weekday a.m. peak hour values are calculated using the ITE Trip Generation Handbook 10th edition ratios for a.m. to p.m. for each use. The distribution of weekday a.m. peak hour trips in and out of the project are the inverse of the weekday p.m. peak hour trips for each land use.

Step 3. Common Destinations

Common destinations, also known as trip distribution, refers to the estimated number of trips people would take to (inbound) and from (outbound) the project and another place (e.g., another neighborhood). Common destinations consist of eight San Francisco neighborhoods, east bay, north bay, and the south bay. **Table 3.B-15, Project Vehicle and Transit Trip Distribution**, provides the estimated percentage of a.m. and p.m. peak period project vehicle and transit trips to the common destinations. The percentages account for the geographic location of the project site and apply to both the Developer's Proposed Option and the Additional Housing Option. **Figure 3.B-5, Project Vehicle and Transit Trip Distribution**, displays the information from Table 3.B-15 on a map.

TABLE 3.B-15
PROJECT VEHICLE AND TRANSIT TRIP DISTRIBUTION

Origin/Destination	Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option	
	Vehicle Trip Distribution	Transit Trip Distribution
Downtown/North Beach	11%	41%
South of Market (SoMa)	2%	8%
Marina/Western Market	12%	7%
Mission/Potrero	10%	5%
Outer Mission/Hills	14%	10%
Bayshore	4%	3%
Richmond	1%	10%
Sunset	24%	3%
Islands	0%	0%
South Bay	16%	4%
East Bay	6%	9%
North Bay	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%

SOURCE: SF Guidelines, 2019.

Step 4. Assignment

Assignment refers to the location or assignment of project vehicle trips to different streets, on-street loading zones, and driveways, and project transit trips to specific transit routes. In other words, assignment uses the results of step 2, number of project trips by different ways of travel, and step 3, percentages of those projects trips to and from common destinations, to place assign project-generated vehicle and transit trips to the local streets and transit routes in the study area. **Figure 3.B-6a, Project Vehicle Trip Assignment – Developer's Proposed Option**, and **Figure 3.B-6b, Project Vehicle Trip Assignment – Developer's Proposed Option**, presents a.m. and p.m. peak period project vehicle trips to the intersections and driveways in the study area for the Developer's Proposed Option. Under the Developer's Proposed Option, the existing vehicle trips destined for the parking lot on the project site were redistributed from the north entrance along Frida Kahlo Way to Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue to access the proposed public parking garage located on the southern end of the project site. **Figure 3.B-7a, Project Vehicle Trip Assignment – Additional Housing Option**, and **Figure 3.B-7b, Project Vehicle Trip Assignment – Additional Housing Option**, presents a.m. and p.m. peak period project vehicle trips to the intersections and driveways in the study area for the Additional Housing Option.

Figure 3.B-5 Project Vehicle and Transit Trip Distribution

Figure 3.B-6a Project Vehicle Trip Assignment – Developer’s Proposed Option

This page intentionally left blank

Figure 3.B-6b Project Vehicle Trip Assignment – Developer’s Proposed Option

This page intentionally left blank

Figure 3.B-7a Project Vehicle Trip Assignment – Additional Housing Option

This page intentionally left blank

Figure 3.B-7b Project Vehicle Trip Assignment – Additional Housing Option

This page intentionally left blank

Loading Demand

Loading demand consists of the estimated number of project delivery/service vehicle and passenger vehicle trips. Loading demand rates, accounting for the size and type of land uses were applied to estimate the freight and passenger loading demand. **Table 3.B-16, Freight and Passenger Loading Demand by Land Use**, presents daily, average, and peak hour demand for delivery/service vehicles and peak hour for passenger vehicles.

TABLE 3.B-16
FREIGHT AND PASSENGER LOADING DEMAND BY LAND USE

Land Use	Developer's Proposed Option				Additional Housing Option			
	Freight Loading Demand (spaces) ^a			Peak Hour Passenger Loading Demand (spaces, rounded) ^b	Freight Loading Demand (spaces) ^a			Peak Hour Passenger Loading Demand (spaces, rounded) ^b
	Daily	Average Hour	Peak Hour		Daily	Average Hour	Peak Hour	
Residential	38.5	1.8	2.2	2	46.4	2.1	2.7	2
Retail	1.7	0.1	0.1	1	1.7	0.1	0.1	1
Daycare	1.0	0.0	0.1	1	1.0	0.0	0.1	1
Total	41.1	1.9	2.4	4	49.1	2.2	2.9	4

SOURCE: SF Guidelines, 2002; SF Guidelines, 2019

NOTES:

^a Freight loading demand is presented as the number of delivery/service vehicle trips per time period. The peak period of freight loading demand typically occurs between 10 a.m. and 1 p.m. and does not coincide with the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak periods.

^b Passenger loading demand is presented as the passenger loading trips estimated to occur during the peak period. The peak period of demand occurs during the extended weekday p.m. peak period (3 to 7 p.m.).

Construction Impacts

The analysis for addressing project construction impacts uses preliminary project construction information. The evaluation addresses the staging and duration of construction activities, estimated daily worker and truck trips, truck routes, roadway and/or sidewalk closures, and evaluates the effects of construction activities on people walking, bicycling, or driving, and riding public transit and emergency vehicle access.

Operational Impacts

The following describes the methodology for analysis of operational impacts, by significance criterion.

Potentially Hazardous Conditions

A "hazard" refers to a project generated vehicle potentially colliding with a person walking, bicycling, or driving or public transit vehicle that could cause serious or fatal physical injury, accounting for the aspects described below. Human error or noncompliance with laws, weather conditions, time-of-day, and other factors can affect whether a collision could occur. However, for purposes of CEQA, hazards refer to engineering aspects of a project (e.g., speed, turning

movements, complex designs, substantial distance between street crossings, sight lines) that may cause a greater risk of collisions that result in serious or fatal physical injury than a typical project. This analysis focuses on hazards that could reasonably stem from the project itself, beyond collisions that may result from aforementioned non-engineering aspects or the transportation system as a whole.

Therefore, the methodology qualitatively addresses the potential for the project to exacerbate an existing or create a new potentially hazardous condition to people walking, bicycling, or driving, or public transit operations. The methodology accounts for the amount, movement type, sightlines, and speed of project vehicle trips and project changes to the public right-of-way in relation to the presence of people walking, bicycling, or driving. Additionally, an evaluation of vehicle volumes and 95th percentile queues²⁸ at the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection was conducted to assess potential of the project to create hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, driving, or public transit operations.

Accessibility

The methodology qualitatively addresses the potential for the project to interfere with the accessibility of people walking or bicycling or results in inadequate emergency access. The methodology accounts for the amount, movement type, sightlines, and speed of project vehicle trips and project changes to the public right-of-way in relation to the presence of people walking and bicycling or emergency service operator facilities.

Public Transit Delay

The department uses a quantitative threshold of significance and qualitative criteria to determine whether the project would substantially delay public transit. For individual Muni routes, if the project would result in transit delay greater than equal to four minutes, then it might result in a significant impact. For individual Muni routes with headways less than eight minutes, the department may use a threshold of significance less than four minutes. For individual surface lines operated by regional agencies, if the project would result in transit delay greater than one-half headway, then it might result in a significant impact. The department considers the following qualitative criteria for determining whether that delay would result in significant impacts due to a substantial number of people riding transit switching to riding in private or for-hire vehicles: transit service headways and ridership, origins and destinations of trips, availability of other transit and modes, and competitiveness with private vehicles.

The methodology assesses and reports a.m. and p.m. peak hour transit delay for Muni routes operating along Frida Kahlo Way (43 Masonic), Ocean Avenue (K Ingleside, 29 Sunset, and 49 Van Ness/Mission), and Geneva Avenue (8 Bayshore, 8BX 8 Bayshore 'B' Express, 43 Masonic, and 54 Felton) using the following three factors:

- **Traffic congestion delay**—When public transit vehicles share travel lanes with private vehicles or private vehicles block intersections or result in longer traffic signal phases to

²⁸ The 95th percentile queue is the queue length (in vehicles) that has only a 5 percent probability of being exceeded during the analysis time period (i.e., for this analysis, a total period of 60 minutes).

accommodate their movements, transit vehicles slow down. The methodology uses Trafficware's Synchro modeling software to calculate traffic congestion delays along corridors served by transit.

- **Transit reentry delay**—Public transit vehicles may experience delays after stopping to pick up and drop off passengers. This delay occurs if the transit vehicles must pull over to another travel lane and they need to wait for gaps in adjacent street traffic to pull out of stops. As traffic volumes on streets increase, transit vehicles experience increased delays as it becomes more challenging for them to reenter the flow of traffic. The methodology uses empirical data from the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual to calculate transit reentry delay caused by the project by summing the transit reentry delay at each stop within the study area, depending on the adjacent lane traffic volumes.
- **Passenger boarding delay**—The amount of time a transit vehicle spends picking up and dropping off passengers (i.e., the transit vehicle dwell time) is correlated to the number of passengers boarding the vehicle. As general transit ridership grows, vehicles spend more time at stops, which increases transit travel times. The methodology uses empirical data to calculate passenger boarding delay caused by the project by multiplying the total number of project transit trips on each route by two seconds of delay.

VTM Analysis Methodology

Land Use Components

The planning department uses the following quantitative thresholds of significance to determine whether the project would generate substantial additional VMT:

- For residential projects, if it exceeds the regional household VMT per capita minus 15 percent;
- For office projects, if it exceeds the regional VMT per employee minus 15 percent;
- For retail projects, if it exceeds the regional VMT per retail employee minus 15 percent;²⁹ and
- For mixed-use projects, evaluate each land use independently, per the thresholds of significance described above.

The department uses a map-based screening criterion to identify types and locations of land use projects that would not exceed these quantitative thresholds of significance. SFCTA uses a travel demand model to present VMT for residential, office, and retail in San Francisco and the region, as described and shown under existing conditions. The department uses that data and associated maps to determine whether a project site's location is below the aforementioned VMT quantitative threshold of significance. Childcare is treated as office for screening and analysis.³⁰

Further, the department presumes residential, retail, and office projects, and projects that are a mix of these uses, proposed within 0.5 mile of an existing major transit stop (as defined by CEQA section 21064.3) or an existing stop along a high-quality transit corridor (as defined by CEQA section 21155) would not exceed these quantitative thresholds of significance. However, this presumption would not apply if the project would: (1) have a floor area ratio of less than 0.75;

²⁹ Ibid, footnote 4 [the footnote that explains what retail VMT is presenting in terms of size]

³⁰ San Francisco Planning Department, *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines*, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Memo Appendix A, Attachment A, p. 5.

(2) include more parking for use by residents, customers, or employees of the project than required or allowed, without a conditional use; or (3) is inconsistent with the applicable Sustainable Communities Strategy.³¹

Transportation Components

The proposed project is a mixed-use development project that includes the creation of an internal street network, facilities for people walking and biking, traffic calming measures, and intersection traffic control devices including stop controls.

The department uses the following quantitative threshold of significance and screening criteria to determine whether transportation projects may substantially induce additional automobile travel: 2,075,220 VMT per year. This threshold is based on the fair share VMT allocated to transportation projects required to achieve California's long-term greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

The department uses a list of transportation components that would not exceed this quantitative threshold of significance. If a project fits within the general types of projects (including combinations of types) listed below, then the department presumes that VMT impacts would be less than significant:

- Active Transportation, Rightsizing, and Transit Projects:
 - Infrastructure projects, including safety and accessibility improvements for people walking or bicycling
 - Installation or reconfiguration of traffic calming devices
 - Creation of new or addition of roadway capacity on local or collector streets provided the project also substantially improves conditions for people walking, bicycling, and, if applicable, riding transit
- Other Minor Transportation Projects:
 - Installation, removal, or reconfiguration of traffic lanes that are not for through traffic, such as left, right, and U-turn pockets, or emergency breakdown lanes that are not used as through lanes
 - Timing of signals to optimize vehicle, bicycle or pedestrian flow on local or collector streets
 - Addition of transportation wayfinding signage
 - Removal of off-street parking spaces

Loading

The loading analysis considers loading conditions within the project site and along Lee Avenue between Ocean Avenue and the project site.

³¹ The department considers a project to be inconsistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy if the project is located outside of areas contemplated for development in the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Within the Project Site

The methodology assesses the potential for convenient off- and on-street freight and passenger loading facilities to meet the project's loading demand during the average peak period. For the purposes of this section, convenient refers to facilities located wholly within the project site.

If convenient loading facilities meet the estimated demand, the analysis is complete. If convenient loading facilities do not meet the demand, then the methodology qualitatively addresses the potential for the project to exacerbate an existing or create a new potentially hazardous condition to people walking, bicycling, or driving or substantially delay public transit.

Lee Avenue between Ocean Avenue and the Project Site

The methodology assesses the potential for the project to result in changes to the existing supply of off- and on-street freight and loading facilities such that it would impact existing loading activity along Lee Avenue between Ocean Avenue and the project site.

If convenient loading facilities meet the existing demand, the analysis is complete. If convenient loading facilities do not meet the existing demand, then the methodology qualitatively addresses the potential for the project to exacerbate an existing or create a new potentially hazardous condition to people walking, bicycling, or driving or substantially delay public transit.

2040 Cumulative Conditions

The 2040 cumulative conditions assess the long-term impacts of the project in combination with cumulative projects. The following summarizes future year modeling and cumulative projects list relevant to particular transportation topics. In addition, the following summarizes differences between existing plus project and these future year conditions regarding the methodology for analyzing and any quantitative thresholds of significance for determining transportation impacts.

2040 Modeling

The cumulative conditions analysis incorporates data and forecasts from the SF-CHAMP outputs in the analysis of VMT impacts. The model is an activity-based travel demand model that the transportation authority calibrates to represent future transportation conditions in San Francisco, accounting for assumptions regarding cumulative infrastructure projects and population growth. Inputs to the model include:

- infrastructure projects listed in Plan Bay Area (2017)
- infrastructure projects listed in San Francisco's Countywide Transportation Plan, Capital Plan, or a San Francisco agency's (e.g., SFMTA) Capital Improvement Program
- infrastructure, private development, or area plan projects actively undergoing environmental review, recently completed environmental review, or the department anticipates to undertake environmental review in the near future because they have received sufficient project definition

- land use growth assumptions derived from the Jobs-Housing-Connections projections developed by ABAG/MTC³²

2040 Cumulative Projects

The cumulative conditions analysis for transportation topics other than VMT uses a list-based approach. The project site is located within the boundaries of the area plan and there are multiple active development and transportation projects in the vicinity of the project site in various stages of planning, design, or construction. The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative transportation impacts generally includes the sidewalks and roadways adjacent to the project site, and the local roadway and transit network within 0.5 mile of the project site. The discussion of cumulative transportation impacts assesses the degree to which the proposed project would affect the transportation network in conjunction with overall citywide growth and other cumulative projects. The following describes cumulative land development and transportation projects that the analysis uses to assess cumulative impacts.

Development

The PEIR estimated that implementation of the area plan would result in a net increase of 1,780 residential units (including 500 residential units on the Balboa Reservoir site) and 104,620 net new square feet of commercial development in the plan area by 2025. As of September 2018, 273 dwelling units and 40,904 square feet of commercial uses had been built in the plan area. **[Note to Reviewer: This will be updated prior to publication.]** Excluding the proposed project, an additional 209 dwelling units and 10,995 square feet of commercial uses are under construction in the plan area (SEIR Section 3.A, Impact Overview, p. 3.A-1).

The list of reasonably foreseeable cumulative development projects generally located within the plan area or 0.5 mile of the project site that are considered in the transportation analysis are presented in Table 3.A-1, Cumulative Projects in the Project Vicinity, p. 3.A-11, and illustrated on Figure 3.A-1, Cumulative Projects in the Project Vicinity, p. 3.A-12, in Section 3.A.6, Approach to Cumulative Impact Analysis.

The Developer's Proposed Option, in combination with completed projects and cumulative development projects, would represent a net increase of 1,582 residential units and 59,339 square feet of commercial development. This is 198 fewer residential units and 45,281 fewer square feet of commercial space than what was assumed in the PEIR.

The Additional Housing Option, in combination with completed projects and cumulative projects, would represent a net increase of 2,032 residential units and 59,339 square feet of commercial development. This is 252 more residential units and 45,281 fewer square feet of commercial space than what was assumed in the PEIR.

³² The analysis used the Hub and Civic Center Model Run. Documentation, including input assumptions, is included in the Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines – Supplementary Guidance Memorandum on pp. 22-28. http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/TIA_Guidelines_Supplementary_Guidance_Memo.pdf, accessed April 16, 2019.

In addition to the development projects identified above, the City College facilities master plan is currently under development and will provide a roadmap for facilities development at the Ocean Avenue campus, including modernization of existing buildings and construction of new buildings, including a 201,000-square-foot performing arts education center and parking lot with 877 vehicle parking spaces. Construction of these facilities is anticipated to occur between 2021 and 2023.

Transportation

The cumulative conditions analysis also considers the effects of foreseeable changes to the transportation network. Some of the changes identified in the area plan have been implemented, including removal of two travel lanes and installation of class II bike lanes on Frida Kahlo Way. Key projects affecting the transportation network that were assumed to be in place as part of the 2040 cumulative conditions include the following:

- **Ocean Avenue Safety Project.**³³ The Ocean Avenue Safety Project is aimed at improving safety, accessibility, and comfort for people traveling on Ocean Avenue between Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way and San Jose Avenue. The project will develop a set of near-term improvements and a long-term vision for the corridor. Near-term projects are anticipated to be under construction in 2020.
- **I-280 Interchange Modifications at Balboa Park Project.**³⁴ The recommended alternative would create a partial split interchange in which northbound I-280 traffic would exit onto Geneva Avenue but enter the freeway from Ocean Avenue; southbound traffic would still be able to exit both Geneva and Ocean avenues while only entering from Geneva Avenue. The project is anticipated to be completed by 2024. The recommended modifications included three project elements:
 - Element 1: Close the northbound I-280/Geneva Avenue on-ramp
 - Element 2: Realign the southbound I-280/Ocean Avenue off-ramp into a “T” intersection with a new signal on Ocean Avenue
 - Element 3: Construct a new northbound frontage road between Geneva Avenue and Ocean Avenue, immediately east of I-280, to accommodate a new kiss-and-ride drop off area with direct connection to the BART Westside Walkway
- **Muni Forward Project.** The Muni Forward project provided a thorough review of San Francisco’s public transit system by SFMTA. Based on this review, the SFMTA developed Muni Forward proposals aimed at improving reliability, reducing travel times, providing service that is more frequent, and updating Muni bus routes and rail lines to better match travel patterns. Muni Forward projects are being implemented based on funding and resource availability. Muni Forward recommendations included new routes and route realignments, more service on busy routes, and elimination or consolidation of certain routes or route segments with low ridership. The proposed changes to Muni routes serving the project site include:
 - **8 Bayshore Transit Priority Treatments.** This project is being implemented in phases as part of the San Bruno Avenue Multimodal Improvement Project and the Geneva Avenue

³³ SFMTA, Ocean Avenue Safety Project website, <https://www.sfmta.com/projects/ocean-avenue-safety-project>, accessed January 10, 2019.

³⁴ SFCTA, I-280 Interchange Modifications at Balboa Park Project website, <https://www.sfcta.org/I-280-interchange-modifications-balboa-park-project>, accessed January 10, 2019.

- & Visitacion Valley Multimodal Improvement Project. Changes under the former have already been approved, but are yet to be implemented. Preliminary transit priority treatments have been developed for the route segments along Geneva Avenue and through Visitacion Valley, but are currently being reevaluated by SFMTA through additional outreach.^{35,36,37} Completion estimated in September 2020.
- **28 19th Avenue Rapid Project.**³⁸ Expand service to operate seven days a week from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. with 10-minute headways. The project includes transit and pedestrian bulbs at 19 intersections, stop relocations and removals at eight intersections, and a bus zone extension.
 - **29 Sunset.** Increase service frequency from 9 minutes to 8 minutes during the weekday a.m. peak period.
 - **Van Ness Improvement Project.**³⁹ This project will build red center-running bus rapid transit lanes, station platforms, and new medians along Van Ness Avenue. Bus Rapid Transit service is expected to begin in 2021 and would cut travel times on the 49 Van Ness/Mission.
 - **49R Van Ness/Mission Rapid.** Conversion of existing 49 Van Ness/Mission service to limited stop service on Mission Street with a 7.5-minute headway during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak periods.
 - **52 Excelsior.** Extension from the Excelsior District to Balboa Park Station and City College Terminal.
 - **54 Felton.** Increase frequency from 20 to 15 minutes during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak periods. Reroute through the Excelsior District and at Balboa Park Station to a new alignment along Persia, Ocean, and Plymouth avenues.
 - **Two-Car Trains on K and T Line.**⁴⁰ Starting with the completion of Twin Peaks tunnel work, the entire K/T line will be upgraded to two-car trains. For the Ocean Avenue section of the line, there is currently not enough space for safe boarding and unloading of the second car. Therefore, only the front trains along Ocean Avenue will be in service.

In addition to the above listed projects, the cumulative conditions analysis also incorporates the effects of several other major projects that are citywide or regional in scope, even though they would not directly affect the transportation network in the vicinity of the project site. Projects such as Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit, the Caltrain Modernization Program, expanded ferry service from WETA, and various capacity upgrades to BART—including the Train Control

³⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, Balboa Park Station Area Project Status Map, https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/viewer?mid=1SmS264e6XZmloZxbCFRwdH_5mX4&ll=37.72365776834927%2C-122.4523862281078&z=18, accessed January 10, 2019.

³⁶ SFMTA, Geneva Avenue Multimodal Improvement Project website, <https://www.sfmta.com/projects-planning/projects/geneva-ave-visitacion-valley-multimodal-improvement-project>, accessed January 10, 2019.

³⁷ SFMTA, San Bruno Avenue Multimodal Improvement Project website, <https://www.sfmta.com/projects/san-bruno-ave-multimodal-improvement-project>, accessed January 10, 2019.

³⁸ SFMTA, 28 19th Avenue Rapid Project website, <https://www.sfmta.com/projects/28-19th-avenue-rapid-project>, accessed January 10, 2019.

³⁹ SFMTA, Van Ness Improvement Project website, <https://www.sfmta.com/projects/van-ness-improvement-project>, accessed January 10, 2019.

⁴⁰ SFMTA, Two-Car Trains on K and T Line website, <https://www.sfmta.com/projects/two-car-trains-k-and-t-line>, accessed January 10, 2019.

Modernization Program and new Fleet of the Future rolling stock—will affect transit service (and capacity), and have been accounted for in the latest SF-CHAMP model runs.

Construction Impacts

The analysis for addressing project construction impacts uses preliminary project construction information from the following reasonably foreseeable projects: City College Performing Arts Center, City College East Basin Parking Structure, Ocean Avenue Safety Project, and I-280 Interchange Modifications at Balboa Park Project.⁴¹ The evaluation uses the same methodology as described above for existing plus project conditions.

Cumulative Operational Impacts

The following describes the methodology for cumulative analysis of operational impacts, by significance criterion. If the combined projects would result in a significant cumulative impact, the 2040 cumulative conditions assess the project's contribution to that impact.

Potentially Hazardous Conditions

The analysis for addressing potentially hazardous conditions uses information from the PEIR and a subset of cumulative projects identified in SEIR Section 3.A, Impact Overview, p. 3.A-1, including the City College Performing Arts Center and City College East Basin Parking Structure. The evaluation uses the same methodology as described above for existing plus project conditions.

Accessibility

The analysis for addressing interference or inadequate access uses information from the PEIR and a subset of cumulative projects identified in SEIR Section 3.A, Impact Overview, p. 3.A-1, including the City College Performing Arts Center and City College East Basin Parking Structure. The evaluation uses the same methodology as described above for existing plus project conditions.

Public Transit Delay

The analysis for addressing public transit delay uses information from the PEIR and a subset of cumulative projects identified in SEIR Section 3.A, Impact Overview, p. 3.A-1, including:

- 2340 San Jose Avenue (Upper Yard)
- 2301 San Jose Avenue (Geneva Office Building – Geneva Car Barn and Powerhouse)
- 1601-1631 Ocean Avenue and 1271 Capitol Avenue
- 350 Ocean Avenue
- City College – Performing Arts Center
- City College – East Basin Parking Structure

⁴¹ City College identified the Performing Arts Center and East Basin Parking Lot as reasonably foreseeable projects that could overlap with the proposed project's construction timeframe. Both City College projects are anticipated to be under construction for 24 months from 2021 to 2023 and operational by 2023.

- Ocean Avenue Safety Project
- I-280 Interchange Modifications at Balboa Park Project

The evaluation uses the same methodology and qualitative criteria as described above for existing plus project conditions.

VMT Analysis

VMT by its nature is largely a cumulative impact. The number and distance of vehicular trips associated with past, present, and future projects might contribute to the secondary physical environmental impacts associated with VMT. It is likely that no single project by itself would be sufficient in size to prevent the region or state in meeting its VMT reduction goals. Instead, a project's individual VMT contributes to cumulative VMT impacts. The department uses existing plus project-level thresholds of significance based on levels at which the department does not anticipate new projects to conflict with state and regional long-term greenhouse gas emission reduction targets and statewide VMT per capita reduction targets.

Therefore, the department assesses whether the region is estimated to meet its long-term greenhouse gas emission reduction targets to determine if a cumulative impact would occur. If a cumulative impact would occur, the department uses a map-based screening criterion to identify types and locations of land use projects that would not exceed the same quantitative thresholds of significance described under existing plus project conditions. The analysis uses the 2040 modeling of VMT estimates to present VMT for residential, office, and retail in San Francisco and the region. The department uses that data and associated maps to determine whether a project site's location is below the aforementioned VMT quantitative threshold of significance, including for the other land use types described above. Childcare is treated as office use for purposes of screening and analysis.

Loading

The analysis for addressing loading uses information from the City College Performing Arts Center and City College East Basin Parking Structure. The evaluation uses the same methodology as described above for existing plus project conditions.

Impact Evaluation

Existing plus Project

Impact TR-1: Construction of the project would not require a substantially extended duration or intense activity and the secondary effects would not create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving; or interfere with accessibility for people walking or bicycling; or substantially delay public transit. (Less than Significant)

The discussion of construction impacts is based on currently available information from the project sponsor, as summarized in SEIR Section 2.G, Project Construction Overview and Schedule, p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.** The construction information has been developed by the sponsor and their contractor for the purpose of environmental review, but is subject to change

once construction-level plans are available and the construction logistics are reviewed by City agencies, as required. Prior to construction, as part of the building permit process, the project sponsor and construction contractor(s) would be required to meet with San Francisco Public Works and SFMTA staff to develop and review truck routing plans for demolition, disposal of excavated materials, materials delivery and storage, as well as staging for construction vehicles. The construction contractor would be required to meet the City of San Francisco's Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets, (the blue book), including those regarding sidewalk and lane closures, and would meet with SFMTA staff to determine if any special traffic permits would be required.⁴² In addition to the regulations in the blue book, the contractor would be responsible for complying with all city, state and federal codes, rules and regulations. The project sponsor would be responsible for reimbursing the SFMTA for any temporary striping and signage during project construction.

The proposed project is anticipated to be constructed in three phases over the course of six years. The three development phases are Phase 0 (grading and site infrastructure, one year), Phase 1 (town homes and inner blocks, 2.5 years), and Phase 2 (Blocks A, B, G, and H, 2.5 years). No parking lane or sidewalk closures would be required during construction and access to Muni bus stops would be maintained during all phases of construction.

Construction activities would generally be conducted between 7 a.m. and 8 p.m. daily, consistent with San Francisco Police Code section 2908.⁴³ Outside of those hours, nighttime construction activities, particularly related to noise, would be subject to a special permit as described in Police Code article 29.

Table 3.B-17, Construction Activity by Phase, presents the anticipated duration for each of the three major phases of construction, and the average and maximum numbers of daily construction truck trips and workers.

⁴² San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, *Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets*, 8th Edition, January 2012, https://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/reports-and-documents/2017/10/blue_book_8th_edition_pdf.pdf, accessed January 10, 2019.

⁴³ San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, *Frequently Asked Questions*, November 2014, <http://sfdbi.org/frequently-asked-questions>, accessed June 12, 2018.

TABLE 3.B-17
CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY BY PHASE

Construction Phase ^a	Duration	Daily Construction Workers (Average/Maximum)		Daily Truck Trips (Average/Maximum)	
		Developer's Proposed Option	Additional Housing Option	Developer's Proposed Option	Additional Housing Option
0 – Grading, Infrastructure	1 year	33/40	33/40	0/0 ^b	0/0 ^b
1 – Townhome, Inner Blocks ^c	2.5 years	330/350	415/460	170/180	220/240
2 – Blocks A, B, G, H	2.5 years	260/290	385/420	140/240	200/320

SOURCE: Reservoir Community Partners, LLC, 2018, ESA, 2019.

NOTES:

- ^a Phase 1 Townhome and Inner Blocks would be occupied following construction. Construction of Phase 2 Blocks A, B, G, and H would overlap with occupancy of Phase 1.
- ^b The grading plan intends to balance the site and use as much cut soil as fill soil in other areas of the site, minimizing or eliminating the need for either soil import or export. Truck trips are not required during Phase 0 because graders, excavators, and dozers would be used to remove and redeposit soil on the project site. Export of soil would occur during Phase 2.
- ^c The Additional Housing Option includes Blocks I and J with the townhomes in Phase 1.

Under both project options, the proposed project would minimize the need for exporting materials by recycling and reusing excavated materials (concrete, asphalt, and soils) on-site during Phase 0. The number of construction-related truck trips would range from 0 to 320 daily round-trips for material delivery and removal depending on the construction phase and project option. The maximum number of daily truck trips (240 daily construction-truck trips under the Developer's Proposed Option and 320 construction-related truck trips under the Additional Housing Option) would occur during Phase 2. Throughout the construction period there would be a flow of construction-related traffic into and out of the site that would be required to use designated freight traffic route. The primary haul routes for construction truck traffic would be:⁴⁴

- Entering the site: I-280 and Ocean Avenue westbound, continue northbound on Frida Kahlo Way to access the site at North Access Road
- Exiting the site: Turn right onto Frida Kahlo Way at Cloud Circle (S), continue southbound on Frida Kahlo Way and turn left onto Ocean Avenue eastbound

These truck routes are consistent with freight traffic routes identified in the general plan and designated street restrictions.^{45,46} Truck routes would be reviewed with the SFMTA as part of the permit process prior to construction.

The impact of construction truck traffic would be a temporary lessening of the capacities on surrounding roadways and truck routes (as well as connecting local streets) due to the slower movement and larger turning radii of trucks. Construction truck traffic could result in minor congestion and conflicts with traffic, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation. However,

⁴⁴ Construction truck haul route map provided by Reservoir Community Partners LLC, dated July 6, 2018.

⁴⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, General Plan Freight Traffic Routes, https://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/images/14.transportation/tra_map15.pdf, accessed February 11, 2019.

⁴⁶ SFMTA, San Francisco Street Restrictions Effective December 2017, https://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/pdf_map/2017/12/streetrestrictions.pdf, accessed February 11, 2019.

potential impacts would be considered less than significant due to their phased duration. The majority of construction activity would occur during off peak hours, when traffic volumes and the potential for conflicts are substantially lower. However, some construction activity would overlap with the City College class schedule and arrival/departure of students, faculty, and staff. The project sponsor would be required to develop a construction management plan in accordance with the blue book regulations addressing transportation-related circulation, access, staging and hours of delivery. The construction management plan would be developed to minimize overall disruption and ensure that overall circulation in the project area is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on minimizing interference with transit, pedestrian, and bicycle connectivity. While there may be some occasional disruption to circulation as a result of on-road construction vehicles or construction-related truck traffic, these effects would not be frequent or substantial enough to constitute a significant impact.

The number of construction workers accessing the site would range from 33 workers per day (the anticipated average during Phase 0 under both project options) to 460 workers per day (the anticipated maximum during Phase 1 under Additional Housing Option). The maximum number of construction workers per day (350 under the Developer's Proposed Option and 460 under the Additional Housing Option) would occur during Phase 1. On-site parking would be provided for construction worker vehicles throughout the construction period. During Phase 0 parking would be provided throughout the site. During Phase 1, parking would be provided in the central park area and Phase 2 construction areas. During Phase 2, limited parking would be provided in the SFPUC open space. Construction workers driving to or from the site would be expected to park on site, or make their own parking arrangements in area parking facilities, as needed. Given the project's location to the Balboa Park BART station (approximately 0.5 mile) and K Ingleside Muni stop (0.1 mile), a portion of construction workers would be expected to take public transit when traveling to and from the site. As part of the construction management plan, construction workers would be encouraged by the project sponsor to access the project site by use of transit or other sustainable means of transportation (including ridesharing, bicycling, and walking).

The proposed project would be subject to San Francisco Public Works Code section 2.4.20, Action on Applications for Permits to Excavate. The contractor would be required to submit a contractor parking plan to public works in order to obtain permits for major work that has a duration of 30 days or longer.⁴⁷ The contractor parking plan would be required to identify the location of construction worker parking, number of parking spaces, and area where vehicles would enter/exit the site (for on-site parking), or how workers would travel between an off-site facility and the project site (for off-site parking), as well as the person(s) responsible for monitoring the implementation of the proposed parking plan. The use of on-street parking to accommodate construction worker parking would be discouraged by providing on-site parking for construction workers. Additionally, most of the on-street parking to the south and east of the project site is within a two-hour time-limited residential parking permit zone, further limiting the convenience of on-street parking for construction workers. These requirements are intended to minimize the

⁴⁷ San Francisco Public Works Code section 2.4.20, Action on Applications for Permits to Excavate, [http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/publicworks/publicworkscode?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca\\$sync=1](http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/publicworks/publicworkscode?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$sync=1), accessed June 12, 2018.

inconvenience to the neighborhood related to the availability of on-street parking within the project vicinity during project construction. The addition of the worker-related vehicle or transit trips would not substantially affect transportation conditions because the majority of employee construction trips occur prior to the morning and evening peak hours when traffic is heaviest and the construction contractor will be required to develop and implement a contractor parking plan.

Both project options would be built out over a period of about six years in three phases. Each construction phase would have a duration of less than three years and most construction worker parking, construction vehicle staging, and construction activity would be contained on the project site. Phase 2 construction would occur after completion of Phase 1 and would overlap with occupancy of Phase 1. Phase 2 construction activities would be concentrated on the outer blocks at the north and south ends of the site: Blocks A, B, G, and H. While the construction staging plan has not yet been finalized, based on the location of Phase 2 construction activities, construction staging during Phase 2 would likely occur adjacent to the proposed buildings, within the SFPUC Open Space and along South Street for Blocks A, B, and H and along North Street and adjacent the proposed Block G building. Temporary travel lane or sidewalk closures may be required along South Street and North Street. The proposed shared-use path extension of Plymouth Avenue and pedestrian paseo extension of Brighton Avenue would be constructed as part of Phase 2. Vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle access for residents of the Townhomes and Inner Blocks (Blocks C, D, E, and F for the Developer's Proposed Option and Blocks C, D, E, F, I, and J for the Additional Housing Option) would be maintained through Phase 2 construction. Construction trucks and construction worker vehicles would be accommodated onsite⁴⁸ and within proposed on-street staging areas. Construction trucks would not block travel lanes, bicycle facilities, or sidewalks or block access to nearby crosswalks. Construction activities during Phase 2 and occupancy of Phase 1 would not result in hazardous conditions and would not substantially interfere with emergency access or accessibility for people walking, bicycling, or taking transit to and from the study area and around the site.

Construction activities are required to be conducted in accordance with the public works code, public works department orders, and the blue book, as applicable, to minimize the potential for hazardous conditions and to ensure safe travel in and around the site. Although construction would occur over a period of approximately six years, construction would be conducted in compliance with City requirements such that construction work can be done with the least possible interference with pedestrian, bicycle, transit, or vehicle circulation or result in hazardous conditions for pedestrians, bicycles, transit, or vehicles. Overall, because construction activities would be phased in duration, and are required to be conducted in accordance with City requirements, construction-related impacts of the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation: None required.

⁴⁸ During Phase 2, limited parking would be provided in the SFPUC open space area.

Comparison of Impact TR-1 to PEIR Impact Analysis

The PEIR did not identify any significant impacts related to construction-related transportation impacts and did not require any mitigation measures. PEIR Improvement Measure (Construction) is superseded by the requirements of the blue book regulations, which include the development of a construction management plan and review and approval by the SFMTA and public works to address overall coordination of construction activities, transportation-related circulation, access, and staging. Consequently, no new or different mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce project impacts related to construction activities are identified or required with respect to the currently proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any new or substantially more severe effects than those identified in the PEIR related to construction-related transportation impacts.

Impact TR-2: Operation of the proposed project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving or public transit operations. (Less than Significant)

The project does not involve any changes to the roadway network outside the project limits or include any design features that could cause major traffic hazards. The project's streetscape improvements would primarily consist of construction of the internal street network, changes to the Lee Avenue configuration between Ocean Avenue and the project site, and the conversion of five metered parking spaces along the frontage of 1150 Ocean Avenue to metered loading spaces between the hours of 6 a.m. and 2 p.m.

Both project options would result in a general increase in vehicle traffic activity on the surrounding roadway network. Project vehicle trip assignments at the study intersections are illustrated in Figure 3.B-6a to Figure 3.B-7b, pp. 3.B-51 to 3.B-57. Access to the project site would be provided at Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way/North Access Road.

Walking and Bicycling

As discussed in "Walking Network Features," p. 3.B-39, and "Bicycle Network Features," p. 3.B-40, there are a number of existing challenges for pedestrians and bicyclists in the study area, such as high volumes of vehicle traffic, unmarked crossings, and lack of protected bicycle facilities. Additionally, the project site has limited entry points. The proposed project would include construction of pedestrian paseos, raised crosswalks, a shared-use path, and class II and class III bicycle facilities. These modifications would enhance the walking and bicycling network in the study area and prioritize safe movement of people walking and bicycling through the site. Pedestrian and bicycle project features would be designed to be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option would contribute additional traffic from people walking, bicycling, and driving to the site. As shown in Table 3.B-13, p. 3.B-46, during the weekday a.m. peak hour, the Developer's Proposed Option would generate 428 walk trips (including 275 walk only and 153 walk-to-transit) and 29 bicycle trips. During the weekday

p.m. peak hour, the Developer's Proposed Option would generate 544 walk trips (including 349 walk only and 195 walk-to-transit) and 37 bicycle trips. During the weekday a.m. peak hour, the Additional Housing Option would generate 565 walk trips (including 363 walk only and 202 walk-to-transit) and 39 bicycle trips. During the weekday p.m. peak hour, the Additional Housing Option would generate 724 walk trips (including 465 walk only and 259 walk-to-transit) and 50 bicycle trips.

The primary access points for people walking to the project site would be from the northern extension of Lee Avenue, through Unity Plaza, the pedestrian paseos connecting to Brighton Avenue and San Ramon Way, and the shared-use path connecting to Plymouth Avenue. These entrances are a short walk (less than three blocks) from the K Ingleside stop and other nearby bus stops. The primary access point for people bicycling would be from the designated bicycle facilities along the North Access Road and Lee Avenue. Potential conflict points associated with the project would be most concentrated at these site access points, as discussed in the following sections.

Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue

Under existing conditions, about 700 people walking and 19 people bicycling across the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection were observed during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 870 people walking and 10 people bicycling through the intersection during the weekday p.m. peak hour. With the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option, it is anticipated that there would be a substantial increase in the number of people walking and bicycling at this location. The Developer's Proposed Option would add 150 vehicles (63 inbound and 87 outbound) to this intersection during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 201 vehicles (142 inbound and 59 outbound) during the weekday p.m. peak hour. The Additional Housing Option would add 190 (80 inbound and 110 outbound) to this intersection during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 267 (192 inbound and 75 outbound) during the weekday p.m. peak hour. All inbound vehicles turning right onto Lee Avenue from Ocean Avenue to access the site would need to cross the north crosswalk and northbound class III bikeway along Lee Avenue.⁴⁹ These vehicle turning movements are not expected to create a substantial hazard for people walking or bicycling, however, as drivers would generally have unobstructed sightlines and/or adequate sight distance to see approaching bicyclists and pedestrians, and drivers would need to wait for a green light and/or wait until there is a sufficient gap in the flow of people walking to clear their vehicle before entering or exiting Lee Avenue.

Frida Kahlo Way/Access Road

Under existing conditions, about 180 people walking and 12 people bicycling across the Frida Kahlo Way/Access Road intersection were observed during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 140 people walking and 9 people bicycling through the intersection during the weekday p.m. peak hour. With the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option, it is anticipated that there would be a substantial increase in the number of people walking and bicycling at this location. The Developer's Proposed Option would add 99 vehicles (29 inbound and 70 outbound)

⁴⁹ Eastbound left turns are prohibited at Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue.

to this intersection during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 117 vehicles (61 inbound and 56 outbound) during the weekday p.m. peak hour. The Additional Housing Option would add 139 (37 inbound and 102 outbound) to this intersection during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 156 (82 inbound and 74 outbound) during the weekday p.m. peak hour. All vehicles accessing the site from Frida Kahlo Way would need to cross the southbound class II bikeway along Frida Kahlo Way. These vehicle turning movements are not expected to constitute a substantial hazard for bicyclists, however, as drivers entering/exiting the Access Road would generally have unobstructed sightlines and/or adequate sight distance to see approaching bicyclists, and drivers would need to wait for a green light and/or wait until there is a sufficient gap in the flow of bicyclists and people walking on the sidewalk to clear their vehicle before entering or exiting the North Access Road.

Other Locations

Outside of the project's proposed access points, other potential conflict points would include right-turn, right turn on red, and permitted left-turn movements in the immediate vicinity of the project site, such as the eastbound and westbound right turns at Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue. These conflicts would be similar in nature to conflicts at the project's access points, however, and given the expected volume of project-generated traffic added to these turning movements (less than 30 vehicles), would not create hazards or interfere with accessibility of people walking or bicycling to and from the site.

Overall, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option would not generate activities that would create hazards for people walking or bicycling.

Driving or Public Transit Operations

An intersection operations analysis was conducted at Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue to assess the potential of the project to create or contribute to vehicle queues and result in hazardous conditions for people driving or public transit operations. The detailed calculation worksheets are provided in Attachment E, Queue Analysis Synchro Worksheets, of SEIR Appendix C2, Transit Assessment Memorandum.

Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue Intersection Operations

Lee Avenue is located about 100 feet to the south of the Whole Foods driveway and 250 feet to the west of Harold Avenue (City College Terminal) and 450 feet to the west of Frida Kahlo Way. The analysis assumes that the proposed project would reconfigure the southbound Lee Avenue approach to Ocean Avenue from one all-movement lane to one southbound through/right-turn lane and one southbound left turn lane with class III bicycle facility (sharrows) in both directions.

Existing Conditions

Under existing conditions, 25 vehicles make a westbound right turn from Ocean Avenue onto Lee Avenue during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hour. The 95th percentile queue length on the westbound approach is about 12 vehicles (approximately 240 feet) during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 14 vehicles (approximately 280 feet) during the weekday p.m. peak hour. The volume for the 95th percentile queue is metered by the upstream signal Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue. Westbound queues along Ocean Avenue can extend to Harold Avenue

and may occasionally block the City College Terminal entrance and SFFD Station 15 driveway on Ocean Avenue. City College Terminal entrance driveway blockages were observed twice during the weekday p.m. peak hour and each occurrence lasted for between 10 and 20 seconds. Both events occurred as a result of westbound queues extending back from the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection and the queue cleared when the signal turned green. Under existing conditions, there are 38 vehicles on the southbound approach along Lee Avenue during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 140 vehicles during the weekday p.m. peak hour. The 95th percentile queue length on the southbound approach along Lee Avenue is about two vehicles (approximately 40 feet) during the weekday a.m. peak hour and about three vehicles (approximately 60 feet) during the weekday p.m. peak hour. The southbound queues along Lee Avenue would not be expected to extend back and block the Whole Foods exit driveway on Lee Avenue.

Developer's Proposed Option

Based on the trip distribution and assignment summarized in the "Project Travel Demand and Results" section, the Developer's Proposed Option would add 47 vehicle trips to the westbound right turn from Ocean Avenue onto Lee Avenue during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 98 vehicle trips to this movement during the weekday p.m. peak hour. The Developer's Proposed Option would add 87 vehicle trips to the southbound approach (66 left turns, 21 right turns) along Lee Avenue during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 59 vehicle trips (47 left turns, 12 right turns) during the weekday p.m. peak hour.

With the addition of vehicle trips generated by the Developer's Proposed Option and reconfiguration of the southbound Lee Avenue approach to provide a southbound left-turn lane and through/right-turn lane, queue lengths along the westbound approach of Ocean Avenue would be shortened from about 12 vehicles in length (about 240 feet) to about 11 vehicles in length (about 220 feet) during the weekday a.m. peak hour and from about 14 vehicles (about 280 feet) to about 13 vehicles (about 260 feet) in the weekday p.m. peak hour. Queues would continue to be metered by the upstream signal. The Developer's Proposed Option would not be expected to increase the frequency or duration of vehicles blocking the City College Terminal entrance and would not create hazardous conditions for public transit operations.

The 95th percentile queue length on the southbound approach along Lee Avenue would increase from two vehicles to about six vehicles (approximately 120 feet) in the southbound left-turn lane during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hour.

Additional Housing Option

Based on the trip distribution and assignment summarized in the "Project Travel Demand and Results" section, the Additional Housing Option would add 62 vehicle trips to the westbound right turn from Ocean Avenue onto Lee Avenue during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 132 vehicle trips to this movement during the weekday p.m. peak hour. The Additional Housing Option would add 110 vehicle trips to the southbound approach (83 left turns, 27 right turns) during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 75 vehicle trips (61 left turns, 14 right turns) during the weekday p.m. peak hour.

With the addition of vehicle trips generated by the Additional Housing Option and reconfiguration of the southbound Lee Avenue approach to provide a southbound left-turn lane and through/right-turn lane, queueing at the westbound approach along Ocean Avenue would be shortened from about 12 vehicles in length (about 240 feet) to about seven vehicles in length (about 140 feet) during the weekday a.m. peak hour and from about 14 vehicles (about 280 feet) to about 13 vehicles (about 260 feet) in the weekday p.m. peak hour. Queues would continue to be metered by the upstream signal. The Additional Housing Option would not be expected to increase the frequency or duration of vehicles blocking the City College Terminal entrance and would not create hazardous conditions for public transit operations.

The 95th percentile queue length on the southbound approach along Lee Avenue would increase from two vehicles to about five vehicles (approximately 100 feet) in the southbound left-turn lane during the weekday a.m. peak hour and from three vehicles to about eight vehicles (approximately 150 feet) during the weekday p.m. peak hour.

The Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option do not include any design features that could cause major traffic hazards. Both project options would increase overall traffic levels at Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue but would not increase the frequency or duration of vehicles blocking the City College Terminal entrance, would not substantially delay public transit, and would not create hazardous conditions for public transit operations.

Other Locations

Outside of Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue, other potential hazards for people driving and public transit operations were identified as a result of the proposed raised crosswalk that would be installed at the Lee Avenue/SFPUC open space intersection. The proximity of the proposed raised crosswalk, about 200 feet north of signalized Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection, may result in hard braking, or sudden slowing or stopping of vehicles, which could increase the potential for rear-end collisions and cause vehicle queues to spillback onto Ocean Avenue.

No other potential hazards or conflict points were identified for people driving or public transit operations.

Overall, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option would not generate activities that would create hazards for people driving or public transit operations.

Other Impacts Related to Traffic Hazards

Impacts related to loading (including freight loading/service vehicles and passenger loading), are discussed in Impact TR-6.

As discussed above, because the project would not generate activities that would create hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, driving or public transit operations, impacts of the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation: None required.

Comparison of Impact TR-2 to PEIR Impact Analysis

Driving hazards were not specifically addressed in the PEIR. Therefore, no relevant mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR. The PEIR did not identify impacts on people walking and bicycling. Consequently, no new or different mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce project impacts related to driving hazards, walking, or bicycling are identified or required with respect to the currently proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any new or substantially more-severe effects than those identified in the PEIR related to hazardous conditions for people walking, biking, driving, or taking transit.

Impact TR-3: Operation of the proposed project would not interfere with accessibility of people walking or bicycling to and from the project site, and adjoining areas, or result in inadequate emergency access. (Less than Significant)

The project does not involve any changes to the roadway network or include any design features that would interfere with accessibility of people walking or bicycling to and from the project site, and adjoining areas, or result in inadequate emergency access. The project's streetscape improvements would primarily consist of construction of the internal street network, changes to the Lee Avenue configuration between Ocean Avenue and the project site, and the conversion of five metered parking spaces along the frontage of 1150 Ocean Avenue to metered loading spaces between the hours of 6 a.m. and 2 p.m.

Walking and Bicycling

As discussed in "Walking Network Features," p. 3.B-39, and "Bicycle Network Features," p. 3.B-40, there are a number of existing challenges for pedestrians and bicyclists in the study area, such as heavy vehicle volumes, unmarked crossings, and lack of protected bicycle facilities. Additionally, the project site has limited entry points. The proposed project would include construction of pedestrian paseos, raised crosswalks, a shared-use path, and class II and class III bicycle facilities. These modifications would enhance the walking and bicycling network in the study area and prioritize safe movement of people walking and bicycling through the site. The project would be designed to be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The primary access points for people walking to the project site would be from the northern extension of Lee Avenue, through Unity Plaza, the pedestrian paseos connecting to Brighton Avenue and San Ramon Way, and the shared-use path connecting to Plymouth Avenue. These entrances are a short walk from the K Ingleside stop and other nearby bus stops. The primary access point for people bicycling would be from the designated bicycle facilities along the northern Access Road and Lee Avenue extension.

Given the expected volume of project-generated traffic on right-turn, right-turn-on-red, and permitted-left-turn movements at the project entrances and nearby intersections, the proposed project would not interfere with accessibility of people walking or bicycling to and from the site.

Overall, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option would promote accessibility for people walking to and through the site by connecting new pathways and

bikeways to the existing sidewalk and bicycling networks. The project would not generate activities that would interfere with access or circulation for people walking or bicycling.

Emergency Access

Emergency access to the project site and nearby hospitals would be similar to existing conditions. Under existing conditions, vehicle traffic along Ocean Avenue currently impedes emergency vehicles exiting SFFD Station 15. During peak periods, vehicle queues extending back from the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection were observed to occasionally partially block the fire station driveway. Driveway blockages were observed approximately five times during the weekday p.m. peak hour and each occurrence lasted for between 10 and 20 seconds. No emergency vehicles were observed trying to exit the driveway during these times. Three of these events occurred when a vehicle was stopped behind a bus that was waiting for pedestrians to clear the crosswalk before turning into the City College Terminal. Two events occurred as a result of westbound queues extending back from the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection and the queue cleared when the signal turned green. Generally, arterial roadways in the study area, such as Ocean Avenue, Geneva Avenue, and Frida Kahlo Way, provide enough clearance space to permit other vehicles to maneuver out of the path and yield right-of-way to the emergency vehicle.

SFFD Station 15 is located approximately 350 feet from the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue access to the project site along the north side of Ocean Avenue between Frida Kahlo Way and Harold Avenue. Emergency vehicles would have access to the site from Ocean Avenue and Lee Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way. Emergency vehicles accessing the site from SFFD Station 15 would likely use the nearest access point at Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue.

As discussed under Impact TR-2, with the addition of vehicle trips generated by the Developer's Proposed Option and reconfiguration of the southbound Lee Avenue approach, queue lengths along the westbound approach of Ocean Avenue would be reduced from about 12 vehicles (or 240 feet) to about 11 vehicles (or 220 feet) during the weekday a.m. peak hour and from 14 vehicles (or 280 feet) to about 13 vehicles (or 260 feet) in the weekday p.m. peak. Therefore, the Developer's Proposed Option would not be expected to increase the frequency or duration of vehicles blocking the SFFD Station 15 entrance and would not result in inadequate emergency access.

With the addition of vehicle trips generated by the Additional Housing Option, queueing at the westbound approach along Ocean Avenue would be shortened from about 12 vehicles in length (about 240 feet) to about seven vehicles in length (about 140 feet) during the weekday a.m. peak hour and from about 14 vehicles (about 280 feet) to about 13 vehicles (about 260 feet) in the weekday p.m. peak hour. Therefore, the Additional Housing Option would not be expected to increase the frequency or duration of vehicles blocking the SFFD Station 15 entrance and would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Although there would be a general increase in vehicle traffic from the additional activity at the site, and the proposed raised crosswalk at the Lee Avenue/SFPUC Open Space intersection would slow emergency vehicles and result in a slight increase in emergency response time, the

Developer's Proposed Option or Additional Housing Option would not inhibit emergency access to the project site or materially affect emergency vehicle response out of the station. Development of the project site, and associated increases in vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycle travel would not substantially affect emergency vehicle access to other buildings or land uses in the area or to hospitals.

Additionally, the proposed internal streets (e.g., North Street, South Street) would provide a 26-foot (minimum) clear width. Clear widths would be sufficient to accommodate emergency vehicles and meet fire department requirements.⁵⁰ The fire department conducted a preliminary review of the development plans and streetscape changes as currently proposed. Prior to finalizing the design and dimensions of the internal street network and on-site pedestrian network, SFFD and the SFPD will review and approve the internal roadway configuration and dimensions, as required, to ensure emergency vehicle access within the site is acceptable.

Overall, because the proposed project would promote accessibility for people walking and biking to and through the site and would not generate activities that would create hazards for people walking or bicycling, or interfere with emergency access or circulation, impacts of the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation: None required.

Comparison of Impact TR-3 to PEIR Impacts Analysis

The PEIR did not identify impacts on people walking and bicycling and the PEIR did not specifically address emergency access. PEIR Improvement Measure (Walking/Accessibility) is not applicable to the proposed project because there are already existing pedestrian countdown signals at signalized intersections serving the project site (i.e., Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way/Access Road). Consequently, no new or different mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce project impacts related to walking/biking, accessibility, and emergency access are identified or required with respect to the currently proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any new or substantially more-severe effects than those identified in the PEIR related to walking/biking, accessibility, and emergency access impacts.

Impact TR-4: Operation of the proposed project would not substantially delay public transit. (Less than Significant)

The project would not result in the relocation or removal of any existing transit stops or other changes that would alter transit service. However, the project would generate up to 267 vehicle trips at the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection which is adjacent to the 29 Sunset bus line and K Ingleside center-running light-rail line, and up to 156 vehicle trips at the Frida Kahlo Way/Access Road intersection which is adjacent to the 43 Masonic bus line.

⁵⁰ San Francisco Fire Code section 503.2.1, <http://sf-fire.org/501-street-widths-emergency-access>, accessed May 25, 2018.

Transit Delay

The impact of the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option on transit delay (traffic congestion, transit reentry delay, and passenger boarding delay) was evaluated along the following corridors and Muni lines for the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours:

- Frida Kahlo Way from Judson Avenue to Ocean Avenue (Line 43)
- Ocean Avenue from Plymouth Avenue to San Jose Avenue (Lines K, 29, 49)
- Geneva Avenue from City College Terminal to San Jose Avenue (Lines 8, 8BX, 43, 54)

The results of the transit delay analysis are summarized in **Table 3.B-18, Transit Delay Analysis**, and provided in Attachment C, Corridor Delay Analysis Synchro Worksheets, and Attachment D, Transit Reentry and Passenger Boarding Delay Analysis Calculations, of SEIR Appendix C2, Transit Assessment Memorandum.

Developer's Proposed Option

As shown in Table 3.B-18, vehicle and transit trips generated by the Developer's Proposed Option would increase transit delay by a maximum of 73 seconds along Frida Kahlo Way (southbound direction, weekday p.m. peak hour), a maximum of 100 seconds along Ocean Avenue (westbound direction, weekday p.m. peak hour), and a maximum of 81 seconds along Geneva Avenue (southbound/westbound direction, weekday p.m. peak hour). The majority of the transit delay increase is attributable to the increase in passenger boarding delay resulting from the project-generated transit riders. The Developer's Proposed Option would not create additional transit reentry delay during the a.m. or p.m. peak hours.

The Developer's Proposed Option would not result in transit delay greater than or equal to four minutes. Therefore, based on the established thresholds of significance, the Developer's Proposed Option would result in a *less-than-significant* impact related to transit delay.

**TABLE 3.B-18
TRANSIT DELAY ANALYSIS**

Corridor	Weekday a.m. Peak Hour (seconds of delay)		Weekday p.m. Peak Hour (seconds of delay)	
	Northbound/ Eastbound	Southbound/ Westbound	Northbound/ Eastbound	Southbound/ Westbound
Transit Delay				
Existing Conditions				
Frida Kahlo Way	5	15	5	28
Ocean Avenue	121	143	124	144
Geneva Avenue	79	53	75	46
Developer's Proposed Option				
Frida Kahlo Way	18	74	29	101
Ocean Avenue	187	182	182	244
Geneva Avenue	99	127	117	127
Additional Housing Option				
Frida Kahlo Way	21	87	46	111
Ocean Avenue	183	207	208	272
Geneva Avenue	109	137	133	137
Project-Related Increase in Delay				
Developer's Proposed Option				
Frida Kahlo Way	13	59	24	73
Ocean Avenue	66	39	58	100
Geneva Avenue	20	74	42	81
Additional Housing Option				
Frida Kahlo Way	16	72	41	83
Ocean Avenue	62	64	84	128
Geneva Avenue	30	84	58	91
SOURCE: Kittelson & Associates, Inc. 2018.				
NOTES:				
Transit delay includes corridor delay, transit reentry delay, and passenger boarding delay.				

Additional Housing Option

As shown in Table 3.B-18, vehicle and transit generated by the Additional Housing Option would increase transit delay by a maximum of 83 seconds along Frida Kahlo Way, (southbound direction, weekday p.m. peak hour), a maximum of 128 seconds along Ocean Avenue (westbound direction, weekday p.m. peak hour), and a maximum of 91 seconds along Geneva Avenue (southbound/westbound direction, weekday p.m. peak hour). The majority of the transit delay increase is attributable to the increase in passenger boarding delay resulting from the project-generated transit riders. The Additional Housing Option would not create additional transit reentry delay during the a.m. or p.m. peak hours.

The Additional Housing Option would not result in transit delay greater than or equal to four minutes. Therefore, based on the established thresholds of significance, the Additional Housing Option would result in a *less-than-significant* impact related to transit delay.

City College Terminal

The impact of the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option on operations of the City College Terminal was evaluated for the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The detailed analysis is included in SEIR Appendix C2, Transit Assessment Memorandum, and summarized in this section.

The evaluation assesses the change in queue lengths at Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue and Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue and potential for queues to spillback and block transit vehicle access or egress to the City College Terminal.

Developer's Proposed Option

Under existing conditions, vehicle queues on the westbound approach at the intersection of Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue were observed to extend past the City College Terminal entrance approximately five times during the weekday p.m. peak hour and each occurrence lasted for between 10 and 20 seconds. Three of these events occurred when a vehicle was stopped behind a bus that was waiting for pedestrians to clear the crosswalk before turning into the City College Terminal. Two events occurred as a result of westbound queues extending back from the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection, and the queue cleared when the signal turned green. With the addition of vehicle trips generated by the Developer's Proposed Option, the queue lengths for westbound movements would be reduced from about 12 vehicles (or 240 feet) to about 11 vehicles (or 220 feet) during the weekday a.m. peak hour and from 14 vehicles (or 280 feet) to about 13 vehicles (or 260 feet) in the weekday p.m. peak.⁵¹

The reduction in 95th percentile queue lengths would not result in increased frequency or duration of vehicles blocking the bus entrance to the City College Terminal. Under existing conditions, vehicle queues on the southbound approach at the intersection of Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue are approximately seven vehicles (or about 140 feet) and do not block the City College Terminal exit driveway. With the addition of vehicle trips generated by the Developer's Proposed Option, the queue length would remain the same during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

⁵¹ The project would modify the southbound approach to include a southbound through/right-turn lane and a southbound left-turn lane. This change to intersection geometry causes the signal to operate more efficiently, and with the addition of project-generated vehicle trips, there would be a reduction in delay and 95th percentile queue lengths. This is a result of existing signal coordination at the fixed cycle actuated-coordinated signal. When more vehicles are present for a specific actuated phase (in this case, the westbound phase), the signal is called and optimized, allowing for improved coordination with preceding signals, and reducing queue lengths on this approach. The 95th percentile queue length is the queue length that would not be exceeded 95 percent of the time.

Additional Housing Option

Under existing conditions, vehicle queues on the westbound approach at the intersection of Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue were observed to extend past the City College Terminal entrance approximately five times during the weekday p.m. peak hour and each occurrence lasted for between 10 and 20 seconds. Three of these events occurred when a vehicle was stopped behind a bus that was waiting for pedestrians to clear the crosswalk before turning into the City College Terminal. Two events occurred as a result of westbound queues extending back from the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection and the queue cleared when the signal turned green. With the addition of vehicle trips generated by the Additional Housing Option, the queue lengths for westbound movements would be shortened from about 12 vehicles in length (about 240 feet) to about seven vehicles in length (about 140 feet) during the weekday a.m. peak hour and from about 14 vehicles (about 280 feet) to about 13 vehicles (about 260 feet) in the weekday p.m. peak hour.⁵²

The reduction in 95th percentile queue lengths would not result in increased frequency or duration of vehicles blocking the bus entrance to the City College Terminal. Under existing conditions, vehicle queues on the southbound approach at the intersection of Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue are approximately seven vehicles (or about 140 feet) and do not block the City College Terminal exit driveway. With the addition of vehicle trips generated by the Additional Housing Option, the queue length would remain the same during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Given the considerations described above, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option would have a *less-than-significant* impact on transit delay.

Mitigation: None required.

Comparison of Impact TR-4 to PEIR Impact Analysis

As discussed in SEIR Section 3.B.3, Summary of Balboa Park Station Area Plan PEIR Transportation Section, p. 3.B-1, under the 2025 with Area Plan scenario, transit capacity utilization impacts were identified on the K Ingleside line and transit delay impacts were identified at Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way and the new Geneva Avenue/I-280 NB Off-Ramp and Geneva Avenue/I-280 SB On-Ramp intersections. Under the Lee Avenue Connection to City College – 2025 with Area Plan scenario, transit delay impacts were identified at Lee Avenue/Ocean Avenue. Under the project-level review of the Kragen Auto Parts Site development, transit delay impacts were identified at Ocean Avenue/ Brighton Avenue.

Transit Capacity Utilization

The Balboa Park Station Area Plan PEIR identified a significant impact related to transit ridership and capacity on the K Ingleside line. The PEIR concluded that implementation of the area plan would contribute about 6 percent to the future ridership on the K Ingleside line at the maximum

⁵² Ibid.

load point,⁵³ increasing the already exceeded capacity utilization from 100 percent to 106 percent during the p.m. peak period. As such, the area plan was considered to have a significant contribution to adverse transit conditions on the K Ingleside line. No feasible mitigation measure was identified and the impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable.

Since the PEIR was approved, the planning department has modified significance criteria related to transit capacity and ridership increases are no longer considered a significant impact. This topic is no longer considered under the CEQA framework, as discussed in the *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Update: Summary of Changes Memorandum*⁵⁴ and the *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review – Update, Public Transit Memo and Appendices*, February 2019.⁵⁵

The department deleted the transit capacity criterion to be consistent with state guidance regarding not treating addition of new users as an adverse impact and to reflect funding sources for and policies that encourage additional ridership. The 2019 guidelines public transit delay threshold of significance uses the adopted City Charter section 8A.103 85 percent on-time performance service standard for Muni, with the charter considering vehicles arriving more than four minutes beyond a published schedule time late. Additionally, San Francisco adopted numerous policies to encourage transit ridership in addition to its existing Transit First Policies. Those policies include the area plans (various years) and the Transportation Demand Management Program (adopted 2017). The planning department now considers potentially hazardous conditions for public transit operations as a separate transit significance criterion. This approach is consistent with other transportation topics and SFMTA's 2018 Strategic Plan objective 1.2 of improving the safety of the transportation system.

Transit Delay

The PEIR identified significant impacts to transit delay under the 2025 with Area Plan scenario, Lee Avenue Connection to City College – 2025 with Area Plan scenario, and project-level analysis of the Kragen Auto Parts Site. Transit delay impacts identified at Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way, the reconfigured Geneva Avenue/I-280 Ramp intersections, Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue, and Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue intersections are discussed in the following sections.

Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way. The PEIR identified a significant impact to transit delay at the Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way intersection as a result of proposed changes to the intersection configuration, and not due to increased vehicle traffic generated by area plan development. Changes proposed by the area plan included elimination of the channelized westbound and southbound right-turn pockets and restriping of the eastbound

⁵³ The maximum load point is the point (i.e., a bus stop or boarding location) at which the highest number of passengers are aboard a transit vehicle on a designated bus line and route direction at a specified time or time period.

⁵⁴ San Francisco Planning Department, *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Update: Summary of Changes*, February 2019, http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/TIA_Guidelines_Summary_of_Changes_Memo.pdf, accessed April 16, 2019.

⁵⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review – Update, Public Transit Memo and Appendices*, February 2019, http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/TIA_Guidelines_Transit_Memo.pdf, accessed February 14, 2019.

and northbound approaches. The intersection reconfiguration was reported to significantly impact intersection operations and result in congestion that could affect operations of the K Ingleside on Ocean Avenue and Muni buses on southbound Frida Kahlo Way. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this was identified as a significant and unavoidable impact.

The Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way intersection was reconfigured as part of the Ocean Avenue Corridor Design Project⁵⁶ and the configuration proposed in the PEIR is included as part of existing conditions in this SEIR. Analysis conducted for this SEIR showed that there would be no more severe effects related to transit delay at this location. Therefore, the proposed project options would not have any new or substantially more severe effects related to transit delay at this location than those identified in the PEIR.

Geneva Avenue/I-280 NB Off-Ramp and Geneva Avenue/I-280 SB On-Ramp. The PEIR identified a significant impact to transit delay at the reconfigured Geneva Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection as a result of the proposed reconfiguration of the intersections and freeway ramps, and not due to increased vehicle traffic generated by area plan development. As reported in the PEIR, operations would worsen from LOS D to LOS F due to the consolidation of all movements into a single intersection. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this was identified as a significant and unavoidable impact.

The reconfiguration of the Geneva Avenue/I-280 Ramps is anticipated to be completed by 2024.⁵⁷ The recommended alternative would create a partial split interchange in which northbound I-280 traffic would exit onto Geneva Avenue but enter the freeway from Ocean Avenue; southbound traffic would still be able to exit both Geneva and Ocean avenues while only entering from Geneva Avenue. The reconfiguration of the Geneva Avenue/I-280 Ramps is included as part of cumulative conditions in this SEIR. Analysis conducted for this SEIR showed that there would be no more severe effects related to transit delay at this location. Therefore, the proposed project options would not have any new or substantially more severe effects related to transit delay at this location than those identified in the PEIR.

Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue. Under the Lee Avenue Connection to City College – 2025 with Area Plan scenario, transit impacts were identified at Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue. As reported in the PEIR, the shift in a portion of City College vehicle traffic from Frida Kahlo Way to Lee Avenue would cause the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection to degrade from LOS D to LOS F, which would constitute a significant transportation impact to auto level of service. There was no transit delay threshold utilized in the PEIR for the transit analysis. As previously discussed, the planning department’s 2019 guidelines has established a threshold of significance for public transit delay of four minutes. The threshold uses the adopted City Charter section 8A.103

⁵⁶ San Francisco Department of Public Works, Ocean Avenue Corridor Design Project website, <https://www.sfpdpublicworks.org/project/ocean-avenue-corridor-design-project>, accessed April 16, 2019.

⁵⁷ SFCTA, I-280 Interchange Modifications at Balboa Park Project website, <https://www.sfcta.org/I-280-interchange-modifications-balboa-park-project>, accessed April 16, 2019.

85 percent on-time performance service standard for Muni, with the charter considering vehicles arriving more than four minutes beyond a published schedule time late.

The auto level of service impact identified in the PEIR could be mitigated through creation of a dedicated eastbound left turn lane on the Ocean Avenue approach to Lee Avenue. However, this would require relocation of the light rail tracks and disruption to Muni service during construction and the mitigation was determined to be infeasible. Therefore, this was identified as a significant and unavoidable impact and any future plan to allow full access to City College parking facilities from the Lee Avenue extension would require separate environmental review.

There is currently no plan to allow full access to City College parking facilities from the Lee Avenue extension. However, the proposed project would extend Lee Avenue north into the project site and increase vehicle traffic volumes at this location. Additionally, under the Developer's Proposed Option, some vehicle traffic that is currently destined for the City College parking facilities would be shifted from Frida Kahlo Way to Lee Avenue to access the public parking garage proposed on the project site. As discussed under Impact TR-4, p. 3.B-80, the impact of the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option on transit delay (traffic congestion, transit reentry delay, and passenger boarding delay) was evaluated along Frida Kahlo Way, Ocean Avenue, and Geneva Avenue corridors for the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The detailed analysis is included in SEIR Appendix C2, Transit Assessment Memorandum, and summarized in this section. As demonstrated in this analysis, the proposed project would not have any new or substantially more severe effects related to transit delay at this location than those identified in the PEIR.

Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue. Under the PEIR project-level review of the Kragen Auto Parts Site development, transit delay impacts were identified at Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue. Specifically, the PEIR concluded that development of the Kragen Auto Parts Site could affect operations of the K Ingleside line that operates along Ocean Avenue. Left turns along this part of Ocean Avenue occur from the left travel lane, shared with the K Ingleside line. At the Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue intersection, the project would add traffic to the eastbound left-turn movement. Therefore, any delays created by traffic entering the project site could also delay Muni light rail vehicles. Without a protected left-turn phase for westbound traffic and, if needed, improvements to the intersection signalization, the project would have a significant impact at the Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue intersection. Implementation of the permitted-protected signal phase would allow for left-turning traffic to clear the intersection at the end of each signal cycle, and reduce the potential for substantial delays to transit operations. However, in order to implement this change, it was determined that it may be necessary to update the traffic signal and/or the signal timing mechanisms and that the changes would need to be reviewed and implemented by the SFMTA, and cannot be guaranteed by the planning department. Therefore, this was identified as a significant and unavoidable impact.

The Kragen Auto Parts Site is included as part of existing conditions in this SEIR. Under existing conditions analyzed in this SEIR, the Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue signal operates without a protected left-turn phase. Eastbound and westbound left turns are permitted, not protected, movements. As discussed under Impact TR-4, p. 3.B-80, the impact of the Developer's Proposed

Option and Additional Housing Option on transit delay (traffic congestion, transit reentry delay, and passenger boarding delay) was evaluated along Frida Kahlo Way, Ocean Avenue, and Geneva Avenue corridors for the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The detailed analysis is included in SEIR Appendix C2, Transit Assessment Memorandum, and summarized above. As demonstrated in this analysis, the proposed project would not have any new or substantially more severe effects related to transit delay at this location than those identified in the PEIR.

Impact TR-5: Operation of the proposed project would not cause substantial additional VMT or substantially induce automobile travel. (Less than Significant)

VMT Assessment

As presented in Table 3.B-9, p. 3.B-30, the existing average daily VMT per capita for the TAZ in which the project site is located (i.e., TAZ 915), is below the existing regional average daily VMT:

- For the residential uses, the existing average household daily VMT per capita is 11.7, which is about 32 percent below the existing regional average household daily VMT per capita of 17.2.
- For the childcare use, the existing average daily office VMT per employee is 13, which is about 33 percent below the existing regional average daily office VMT per employee of 19.1.
- For the retail uses, the average daily VMT per retail employee is 1.9, which is about 87 percent below the existing regional average daily retail VMT per employee of 14.9.^{58,59}

Given the project site is located in an area where existing VMT is more than 15 percent below the existing regional average, the project's residential, retail, and childcare uses would not cause substantial additional VMT and impacts would be less than significant. Furthermore, the project site meets the Proximity to Transit Stations screening criterion (including located within a half mile of an existing major transit stop), which also indicates the project's uses would not cause substantial additional VMT.

The Developer's Proposed Option would construct a 650-space public parking garage to partially replace the existing 1,007-space surface parking lot on the project site. The proposed public parking facility would not result in a substantial increase in VMT because it would replace an existing facility and would not increase the amount of parking available.

In addition, the project would be subject to a TDM program. Measures included in the project's TDM plan are presented in "Transportation Demand Management Program," p. 3.B-36.

Induced Automobile Travel Assessment

The project is not a transportation project. However, the project would include features that would alter the transportation network. These features include items such as new sidewalks, local streets, on-street loading, and bicycle lanes. These features fit within the general types of projects that

⁵⁸ Ibid, footnote 4 [the footnote that explains what retail VMT is presenting in terms of size]

⁵⁹ San Francisco Planning Department, Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for Balboa Reservoir Project, November 15, 2018.

would not substantially induce automobile travel. Therefore, impacts related would be less than significant.

Comparison of Impact TR-5 to PEIR Impact Analysis

The San Francisco Planning Commission replaced automobile delay (vehicle level of service) with the VMT significance criteria (resolution 19579) in March 2016. As a result, the PEIR did not analyze VMT or induced automobile travel. The PEIR did not identify any significant impacts related to VMT or induced automobile travel impacts and did not require any mitigation measures. Consequently, no new or different mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce project impacts are identified or required with respect to the currently proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any new or substantially more-severe effects than those identified in the PEIR related to VMT and induced automobile travel impacts.

Impact TR-6: Operation of the proposed project, including proposed street network changes, would result in a reduction in on-street loading supply such that the loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities would not be accommodated within the on-street loading supply, would impact existing passenger and freight loading/unloading zones, and may create hazardous conditions or significant delay that may affect transit, other vehicles, bicycles, or people walking (Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)

Proposed loading facilities are described in “Loading Features,” p. 3.B-40, and potential locations of on-street parking and loading areas are shown in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description, Figure 2-11, p. Error! Bookmark not defined.. Freight and passenger loading demand is presented in Table 3.B-16, p. 3.B-59.

Within the Project Site – Developer’s Proposed Option

The Developer’s Proposed Option would include six on-street freight loading (yellow curb) spaces and eight passenger loading (white curb) areas along the internal streets.

Freight Loading

The Developer’s Proposed Option would generate about 41 daily delivery/service vehicle trips, and would have a demand for two loading spaces during the average hour and three loading spaces during the peak hour of freight loading activity. The proposed six on-street loading/service vehicle spaces would satisfy the average and peak hour freight loading demand. However, it is likely that delivery vehicles would be more concentrated near the uses they are attempting to serve. If delivery vehicles are destined for the same land use or units within the same building, there would be an uneven distribution of demand, and while there are enough loading spaces across the entire site, there may not be enough nearby loading spaces to accommodate the localized demand. Where commercial loading zones aren’t available, delivery vehicles could temporarily block the travel lane during loading/unloading of goods, resulting in a temporary lessening of the capacities of internal roadways. This could result in minor congestion and conflicts with vehicle traffic, bicycle, and walking circulation within the project site. However, potential impacts would be

considered less than significant due the temporary nature. Additionally, given the internal roadway configuration and distance from the external street network, the Developer's Proposed Option would not cause secondary effects outside of the project site.

Residential Move-In/Move-Out

It is anticipated that residents conducting move-in/move-out activities with smaller vehicles would utilize parking spaces within proposed building garages for move-in/move-out activities. Should on-street parking be necessary for move-in/move-out activities, individuals or building management would be required to reserve spaces through SFMTA's temporary signage program. Typically, these activities occur during off-peak times, such as in the evenings and on weekends when there are lower volumes of vehicle traffic, people walking, and bicycling. Therefore, residential move-in/move-out operations would not substantially affect conditions in the study area, and the Developer's Proposed Option would result in a less-than-significant impact related to residential move-in/move-out activities.

Garbage/Recycling Collection

Garbage, recycling and green waste storage would be conducted in designated areas within each building. On collection days, garbage, recycling, and green waste would be brought curbside. Bins would present a minor and temporary obstacle for people walking, but would not substantially affect walking conditions or accessibility given the temporary nature of the obstruction and the fact that garbage and recycling collection activities typically occur during off-peak times. Consistent with current practice, Recology trucks would have direct access to the curbside locations from proposed commercial loading (yellow curb) zones. Where commercial loading zones aren't available, trucks would temporarily block the travel lane during collection. There would be a temporary lessening of the capacities on internal roadways due to the slower movement and larger turning radii of garbage and recycling trucks, which could result in minor congestion and conflicts with traffic, bicycle, and walking circulation within the project site. However, potential impacts would be considered less than significant due the temporary nature and the fact that garbage and recycling collection activities typically occur during off-peak times. Additionally, given the internal roadway configuration and distance from the external street network, garbage/recycling collection activity under the Developer's Proposed Option would not cause secondary effects outside of the project site.

Passenger Loading

The Developer's Proposed Option would generate a peak hour demand of up to four passenger loading spaces, or less than one passenger loading space per building, during the peak hour of demand. The estimated demand for passenger loading spaces includes demand generated by drop-off/pick-up in private vehicles, taxis, and TNC vehicles (e.g., Uber and Lyft). The eight proposed passenger loading areas along internal streets would satisfy the peak hour passenger loading demand. The passenger loading spaces would be located in proximity to building entrances and distributed around the site. Therefore, the proposed supply would meet demand in terms of number, size, and location of spaces and the Developer's Proposed Option would result in a less-than-significant impact related to passenger loading.

Daycare Drop-Off and Pick-Up

The daycare and community space would be located on the ground floor of Block B (see SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description, Figure 2-5, p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**). A provider has not yet been identified but typical hours of operation would likely occur between 7:30 a.m. and 6 p.m. Drop-off and pick-up for the daycare facility would be from the proposed passenger loading (white curb) zones on South Street. Passenger loading areas would be signed and designated for drop-off/pick-up between the hours of 7:30 and 9:30 a.m. and 4 and 6 p.m., depending on hours of operation. There would be approximately 11 on-street spaces on the south side of South Street, near the building lobby, and 11 on-street spaces on the north side of South Street. As shown in Table 3.B-14, p. 3.B-47, the childcare facility would generate 30 vehicle trips (about 15 inbound and 15 outbound) during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours. This level of demand could be accommodated within the available curbside loading area and the Developer's Proposed Option would result in a less-than-significant impact related to daycare drop-off and pick-up.

Within the Project Site – Additional Housing Option

The Additional Housing Option would include six on-street freight loading (yellow curb) spaces and eight passenger loading (white curb) areas along the internal streets.

Freight Loading

The Additional Housing Option would generate about 49 daily delivery/service vehicle trips, and would have a demand for three loading spaces during the average and peak hours of freight loading activity. The proposed six on-street loading/service vehicle spaces would satisfy the average and peak hour freight loading demand. However, it is likely that delivery vehicles would be more concentrated near the uses they are attempting to serve. If delivery vehicles are destined for the same land use or units within the same building, there would be an uneven distribution of demand, and while there are enough loading spaces across the entire site, there may not be enough nearby loading spaces to accommodate the localized demand. Where commercial loading zones aren't available, delivery vehicles could temporarily block the travel lane during loading/unloading of goods, resulting in a temporary lessening of the capacities of internal roadways. This could result in minor congestion and conflicts with vehicle traffic, bicycle, and walking circulation within the project site. However, potential impacts would be considered less than significant due to the temporary nature. Additionally, given the internal roadway configuration and distance from the external street network, freight loading demand generated by the Additional Housing Option would not cause secondary effects outside of the project site.

Residential Move-In/Move-Out

It is anticipated that residents conducting move-in/move-out activities with smaller vehicles would utilize parking spaces within proposed building garages for move-in/move-out activities. Should on-street parking be necessary for move-in/move-out activities, individuals or building management would be required to reserve spaces through SFMTA's temporary signage program. Typically, these activities occur during off-peak times, such as in the evenings and on weekends when there are lower volumes of vehicle traffic, people walking, and bicycling. Therefore, residential move-in/move-out operations would not substantially affect conditions in the study

area, and the Additional Housing Option would result in a less-than-significant impact related to residential move-in/move-out activities.

Garbage/Recycling Collection

Garbage, recycling and green waste storage would be conducted in designated areas within each building. On collection days, garbage, recycling, and green waste would be brought curbside. Bins would present a minor and temporary obstacle for people walking, but would not substantially affect walking conditions or accessibility given the temporary nature of the obstruction and the fact that garbage and recycling collection activities typically occur during off-peak times. Consistent with current practice, Recology trucks would have direct access to the curbside locations from proposed commercial loading (yellow curb) zones. Where commercial loading zones aren't available, trucks would temporarily block the travel lane during collection. There would be a temporary lessening of the capacities on internal roadways due to the slower movement and larger turning radii of garbage and recycling trucks, which could result in minor congestion and conflicts with traffic, bicycle, and walking circulation within the site. However, potential impacts would be considered less than significant due the temporary nature and the fact that garbage and recycling collection activities typically occur during off-peak times. Additionally, given the internal roadway configuration and distance from the external street network, garbage/recycling collection activity under the Additional Housing Option would not cause secondary effects outside of the project site.

Passenger Loading

The Additional Housing Option would generate a peak hour demand of up to four passenger loading spaces, or less than one passenger loading space per building, during the peak hour of demand. The estimated demand for passenger loading spaces includes demand generated by drop-off/pick-up in private vehicles, taxis, and TNC vehicles (e.g., Uber and Lyft). The eight proposed passenger loading areas along internal streets would satisfy the peak hour passenger loading demand. The passenger loading spaces would be located in proximity to building entrances and distributed around the site. Therefore, the proposed supply would meet demand in terms of number, size, and location of spaces and the Additional Housing Option would result in a less-than-significant impact related to passenger loading.

Daycare Drop-Off and Pick-Up

As under the Developer's Proposed Option, the childcare and community space would be located on the ground floor of Block B (see SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description, Figure 2-5, p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**). Drop-off and pick-up for the daycare facility would be from a passenger loading (white curb) zones on South Street. Passenger loading areas would be signed and designated for drop-off/pick-up between the hours of 7:30 and 9:30 a.m. and 4 and 6 p.m., depending on hours of operation. There would be approximately 11 on-street spaces on the south side of South Street, near the building lobby, and 11 on-street spaces on the north side of South Street. As shown in Table 3.B-14, p. 3.B-47, the childcare facility would generate 30 vehicle trips (about 15 inbound and 15 outbound) during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours. This level of demand could be accommodated within the available curbside loading area and the Additional Housing Option would result in a less-than-significant impact related to daycare drop-off and pick-up.

Given the considerations described above, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option would not result in a freight or passenger loading deficit and would have a *less-than-significant* impact on freight and passenger loading within the project site.

Lee Avenue Between the Project Site and Ocean Avenue

As discussed in the Existing Conditions section on Freight Loading, SEIR p. 3.B-31, there were 76 total loading events observed either on Lee Avenue, within the Whole Foods loading dock, and within the auxiliary loading dock/truck turnaround over a 17-hour time period between 5 a.m. and 10 p.m. Of these freight and passenger loading events, 52 (or 68 percent) were related to Whole Foods and 31 (58 percent) of these Whole Foods-related events were vehicles stopped on Lee Avenue. Of the 52 loading/unloading events attributed to Whole Foods, six vehicles were classified as passenger cars and 15 vehicles were classified as light-duty, two-axle, four-tire, single-unit trucks, and the remaining 31 vehicles were classified as two-axle, six-tire, single-unit trucks or larger. A total of 43 (83 percent) of the loading activity occurred within the five-hour time period between 7 a.m. and 12 p.m. Three events occurred prior to 7 a.m. and the remaining six events occurred between 1 p.m. and 9 p.m. The PEIR identified that the Kragen Auto Parts site food market would have a total of 24 daily truck trips. The PEIR did not state the number of non-truck daily loading trips. The advent of courier network services such as Instacart, GrubHub, and AmazonFresh were not present at the time of the PEIR. Based on information provided by the Whole Foods store manager and data collected at 1150 Ocean Avenue Whole Foods, the observed average and peak hour loading demand is three and ten, respectively. The typical and maximum duration of loading activity is 14 minutes and 92 minutes, respectively.⁶⁰

Based on observations, the existing freight loading operations do not adhere to the measures outlined in the 1150 Ocean Avenue project (location of the Whole Foods store) conditions of approval and are illegal, given that "No Parking" signs are posted on both sides of Lee Avenue.⁶¹ Under existing conditions, Lee Avenue is a dead-end street, with no through traffic, and essentially functions as a loading zone that provides sufficient on-street loading supply to meet Whole Foods' loading demand and accommodate deliveries and passenger loading activity related to other nearby businesses along Ocean Avenue. Illegal loading and parking and lack of implementation of the required loading conditions of approval does not impede existing operations. The existing loading demand is accommodated within the on-street loading supply along Lee Avenue between the project site and Ocean Avenue and does not create hazardous conditions or significant delay affecting transit, other vehicles, bicycles, or people walking. Moreover, essentially the only other vehicle traffic on Lee Avenue is from cars entering the Whole Foods parking garage.

The proposed project would extend Lee Avenue into the project site, altering Lee Avenue's current status as a dead-end street and de facto loading area for passenger pickup and drop-off and freight deliveries. This reconfiguration of Lee Avenue would reduce the supply of on-street

⁶⁰ One vehicle was present at the beginning of the data collection period (5 a.m.) and departed at 10:34 a.m. This vehicle was stopped for a duration of over 5.5 hours. However, this length of stay does not represent typical turnover during hours of operation and is therefore excluded from the calculation of typical average and maximum duration.

⁶¹ 1150 Ocean Avenue, Case No. 2006.0884CEU Motion No. 17885, Hearing date: May 21, 2009, <http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/2016-003525CUA.pdf>, accessed April 26, 2019.

loading available to Whole Foods and nearby land uses. The project proposes to convert five metered parking spaces (105 linear feet) to commercial loading along Ocean Avenue between Lee Avenue and Brighton Avenue. There are currently three metered commercial spaces (66 linear feet) on Ocean Avenue immediately east of Brighton Avenue and one accessible parking space (22 linear feet) on Ocean Avenue immediately west of Lee Avenue. These existing spaces would remain.

Assuming an average vehicle length of 32 feet and about four feet of space between vehicles to load/unload goods (36 feet total), given the existing average and peak hour demand for approximately three spaces (108 feet) and five spaces (180 feet) of curbside loading, the proposed project options would meet average demand and result in a deficit of two spaces (75 feet) during the average and peak hour, respectively. It is possible that Whole Foods will be able to internalize and manage some or all of that remaining demand. However, if that were not to occur, the deficit would result in the following possible secondary effects:

- Under existing conditions, the distance people need to travel to load/unload goods is between 10 feet and 100 feet. The proposed commercial loading spaces on Ocean Avenue between Lee Avenue and Brighton Avenue are between 150 feet and 240 feet from the Whole Foods loading dock, increasing the travel distance by up to 230 feet. Given the increased distance from the loading dock, the average duration vehicles are stopped to load/unload goods would likely increase. Additionally, some drivers may choose to use the SFPUC easement/truck turnaround or double park on Lee Avenue instead of the proposed commercial loading spaces on Ocean Avenue.
- Vehicles may park in the northbound travel lane along Lee Avenue to conduct loading/unloading of goods. During the weekday p.m. peak hour, the Developer's Proposed Option would add 98 vehicles to northbound Lee Avenue and the Additional Housing Option would add 132 vehicles to northbound Lee Avenue. During the weekday p.m. peak hour, there would be approximately 979 and 1,013 vehicles on the Ocean Avenue westbound approach to Lee Avenue under existing conditions with the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option, respectively. Given the queue of right-turning vehicles in the rightmost travel lane, some drivers may shift to the center lane shared by the Muni K Ingleside line. As described under Impact TR-4 and assuming no loading deficit along Lee Avenue, the Developer's Proposed Option would add a maximum of 100 seconds of delay and the Additional Housing Option would add a maximum of 128 seconds of delay to transit vehicles operating along Ocean Avenue (including the K Ingleside). With the loading deficit, although unlikely, it is possible that delays to the K Ingleside could exceed the four-minute threshold of significance. Furthermore, this situation could create potentially hazardous conditions for people bicycling northbound on Lee Avenue as they may have to cross into the opposing southbound travel lane to avoid the commercial vehicles stopped and blocking the northbound travel lane.
- Vehicles may park in the southbound travel lane along Lee Avenue to conduct loading/unloading of goods. This situation could create potentially hazardous conditions for people bicycling southbound on Lee Avenue as they may have to cross into the opposing northbound travel lane to avoid the commercial vehicles stopped and blocking the southbound travel lane.
- Trucks may block Lee Avenue temporarily as they utilize the SFPUC easement/truck turnaround to maneuver into the loading dock. Trucks accessing the loading dock pull headfirst into the SFPUC easement/truck turnaround and reverse across Lee Avenue to enter

the loading dock. Physical constraints, including limited right-of-way and room to maneuver, restrict the ability for large trucks to conveniently complete turning movements. While there are no permanent physical features that prevent large vehicles from negotiating the turns or reversing into the loading dock, in some cases, the entire street width and truck turnaround area may be needed for truck maneuvering. This maneuvering would require trucks to use opposing travel lanes normally used by oncoming traffic and would require flaggers to manage traffic flow on the street and sidewalk. While trucks are reversing out of the SFPUC easement/truck turnaround, the driver's ability to see people walking on the Lee Avenue sidewalks or bicycling along Lee Avenue would be limited. Based on data collected at the loading dock, a total of nine vehicles were observed to utilize the loading dock over the 17-hour observation period, including six single-unit trucks (about 30 feet long) and three trucks 50 feet long or longer. One truck arrived to the loading dock between 7 a.m. and 8 a.m., three trucks arrived between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m. (including one longer truck), one truck arrived between 10 a.m. and 11 a.m., one truck arrived between 11 a.m. and 12 p.m., and two longer trucks arrived after 7:30 p.m. The single-unit trucks could more easily maneuver into the loading dock and would not be expected to substantially interfere with surrounding traffic. Given the infrequency of large truck maneuvers, the fact that larger vehicles arrived after 7:30 p.m. during off-peak hours when the conflicting volumes of people walking, bicycling, and driving along Lee Avenue are relatively low, the large truck maneuvers are not expected to create a hazardous condition. However, the loading activity would need to be actively managed and truck maneuvers could create delays and queues that may cause some drivers to shift to the center lane shared by the Muni K Ingleside line and affect transit operating on Ocean Avenue.

As discussed above, to the extent that loading demand is not accommodated within the proposed commercial loading zone along Ocean Avenue and could not be conveniently accommodated within existing loading spaces nearby, double-parking, illegal use of sidewalks and other public space is likely to occur. Such activities could affect traffic and transit operations as well as circulation for people walking and bicycling. Double parking and maneuvering of large trucks along and across Lee Avenue could adversely affect local vehicular, transit, walking and bicycle circulation, particularly along Lee Avenue and Ocean Avenue. Furthermore, given the uncertainty regarding the ability of the existing loading demand to be accommodated and the presence of active loading dock management by Whole Foods, the proposed project options would result in a significant impact with respect to loading.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-TR-6, Monitor Loading Activity and Implement Loading Strategies as Needed**, would require the project sponsor to coordinate with adjacent property owners at Avalon Ocean Avenue/Whole Foods at 1150 Ocean Avenue (Kragen Auto Parts Site) and 1100 Ocean Avenue (City College Terminal Site) to monitor loading activity along Lee Avenue. However, while implementation of the mitigation measure is the responsibility of the adjacent property owners and SFMTA, the Planning Commission may revoke a project approval for failure to comply with conditions of approval, such as mitigation measures.

Nevertheless, given the foregoing and the associated uncertainty about future loading operations, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-6, the impact of the proposed project options would remain *significant and unavoidable with mitigation*.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-6: Monitor Loading Activity and Implement Loading Strategies as Needed. The project sponsor shall coordinate with adjacent property

owners at Avalon Ocean Avenue/Whole Foods at 1150 Ocean Avenue (Kragen Auto Parts Site) and 1100 Ocean Avenue (City College Terminal Site) to monitor loading activity along Lee Avenue. If warranted, the project sponsor shall coordinate with the Avalon Ocean Avenue/Whole Foods at 1150 Ocean Avenue (Kragen Auto Parts Site) and 1100 Ocean Avenue (City College Terminal Site) property owners to implement relevant improvements identified in the PEIR and conditions of approval identified in Planning Commission Motion No. 17885 for 1150 Ocean Avenue, or other strategies, as needed.

- Restrict truck access to the loading dock to 30-foot trucks or shorter;
- If longer trucks are needed, the project sponsor for the Kragen Auto Parts Site development shall:
 - Restrict deliveries to the early morning to avoid peak morning and peak evening commute periods;
- Schedule all deliveries to reduce the potential for trucks waiting to enter the loading dock (which may cause a back-up onto Ocean Avenue):
 - Traffic volumes along Ocean Avenue are constantly high throughout the day; therefore, deliveries between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. should be avoided;
- Maintain accurate truck logs to document the time and duration of truck activities;
- Station loading dock personnel at the corner of the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection and at the loading dock to assist truck maneuvers and to manage traffic flows;
- Station loading dock personnel on Lee Avenue whenever delivery vehicles accessing the loading dock require traffic lanes to be blocked to assist truck maneuvering and manage traffic flow including minimizing potential conflicts with Muni operations;
- Prohibit loading dock staging from Ocean Avenue and schedule deliveries by 18-wheel trucks such that on-street queuing is unnecessary; and
- Work with SFMTA to enforce on-street parking prohibitions along Lee Avenue.

Significance after Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable

Comparison of Impact TR-6 to PEIR Impact Analysis

The PEIR did not assess loading impacts at the program level, and did not require any mitigation measures.

The PEIR identified the following improvement measures to improve loading at the City College Terminal (formerly Phelan Loop) and Kragen Auto Parts site (now Avalon Ocean Avenue/Whole Foods at 1150 Ocean Avenue).

PEIR Improvement Measure (City College Terminal Site Development – Truck Loading). Due to the configuration of Lee Avenue, trucks longer than 30 feet would have difficulty accessing the loading dock on Lee Avenue without interfering with traffic and

on-street parking during turning movements to access the loading dock area. Therefore, the following improvement measures have been developed:

- Restrict truck access to the loading dock to 30-foot trucks or shorter;
- Schedule all deliveries to reduce the potential for trucks waiting to enter the loading dock (which may cause a back-up onto Ocean Avenue);
- Maintain accurate truck logs to document the time and duration of truck activities;
- Station loading dock personnel at the corner of the Ocean/Lee intersection and at the loading dock to assist truck maneuvers and to manage traffic flows; and
- Work with SFMTA to prohibit on-street parking along Lee Avenue during the peak loading periods to provide sufficient right-of-way for truck maneuvers.

PEIR Improvement Measure (Kragen Auto Parts Site Development – Truck Loading).

The food market operator may require use of trucks longer than 30 feet, which would have difficulty accessing the loading dock on Lee Avenue without interfering with traffic or on-street parking during turning movements to back into or exit the loading dock area. Therefore, the following improvement measures have been developed:

- Restrict truck access to the loading dock to 30-foot trucks or shorter
- If longer trucks are needed, the project sponsor for the Kragen Auto Parts Site development would:
 - Restrict deliveries to the early morning to avoid peak morning and peak evening commute periods
- Schedule all deliveries to reduce the potential for trucks waiting to enter the loading dock (which may cause a back-up onto Ocean Avenue)
 - Traffic volumes along Ocean Avenue are constantly high throughout the day; therefore, deliveries between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. should be avoided
- Maintain accurate truck logs to document the time and duration of truck activities
- Station loading dock personnel at the corner of the Ocean/Lee intersection and at the loading dock to assist truck maneuvers and to manage traffic flows
- Work with SFMTA to prohibit on-street parking along Lee Avenue during the peak loading periods to provide sufficient right-of-way for truck maneuvers

Additionally, the following conditions of approval regarding loading were identified in the Planning Commission Motions for the 1150 Ocean Avenue project.

1150 Ocean Avenue, Case No. 2006.0884CEU Motion No. 17885, Hearing date: May 21, 2009

- To accommodate a grocery store use in the east block, a loading dock capable of accommodating 65-foot trucks as shown in Exhibit B may be provided with access from the Lee Avenue Extension. The Project Sponsor may seek an easement, license or other accommodation from the appropriate City agency

permitting trucks up to 65 feet in length to use a turn-around at the rear of the current Phelan Loop perpendicular to the Lee Avenue Extension to maneuver trucks so that they can back into the loading dock.

- All grocery store loading shall occur from Lee Avenue and utilize the two-space off-street loading area located on Lee Avenue.
- Because of the location of residential units in the project above the loading dock and the City's proposal to construct an affordable residential project directly across Lee Avenue from the project site, loading via the truck turnaround driveway/easement on the adjacent property to the east shall be prohibited during the late-night and early-morning hours of 11 p.m. to 6 a.m.
- Loading dock personnel shall be stationed on Lee Avenue whenever delivery vehicles accessing the loading dock require traffic lanes to be blocked, in the northbound and/or southbound direction, to assist truck maneuvering and manage traffic flow including minimizing potential conflicts with MUNI operations.
- Loading dock staging shall be prohibited from Ocean, and deliveries by 18-wheel trucks shall be scheduled such that on-street queueing is unnecessary.

Mitigation Measures M-TR-6 would require the project sponsor to coordinate with adjacent property owners to monitor loading and implement loading management strategies.; however, given the uncertainty regarding implementation of the mitigation measure and the ability of the loading supply to meet demand, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Consequently, the proposed project options would result in a new significant impact that was not previously identified in the PEIR.

2040 Cumulative Conditions

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts is the transportation study area shown on Figure 3.B-1, p. 3.B-10. This section discusses the cumulative impacts to transportation that could result from the proposed project in combination with cumulative projects. Additional discussion of the land use development and transportation network assumptions is provided in "2040 Cumulative Conditions," p. 3.B-63.

Impact C-TR-1: The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in significant construction-related transportation impacts. (Less than Significant)

As discussed under Impact TR-1, p. 3.B-68, the project would not result in significant construction-related impacts under existing plus project conditions.

Cumulative development projects located within an approximately 0.5-mile radius of the project site are identified in SEIR Section 3.A, Impact Overview, Table 3.A-1, Cumulative Projects in the

Project Vicinity, p. 3.A-11. The construction of the proposed project or project variant may overlap with construction of other cumulative development and transportation infrastructure projects, including new development and/or modernization of existing buildings as part of the City College Facilities Master Plan, I-280 Interchange Modifications, and Ocean Avenue Safety Project.

It is anticipated that construction of the Developer's Proposed Option or Additional Housing Option would occur over a time period of six years and construction of Phase 2 would overlap with occupancy of Phase 1. Construction of the cumulative projects in the vicinity of the project site could temporarily generate increased traffic at the same time and on the same roads as the Developer's Proposed Option or Additional Housing Option and change areawide circulation patterns. As part of the construction permitting process, development projects would be required to work with the various City departments to develop detailed and coordinated construction logistics and contractor parking plans, as applicable, that would address construction vehicle routing, traffic control, transit movement, pedestrian movement, and bicycle movement adjacent to the construction area. Although the City College Performing Arts Center and City College East Basin Parking Structure would not be required to comply with all of the city's requirements, they would be required to adhere to the blue book regulations addressing transportation-related circulation, access, staging and hours of delivery when working on city streets.

Overall, because the proposed construction activities of the cumulative projects would, to the maximum extent feasible, accommodate construction and staging activities on their respective project sites, and most development projects would also be required to conduct construction in accordance with City requirements, the cumulative projects would not result in *less-than-significant* cumulative construction-related transportation impacts.

Mitigation: None required.

Comparison of Impact C-TR-1 to PEIR Impact Analysis

The PEIR did not identify any significant cumulative impacts related to construction-related transportation impacts. Therefore, no new or different mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce project impacts related to construction activities are identified or required with respect to the currently proposed project. Therefore, the project would result in no new or substantially more-severe significant effects than those identified in the PEIR related to construction-related impacts.

Impact C-TR-2: The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not create traffic hazards. (Less than Significant)

As discussed under Impact TR-2, p. 3.B-73, the project would not create traffic hazards under existing plus project conditions.

Cumulative development projects located within an approximately 0.5-mile radius of the project site are identified in SEIR Section 3.A, Impact Overview, Table 3.A-1, Cumulative Projects in the

Project Vicinity, p. 3.A-11. Under cumulative conditions, traffic from people walking, bicycling, and driving on the surrounding street network would increase as a result of the Developer's Proposed Option or Additional Housing Option, other development projects within the study area, and background growth elsewhere in the city and region. This would generally be expected to lead to an increase in the potential for traffic hazards, including conflicts between people driving and people walking, bicycling, and public transit operations. However, a general increase in traffic in and of itself would not be considered a traffic hazard.

As with the Developer's Proposed Option or Additional Housing Option, other cumulative development projects would conform to the requirements of the Better Streets Plan, the Transit-First Policy, and the Transportation Demand Management program, as applicable. Furthermore, the effects of increased vehicle traffic would be balanced by cumulative transportation infrastructure projects such as the Ocean Avenue Safety Project and Muni Forward improvements that would include design features that enhance safety, and promote walking, bicycling, and transit use. Although the City College Performing Arts Center and East Basin Parking Structure would not be required to comply with the City's Better Streets Plan, the Transit-First Policy, or the Transportation Demand Management program, the City College Facilities Master Plan's planning principles identify encouraging the use of various modes of transportation, including BART, Muni, bicycles, and walking and providing convenient connections between transit stops and campus and safe routes for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Additionally, the planning principles identify development of facilities and site improvements that create usable open spaces, universal accessible design standards, and well-integrated design. These planning principles are consistent with established city policies and programs, including the Better Streets Plan, Transit-First Policy, and Transportation Demand Management program. For these reasons, the cumulative projects would not generate activities that would create hazards for people walking or bicycling or interfere with access or circulation. Therefore, the cumulative projects would result in a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact related to traffic hazards. As well, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option, in combination cumulative development in the project vicinity, would result in *less-than-significant* cumulative impacts related to traffic hazards.

Mitigation: None required.

Comparison of Impact C-TR-2 to PEIR Impact Analysis

Traffic hazards were not specifically addressed in the PEIR. Therefore, no relevant mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR. Consequently, no new or different mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce project impacts related to traffic hazards are identified or required with respect to the currently proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any new or substantially more-severe effects than those identified in the PEIR related to traffic hazards.

Impact C-TR-3: The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not interfere with accessibility or emergency access. (Less than Significant)

As discussed under Impact TR-3, p. 3.B-78, the project would not interfere with accessibility to the project site, adjoining areas, or emergency access under existing plus project conditions.

Cumulative development projects located within an approximately 0.5-mile radius of the project site are identified in SEIR Section 3.A, Impact Overview, Table 3.A-1, Cumulative Projects in the Project Vicinity, p. 3.A-11. Under cumulative conditions, vehicle activity on the surrounding street network would likely increase as a result of the Developer's Proposed Option or Additional Housing Option, other development projects within the study area, and background growth elsewhere in the city and region. As with the Developer's Proposed Option or Additional Housing Option, other cumulative development projects would conform to the requirements of the Better Streets Plan, the Transit-First Policy, and the Transportation Demand Management program, as applicable. Furthermore, the effects of increased vehicle traffic would be balanced by cumulative transportation infrastructure projects such as the Ocean Avenue Safety Project and Muni Forward improvements that would include design features that enhance safety, and promote walking, bicycling, and transit use. Although the City College Performing Arts Center and East Basin Parking Structure would not be required to comply with the City's Better Streets Plan, the Transit-First Policy, or the Transportation Demand Management program, the City College Facilities Master Plan's planning principles identify encouraging the use of various modes of transportation, including BART, Muni, bicycles, and walking and providing convenient connections between transit stops and campus and safe routes for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Additionally, the planning principles identify development of facilities and site improvements that create usable open spaces, universal accessible design standards, and well-integrated design. These planning principles are consistent with established city policies and programs, including the Better Streets Plan, Transit-First Policy, and Transportation Demand Management program. For these reasons, the cumulative projects would not generate activities that would interfere with accessibility or emergency access. Therefore, the cumulative projects would result in a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact related to accessibility and emergency access.

Given the considerations outlined above, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option in combination with cumulative development in the project vicinity would result in *less-than-significant* cumulative impacts related to accessibility of people walking or biking to and from the site and adjoining areas, and emergency access.

Mitigation: None required.

Comparison of Impact C-TR-3 to PEIR Impact Analysis

Impacts on pedestrians and bicyclists were not identified and emergency access were not specifically addressed in the PEIR. Consequently, no new or different mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce project impacts related to walking/biking, accessibility, and emergency access are identified or required with respect to the currently proposed project. Therefore, the proposed

project would not have any new or substantially more-severe effects than those identified in the PEIR related to walking/biking, accessibility, and emergency access impacts.

Impact C-TR-4: The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would substantially delay public transit, but the project would not contribute considerably to those impacts. (Less than Significant)

As discussed under Impact TR-4, p. 3.B-80, under the 2025 with Area Plan scenario, transit delay impacts were identified at Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way and the new Geneva Avenue/I-280 NB Off-Ramp and Geneva Avenue/I-280 SB On-Ramp intersections. Under the Lee Avenue Connection to City College – 2025 with Area Plan scenario, transit delay impacts were identified at Lee Avenue/Ocean Avenue. Under the project-level review of the Kragen Auto Parts Site development, transit delay impacts were identified at Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue.

The PEIR identified significant impacts to transit delay at the Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way and new Geneva Avenue/I-280 NB Off-Ramp and Geneva Avenue/I-280 SB On-Ramp intersections as a result of proposed changes to the intersection configuration, and not to increased vehicle traffic generated by area plan development. The proposed modifications to the Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way have been completed and are assumed as part of the existing conditions in this SEIR. The reconfiguration of the Geneva Avenue/I-280 Ramps is anticipated to be completed by 2024 and is assumed as part of cumulative conditions.⁶² There is currently no plan to allow full access to City College parking facilities from the Lee Avenue extension and, therefore, it is not assumed in the analysis in this SEIR. The Kragen Auto Parts Site is included in existing conditions in this SEIR. Under existing conditions analyzed in this SEIR, the Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue signal operates without a protected left-turn phase.

Since the PEIR was approved, the planning department has modified significance criteria related to public transit and transit capacity and ridership increases are no longer considered a significant impact. This topic is no longer considered under the CEQA framework, as discussed in the *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Update: Summary of Changes Memorandum*⁶³ and the *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review – Update, Public Transit Memo and Appendices*, February 2019.⁶⁴ The department deleted the transit capacity criterion to be consistent with state guidance regarding not treating addition of new users as an adverse impact and to reflect funding sources for and policies that encourage additional ridership. The 2019 Guidelines public transit delay threshold of significance uses the adopted City Charter

⁶² SFCTA, I-280 Interchange Modifications at Balboa Park Project website, <https://www.sfcta.org/I-280-interchange-modifications-balboa-park-project>, accessed April 16, 2019.

⁶³ San Francisco Planning Department, *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Update: Summary of Changes*, February 2019, http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/TIA_Guidelines_Summary_of_Changes_Memo.pdf, accessed April 16, 2019.

⁶⁴ San Francisco Planning Department, *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review – Update, Public Transit Memo and Appendices*, February 2019, http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/TIA_Guidelines_Transit_Memo.pdf, accessed February 14, 2019.

section 8A.103 85 percent on-time performance service standard for Muni, with the charter considering vehicles arriving more than four minutes beyond a published schedule time late. Additionally, San Francisco adopted numerous policies to encourage transit ridership in addition to its existing Transit First Policies. Those policies include the area plans (various years) and the Transportation Demand Management Program (adopted 2017). The planning department now considers potentially hazardous conditions for public transit operations as a separate transit significance criterion. This approach is consistent with other transportation topics and SFMTA's 2018 Strategic Plan objective 1.2 of improving the safety of the transportation system.

Intersection delay and level of service reported in the *Balboa Park Station Area Plan Transportation Study* (December 2006) for existing (2005) conditions and intersection delay and level of service for existing (2018) conditions for a subset of SEIR study intersections that overlap with intersections analyzed in the PEIR is presented in **Table 3.B-19, Weekday PM Peak Hour Intersection Delay and Level of Service**.

TABLE 3.B-19
WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION DELAY AND LEVEL OF SERVICE

Number	Intersection	Balboa Reservoir Station Area Plan (2005)		SEIR (2018)	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
2	Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue	12.5	B	13.5	B
3	Ocean Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way/Geneva Avenue	19.0	B	31.6	C
4	Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue	22.8	C	35.4	D
8	Geneva Avenue/San Jose Avenue	15.2	B	72.3	E
14	City College (S)/Frida Kahlo Way	16.6	B	23.5	C
18	I-280 SB Ramps/Geneva Avenue	22.3	C	56.2	E
19	I-280 NB Ramps/Geneva Avenue	29.4	C	65.0	E
20	I-280 NB Ramps/Ocean Avenue	23.7	C	20.0	B
21	Ocean Avenue/Brighton Avenue	22.2	C	11.1	B
Sum of Delay Intersections on Ocean Avenue		100.2	—	111.6	—
Sum of Delay Intersections on Geneva Avenue		85.9	—	225.1	—
Sum of Delay at Intersections on Geneva Avenue		35.6	—	55.1	—

SOURCES: Kolve Engineering, *Balboa Park Station Area Plan Transportation Study*, 2006; Kittelson & Associates Inc., 2019.

NOTES: LOS = level of service

^a Delay presented in seconds as the average overall intersection delay.

^b Number references study intersection number in this SEIR.

While a portion of the difference in delay and level of service between 2018 and 2005 shown in Table 3.B-19 can be attributed to general background growth within the city, for purposes of the transit delay analysis, the change can be attributed to development of the 1150 Ocean Avenue (Kragen Auto Parts) and 1100 Ocean Avenue (City College Terminal) sites. Under existing (2005) conditions, there was a combined delay of 100.2 seconds at study intersections along Ocean

Avenue, a combined delay of 85.9 seconds at study intersections along Geneva Avenue, and a combined delay of 35.6 seconds at study intersections along Frida Kahlo Way. Under existing (2018) conditions, there was a combined delay of 111.6 seconds at study intersections along Ocean Avenue, a combined delay of 225.1 seconds at study intersections along Geneva Avenue, and a combined delay of 55.1 seconds at study intersections along Frida Kahlo Way. Assuming the change is wholly attributable to the development of the 1150 Ocean Avenue (Kragen Auto Parts) and 1100 Ocean Avenue (City College Terminal) sites, these projects resulted in an increase in delay of 11.4 seconds on Ocean Avenue, 139.2 seconds on Geneva Avenue, and 19.5 seconds on Frida Kahlo Way. The transit delay resulting from the Kragen Auto Parts and City College Terminal sites would not exceed the 2019 Guidelines public transit delay threshold of significance of four minutes.

As discussed in Table 3.B-18, p. 3.B-82, under Impact TR-4, vehicle and transit trips generated by the Developer's Proposed Option would increase transit delay by a maximum of 100 seconds along Ocean Avenue, 81 seconds along Geneva Avenue, and a maximum of 73 seconds along Frida Kahlo Way during the weekday p.m. peak hour. Vehicle and transit generated by the Additional Housing Option would increase transit delay by a maximum of 128 seconds along Ocean Avenue, a maximum of 91 seconds along Geneva Avenue, and a maximum of 83 seconds along Frida Kahlo Way.

The Developer's Proposed Option in combination with the delay attributed to the Kragen Auto Parts and City College Terminal sites would result in a transit delay of 111.4 seconds on Ocean Avenue, 220.2 seconds on Geneva Avenue, and 92.5 seconds on Frida Kahlo Way. The Additional Housing Option in combination with the delay attributed to the Kragen Auto Parts and City College Terminal sites would result in a transit delay of 139.4 seconds on Ocean Avenue, 230.2 seconds on Geneva Avenue, and 102.5 seconds on Frida Kahlo Way. As demonstrated by this analysis, the increase in transit delay associated with the proposed project options in combination with the delay that has already occurred and has been measured as the change between the existing (2005) and existing (2018) conditions will not exceed the 2019 Guidelines public transit delay threshold of significance of four minutes.

Therefore, given the considerations outlined above, under the 2019 Guidelines public transit delay criteria, the PEIR would not have identified a significant cumulative transit impact.

Mitigation: None required.

Comparison of Impact C-TR-4 to PEIR Impact Analysis

The PEIR identified a significant impact related to transit ridership and capacity on the K Ingleside line. No feasible mitigation measure was identified and the impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable. Since the PEIR was approved, the planning department has modified significance criteria related to transit impacts, and transit capacity utilization is no longer a consideration for determining a significant impacts. This topic is no longer considered under the CEQA framework, as discussed in the *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Update*:

*Summary of Changes Memorandum*⁶⁵ and the *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review – Update, Public Transit Memo and Appendices*, February 2019.⁶⁶

The PEIR identified transit delay impacts at Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Frida Kahlo Way and the new Geneva Avenue/I-280 NB Off-Ramp and Geneva Avenue/I-280 SB On-Ramp intersections under 2025 with Area Plan scenario and at Lee Avenue/Ocean Avenue under the Lee Avenue Connection to City College – 2025 with Area Plan scenario. No feasible mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR that would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, these were identified as significant, unavoidable impacts. As discussed under Impact C-TR-4 above, the proposed project would not have any new or substantially more severe effects than those identified in the PEIR related to transit impacts.

Impact C-TR-5: The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not cause substantial additional VMT or substantially induce automobile travel. (Less than Significant)

As stated in the approach to analysis, VMT by its very nature is largely a cumulative impact. As discussed under Impact TR-5, p. 3.B-88, the project would not exceed the project-level quantitative thresholds of significance for VMT. In addition, Plan Bay Area meets greenhouse gas reduction targets set by the California Air Resources Board. Furthermore, as shown in **Table 3.B-20, 2040 Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled**, projected 2040 average daily VMT per capita for the TAZ the project site is located in (i.e., TAZ 915) is below the project 2040 regional average daily VMT:

- For the residential uses, the projected 2040 average household daily VMT per capita is 10.8, which is about 21 percent below the projected 2040 regional average household daily VMT per capita of 16.1.
- For the childcare use, the projected 2040 average household daily office VMT per employee is 12.6, which is about 26 percent below the projected 2040 regional average daily office VMT per employee of 17.1.
- For the retail uses, the projected 2040 daily VMT per retail employee is 2.2, which is about 82 percent below the projected 2040 regional average daily retail VMT per employee of 14.6.^{67,68}

⁶⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Update: Summary of Changes*, February 2019, http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/TIA_Guidelines_Summary_of_Changes_Memo.pdf, accessed April 16, 2019.

⁶⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review – Update, Public Transit Memo and Appendices*, February 2019, http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/TIA_Guidelines_Transit_Memo.pdf, accessed February 14, 2019.

⁶⁷ Ibid, footnote 4.

⁶⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, *Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for Balboa Reservoir Project*, November 15, 2018.

TABLE 3.B-20
2040 DAILY VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED

Land Use	Bay Area Regional Average	Project TAZ (TAZ 915)
Residential (per capita)	16.1	10.8
Childcare (per employee)	17.1	12.6
Retail (per employee)	14.6	2.2

SOURCE: San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Information Map. <http://sfplanninggis.org/TIM/>.

NOTE:
Childcare is treated as office for purposes of screening and analysis.

Therefore, no significant cumulative VMT impacts would occur.

Mitigation: None required.

Comparison of Impact C-TR-5 to PEIR Impact Analysis

The San Francisco Planning Commission replaced automobile delay (vehicle level of service) with the VMT significance criteria (resolution 19579) in March 2016. As a result, the PEIR did not analyze VMT or induced automobile travel. The PEIR and identify any significant impacts related to VMT or induced automobile travel impacts and did not require any mitigation measures. Consequently, no new or different mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce project impacts are identified or required with respect to the currently proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any new or substantially more severe effects than those identified in the PEIR related to VMT and induced automobile travel impacts.

Impact C-TR-6: The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in significant loading impacts. (Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)

As discussed under Impact TR-6, p. 3.B-89, the project would result in significant and unavoidable with mitigation loading impacts on Lee Avenue between the project site and Ocean Avenue under existing plus project conditions.

Cumulative development projects located within an approximately 0.5-mile radius of the project site are identified in SEIR Section 3.A, Impact Overview, Table 3.A-1, Cumulative Projects in the Project Vicinity, p. 3.A-11. Under cumulative conditions, freight and passenger loading activity on the surrounding street network would increase as a result of development projects within the study area. To the extent that loading demand could not be conveniently accommodated within available loading spaces, double-parking, illegal use of sidewalks and other public space is likely to occur. Such activities could affect traffic and transit operations as well as circulation for people walking and bicycling. Therefore, cumulative loading impacts would be significant. Given the uncertainty regarding the ability of the existing and future loading demand to be accommodated and the uncertainty regarding the efficacy of the active loading dock management by Whole

Foods, the proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would have *significant-and-unavoidable* cumulative impacts related to loading.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-TR-6, Monitor Loading Activity and Implement Loading Strategies as Needed**, would require the project sponsor to coordinate with adjacent property owners at Avalon Ocean Avenue/Whole Foods at 1150 Ocean Avenue (Kragen Auto Parts Site) and 1100 Ocean Avenue (City College Terminal Site) to monitor loading activity along Lee Avenue. However, implementation of the mitigation measure is the responsibility of the adjacent property owners and SFMTA, and cannot be guaranteed by the planning department.

Therefore, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-6, the proposed project's impact would be cumulatively considerable and the cumulative impact would be *significant and unavoidable with mitigation*.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-6: Monitor Loading Activity and Implement Loading Strategies as Needed (Impact TR-6, p. 3.B-89).

Comparison of Impact C-TR-6 to PEIR Impact Analysis

The PEIR did not assess loading impacts at the program level, and did not require any mitigation measures. Mitigation Measures M-TR-6 would require the project sponsor to coordinate with adjacent property owners to monitor loading and implement loading management strategies.; however, given the uncertainty regarding implementation of the mitigation measure and the ability of the loading supply to meet demand, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Consequently, the proposed project options would result in a new significant impact that was not previously identified in the PEIR.